

# Pedophile Priests

Philip Jenkins

Long-standing media hostility to the Catholic Church was expressed in singularly frank terms in 2002, during what was commonly (and misleadingly) called the nation's "pedophile priest" crisis. Even reputable news outlets presented a picture of a Catholic priesthood heavily infiltrated by perverts and child molesters, whose activities were treated so mildly by their superiors that the bishops themselves were virtually accomplices. This awful picture gave the opportunity for the widespread public expression of grotesquely anti-Catholic and anti-clerical sentiments and the revival of every ancient stereotype.

Undeniably, some Catholic authorities had responded poorly to abuse problems in bygone years, sometimes callously or irresponsibly, and on occasion worse than that. Yet the disproportionate reaction to the clergy abuse issue, the suggestions of pervasive criminality, cannot be understood except as a reflection of accumulated political grievances over other issues, often involving sexuality and gender. Every interest group with an axe to grind now used the "pedophile crisis" as the grounds for unrestrained frontal attacks on the clergy, but also on fundamental aspects of Catholic belief.

In modern American history, no mainstream denomination has ever been treated so consistently, so publicly, with such venom. The only justification would have been if in fact the institutional Church had been guilty of the abuses alleged and the media were doing no more than reporting the sober truth – or at least they had solid grounds for their charges. Since in most cases they did not, it is reasonable to cite this affair as a gross efflorescence of anti-Catholic rhetoric.

The problem of sexual abuse by clergy first came to public attention during the mid-1980s, when the issue was commonly identified as that of "pedophile priests" – that is, an overwhelmingly Catholic problem. For most of the past century, the media refused to examine sexual abuse by clergy of any denomination, but beginning in the early 1980s the volume of reporting grew enormously. One wave of scandals crested in 1992-93 and subsided by about 1994, partly as a result of public revulsion at the blatantly false charges brought against Chicago's Cardinal Bernardin.

The latest wave of scandals was launched by a Boston case that seemed to involve all the very worst stereotypes of clerical misbehavior and Church connivance. Through 2001, the case against former Father John Geoghan revealed the career of an all too genuine "pedophile priest," with a horrifying record of molestation. By the time he was finally defrocked (expelled from the priesthood) in 1998, he may have molested hundreds of children. This case attracted close attention in the Boston media, and at the start of 2002, an investigation by the *Boston Globe* demonstrated how directly Cardinal Law and other senior clerics had been involved in the mismanagement of this case throughout the years. This scandal was soon picked up by the national news media.

The Geoghan story was troubling enough in its own right, but the story also gave a damning picture of Church attitudes. Geoghan's misdeeds came to the attention of Church authorities, but time and again, his superiors sent him for ineffective courses of treatment before placing him in a new parish. Obviously, parishioners were not warned of their

pastor's previous record, and not surprisingly, the troubles began afresh. When this record came to light, the public was appalled to hear that Catholic authorities could so cynically have put children at risk.

Pressure from the news media and from lawyers now forced dioceses across the country to turn over the names of other priests who had drawn complaints of abuse or misconduct through the years. Some complaints had been investigated internally, while others had resulted in lawsuits, but repeatedly, Church authorities had insisted on keeping these scandals from the public. Though very few other cases involved anything like the depravity of the Geoghan case this emphasis on silence and secrecy gave a conspiratorial air to Church actions.

In the first half of 2002, three hundred American priests either resigned or were removed from duty following charges of misconduct with minors. Time and again, the headlines were linking words such as church and priest with abuse, pedophile, and cover-up. Media commentators generalized their criticism to the whole Catholic Church for its alleged softness on pedophilia, a point that emerged forcibly in op-ed pieces and cartoons. Such stories and images naturally had a dreadful effect on Catholics, lay and clerical.

On closer examination, the problem was, and is, rather different from what was perceived by the media, and at every stage familiar stereotypes break down. Crucially, there is no evidence that Catholic priests are especially likely to be abusers, still less to be pedophiles. A casual observer relying on the mass media would form the overwhelming impression of a Church institution awash in perversion, conspiracy, and criminality. That is very far from the truth.

Widespread media reports suggest that the pedophile priest represents a very common type. Based on their misinterpretations of some expert observation, the media presented the figure that 5 or 6 percent of all priests were "pedophiles," a terrifying statistic that suggested perhaps three thousand predatory individuals like Father Geoghan were active at any given time. If we add to these figures for clerical pedophiles those priests involved sexually with older teenagers, then a very large proportion of priests would be grave abusers, perhaps a quarter or a half. Often, however, the media was relying uncritically on claims made by activists and victims groups. Such figures are wildly exaggerated.

Perhaps the most reliable source available is the Chicago study commissioned by Cardinal Bernardin during the previous national wave of abuse crises in the early 1990s [Julia Quinn Dempsey, John R. Gorman, John P. Madden, and Alphonse P. Spilly, *The Cardinal's Commission on Clerical Sexual Misconduct with Minors*, 1992]. A committee of experts examined the personnel files of all men who had been priests in the Archdiocese of Chicago between 1951 and 1991, or 2,252 individuals. That number should be stressed, since it represents the kind of large sample that social scientists usually insist on, so that results can be applied to wider populations. Between 1963 and 1991, fifty-seven of these priests had been subject to allegations of sexual abuse, in addition to two visiting clerics. The commission reviewed all charges, not by the standard of criminal cases, which insists on proof beyond a reasonable doubt, but on the civil criterion of the preponderance of evidence. In addition, evidence was used that would not have been acceptable in a court of law, including hearsay testimony. Where there was doubt about a case, the commission decided to err on the side of the accuser rather than the priest involved. By these standards, the charges in eighteen

cases were judged not to involve sexual misconduct. Removing these eighteen cases left valid charges against thirty-nine priests in the archdiocese and the two externs.

In short, 2.6 percent of Chicago's archdiocesan clergy were the subject of complaints, and charges against 1.7 percent of priests were probably true. As the Cardinal's commission was under intense public pressure to examine the records thoroughly and frankly, we can be reasonably confident about the validity of these figures. Some confirmation of this figure comes from more recent events in Philadelphia where, facing a comparable clamor for openness, the archdiocese released information on all the priests who have been the subjects of "credible" abuse complaints in the previous half century. The number of offenders was 35, out of some 2,100 priests who had served in the archdiocese since 1950. Again, this represents a proportion of around 1.7 percent.

The figure that around 2 percent of priests might be involved in misconduct is a useful guideline, though we cannot insist on its absolute value. Obviously, unknown or unreported offenses are not included. Yet, we must be struck by the relatively minor nature of many of the cases that people were reporting to Church authorities and which the committee did not count as abuse – behavior such as inappropriate speech or horseplay with teenagers. If people were prepared to report these misdeeds, it is not likely that they were too intimidated to speak out against the clergy on weightier matters. Although parents would have been very reluctant to denounce priests to police or social workers, they were clearly prepared to bring their suspicions to the Church.

Perhaps the real figure for clergy abusers is 1 percent, perhaps it is 4 or 5 percent, but we should be suspicious of any figures far outside this ballpark. Put another way: if the figures are correct, 97 or 98 percent of Catholic priests are not involved with minors.

Having said this, a 2 percent offense rate is bad enough in its own right, and the problem requires action. As was often pointed out in 2002, the Church needed tough policies to ensure that complaints would be investigated thoroughly, the accused clergy would be kept from any further involvement with children, and so on. In fact, most dioceses implemented exactly these policies during the previous wave of abuse cases in 1993, and they have been observing them ever since. Contrary to the impression one might obtain from the media, most dioceses have in recent years done a respectable job of acknowledging the clerical abuse problem and responding to it.

Moreover, although 2 or 3 percent of Catholic priests might have offended sexually, this does not mean that they are pedophiles, namely, adults sexually interested in pre-pubescent children. In the Chicago study, only a single priest out of over 2,200 fell into this pedophile category: one priest, not 1 percent of priests. All the other offenders were active with young people in their mid-or late teens. That fact is important for the number of victims affected by a given offender and the far-out claims made by activist groups such as the Linkup. Some rare serial pedophiles might indeed claim hundreds of victims, but the vast majority of clergy active with older teenagers are likely to be involved with just one or two individuals.

These numbers are radically different from the impression we normally find in the media and in public discourse. Though the notion that around 6 percent of priests are pedophiles has been discredited for a decade, it still appears in print.

Also contradicting conventional wisdom, there is strikingly little evidence that clergy of any kind are any more or less likely to abuse than non-clerical groups who have close contact with children, for instance, teachers, Scoutmasters, or supervisors in residential homes and summer camps. And though a sizable number of clergy have been implicated in this kind of abuse, no evidence indicates that Catholic or celibate clergy are more (or less) involved than their non-celibate counterparts. Every denomination and faith tradition has had its trail of disasters. A study of seventy-five priests and ministers convicted of criminal sexual abuse between 1985 and 2002 found that thirty-eight were Catholic priests, while most of the rest were from Protestant denominations [Mark Clayton and Seth Stern, "Clergy, Abuse, and Jail Time," *Christian Science Monitor*, Mar. 21, 2002].

Sexual misconduct appears to be spread fairly evenly across denominations, though I stress the word appears. Astonishingly, Catholic priests are literally the only profession in the country for whom we have relatively good figures for the incidence of child abuse and molestation. For these other groups, we have to depend on the volume of news stories and largely impressionistic evidence, but based on this, there do not appear to be significant differences in the amount of misconduct. If someone wants to claim that the Catholic priesthood is more prone to abusive behavior than other groups, then the burden of proof is upon that person: it is not possible to prove a negative. In order to establish a case proving priestly depravity, we would need to compare like samples of clergy from different denominations, with comparable systems of processing complaints and keeping records. No such studies have ever been attempted. As a result, the Catholic connection to abuse or pedophilia remains no more than an unproven assumption, or rather a prejudice.

As reported cases of priestly abuse proliferated during 2002, the media became increasingly intolerant of protests that the Catholic angle of the affair was being exaggerated. If that's so, they demanded, why is it we only hear about Catholic molestation stories? Actually, there are several answers to this question, which reflect the intertwined workings of the media and the courts.

One obvious point is that there are a great many Catholic priests and religious. Moreover, many of the cases revealed recently took place many years ago, often in the 1960s or 1970s, so we should really be looking at the total number of men who had been Catholic clergy since about 1960. Currently, there are rather less than 50,000 Catholic priests, but if we take all the current and former priests and religious who served at any point in time since 1960, we are probably talking of at least 120,000 individuals. If we assume that 2 or 3 percent of that population have offended sexually, that represents perhaps 3,000 abusive clergy, a far larger number of cases than have actually come to light to date. As of mid-2002, the number of accused priests was around 1,500, and of course, not all those charges would be substantiated. A large absolute number of Catholic abuse cases does not necessarily reflect a high rate of priestly misbehavior.

Structural and bureaucratic reasons also help explain the number of Catholic cases that appear in the news. Much of the evidence comes from civil lawsuits involving priests and their dioceses. The proliferation of specifically Catholic lawsuits does not mean that priests are more likely to have offended, but rather that a centralized church with good record keeping and extensive property holdings is a much more valuable legal target than a small decentralized congregation. Catholic clergy lead the list of known abuse cases because they are relatively easy to sue and because civil lawsuits produce a wealth of internal church

documents. Political probing and legal threats in the Geoghan case induced the Boston archdiocese to hand over the names of eighty priests suspected of sexual misconduct, a litigator's dream. In the diocese of Portland, Maine, prosecutors asked Church authorities to hand over any records of abuse allegations against priests within the past seventy-five years, that is, dating back to 1927. How many other agencies or denominations might conceivably be expected to have records dating back anything like that so far? Yet with the Catholic Church, such a fishing expedition might well produce a rich haul.

To some extent, the media concentration on Catholic abuse cases represents a kind of self-fulfilling expectation. Because priests are considered likely to offend, any cases that come to light can be fitted into a prepared package of images and issues: the media has a lot of experts handy and know what questions to ask, and those all deal with Catholic themes. If a non-Catholic case comes to light (as it often does), it is usually treated as an isolated case of individual depravity, rather than an institutional problem. If a Presbyterian minister tries to seduce a young boy met on the Internet, it is reported as the story of an evil or depraved man, not of a troubled church. If a priest is caught in the same circumstances, then this event is contextualized with other tales of "pedophile priests." The media knows what questions to ask about the institutional crisis of the Catholic Church, the failures of celibacy, the abuse of Episcopal power, the culture of secrecy, and so on. And the media know the answers they wish to obtain. Journalists find writing stories much easier when they know from the start exactly what the finished product is going to look like. The more Catholic cases are treated in this way, the more the accumulation of sensational cases confirms the media expectation about the Catholic nature of the problem.

This issue of expectation is critical. Let us imagine a hypothetical series of events in which some other group might be labeled similarly as real or potential abusers. Just for argument, take public school teachers. Quite frequently, cases come to light of teachers involved in sexual misconduct or online seduction, trading child pornography, and so on. We generally see these cases as isolated examples of individual deviance. But the stories are surprisingly abundant, and newspapers and magazines have published exposes suggesting a widespread underlying problem. A 1998 survey of newspaper archives nationwide by the non-sensationalist magazine *Education Week* found 244 reported cases involving teacher-student relationships in a six-month period, with behaviors varying from "unwanted touching to sexual relationships and serial rape." That represents an average of over nine cases a week. [Caroline Hendrie and Steven Drummond, et al., "A Trust Betrayed: Sexual Abuse by Teachers," three-part series, *Education Week*, Dec. 2-16, 1998]

Of course, these are only the reported cases, and some activists feel that many other incidents remain undetected or unreported. The Web site of the advocacy group Survivors of Educator Sexual Abuse and Misconduct Emerge (SESAME) claims, "The best estimate is that 15 percent of students will be sexually abused by a member of the school staff during their school career." The organization's president complains, "Schools don't report rumors. Schools don't report allegations. Schools don't report teacher resignations under suspicious circumstances." No central clearinghouse collects and analyses such incidents. As a result, there are scandalous cases of teachers who have run into trouble in one school system moving to a new area, where they resume their abusive careers. It all sounds very much like the worst image of priestly abuse before the recent upsurge of clerical scandals, though at the time of writing, abusive teachers rarely register on the popular consciousness. To use a social science term, they represent an unconstructed social problem.

But let us imagine that civil lawsuits started exposing cases not just of actual criminality among teachers, but of internal complaints and disciplinary proceedings. Obviously, the number of cases that came to public attention would then increase dramatically. At that stage, the media might focus on an emerging social problem, which would be painted in the most sinister terms. Cases involving teachers and older teenagers would be reported alongside stories of child pornography and molestation, and presented as part of a single social menace. Media reports would tend to lump together minor acts of harassment with consensual affairs between teachers and students, and even forcible rape. Perhaps the issue would be framed in terms of memorable phrases – “peducators,” for example. Since teachers are so numerous, even a tiny proportion of offenders would produce an impressive-sounding absolute number of cases, probably far higher than for priests or other clergy.

With the image of the pedophile teacher firmly established in the public mind, there would be a sizable incentive for further litigation, which would generate ever larger numbers of known and suspected cases. The new media and talk shows would give the issue daily coverage; the matter would become the subject of jokes on comedy shows, a theme in television drama. Sensing the new public mood, individuals would be encouraged to come forward and report instances of victimization, often from the distant past. Reporting would encourage further reporting, litigation would stir more litigation, in a spiral that has no logical ending. Numbers beget numbers. With so many cases surfacing, experts would debate the circumstances that created such a dysfunctional culture in the schools and the teaching profession. The scale and seriousness of the problem would be so obvious a part of everyday discourse that any attempt to challenge public perceptions would be viewed as callous or self-serving.

If you expect a group to be villainous, you will generally find ample confirmation of that view. And once a problem becomes established, once it becomes a social fact, not much fire is needed to generate a very large amount of dense smoke.

During the 1980s, the media had to find a way of understanding a large number of misconduct cases involving clergy. For various reasons the media had largely decided by mid-decade that clergy abuse was above all a Catholic problem. Once that decision was made, all future cases were fitted into a particular stereotype. The problem was that of the “pedophile priest.” The popularity of the term served to channel and constrain discussion of the abuse issue by focusing entirely on (Catholic) priests and stressing the misleading angle of pedophilia. The use of this term, with all its connotations of predation and molestation, was clearly aimed at presenting the misconduct issue in the gravest and most repulsive terms.

As we have seen, the whole image of the “pedophile” is open to debate. Father Geoghan was indeed a pedophile, yet such individuals account for only a tiny minority of sexual misconduct cases involving clergy. If there is a “typical” clergy abuse case, then it involves a cleric sexually active with a young person between fifteen and seventeen, more commonly a boy than a girl. The act may be criminal as well as immoral, and it usually involves a disastrous violation of trust, but it is not pedophilia. In some instances, it is not even criminal: in many states, the age of consent is sixteen.

I thus draw a crucial distinction between pedophile activity and sexual misconduct with older teenagers – basically, pedophilia occurs when the younger party is seven or eight rather than

seventeen or eighteen. Though the difference seems self-evident, some Church critics angrily reject any discussion of priestly misdeeds that denies the “pedophilia” of offenders.

So if it is not pedophilia, exactly what is the misconduct of which most errant priests are guilty? In the psychiatric literature, an adult sexually interested in a teenager is technically described as an “ephebophile,” but that word is of limited usefulness because it is so obscure. But perhaps we do not actually need a formal medical label at all. When an adult man has consensual sex with a sixteen- or seventeen-year-old girl, we do not normally describe that act in terms of a psychiatric condition, but would rather speak of a heterosexual relationship (though we might well think that the age difference makes the affair inadvisable or dangerous). Equally, when a man has sex with a boy who is sixteen or seventeen, we refer to the act as homosexuality rather than pedophilia or child abuse.

To stress that many instances of clerical misconduct involve what should properly be called homosexuality is not to minimize or excuse the activities. It is difficult to speak of full consent when there is such a grotesque imbalance of power and authority between the partners, and the priest is certainly breaching an assumed bond of trust, in addition to his clerical vows. Even so, the media treat such relationships very differently than similar instances in which the older partner is a non-clerical authority figure, such as a teacher or coach. In recent years, novels about youth homosexuality and teens coming out have proliferated, usually treating the subject sympathetically, and often portraying an intergenerational relationship as a kind of “initiation.”

This take on the topic is reflected when the books are reviewed by mainstream media, which normally advocate zero tolerance for any such offense involving a priest. A reviewer in the *New York Times* responds to Sylvia Brownrigg’s book *Pages for You*, which tells the story of a relationship between a seventeen-year-old girl and a woman teacher. This is portrayed as an “age-old story of first love and sexual initiation,” “a gay love affair” that must nevertheless be kept from outsiders. In 2000, the *Los Angeles Times* reviewed Gavin Lambert’s *Mainly About Lindsay Anderson*, observing that “since [Lambert’s] sexual initiation at age eleven with a teacher at his preparatory school, he has felt only ‘gratitude’ for realizing his homosexuality.” In the *New York Times*, film critic Stanley Kauffmann relates in matter-of-fact terms how “[w]hen Lambert was a schoolboy of eleven, a teacher initiated him.” The lack of critical comment in these instances is stunning, as is the failure to place quotation marks around initiation or initiated. Others would choose much harsher terms, such as molestation, pedophilia, or child rape. Even in such a grossly exploitative context, journalists feel a need to avoid condemning alternative forms of sexuality. When clergy are involved, though, the media adopt a stern moralism.

In short, the media are quite justified in denouncing the sexual exploitation of the young and vulnerable; but why do they only do so when the perpetrator is a cleric? Where is the consistency?

Despite the inaccuracy of the term, the pedophile theme has dominated news coverage since clergy abuse cases first hit the headlines in the mid-1980s, and has continued to do so long after the news media should have known better. In the new crisis of 2002, yet again the standard image was of a middle-aged priest as a potential molester targeting small children – usually boys – of seven or eight.

To insist on the strict definition of pedophilia may seem like verbal sleight of hand, but it is critical in determining whether an offending minister should be returned to parish life – and therefore, the degree of the Church’s guilt in mishandling the sensational cases. According to what was long psychiatric orthodoxy, a cleric who offended with an older teenager could be treated successfully with little risk of recurrence, so returning him to parish life was a reasonable decision, while such mercy was wholly inappropriate toward a true pedophile. The fact that the Boston archdiocese acted abominably in the Geoghan case does not mean that other dioceses acted foolishly or dishonestly when they returned other priests to parish service: sometimes they did, sometimes they didn’t. It is not fair, though, to conclude that Catholic priests are especially likely to be abusers, that they are likely to be pedophiles, or that their superiors usually act irresponsibly.

Equally dubious is the assumed linkage between clerical misdeeds and celibacy, yet this too was a very common theme in media reporting. One writer in *Slate* entitled his analysis “Booty and the Priest: Does Abstinence Make the Church Grow Fondlers?”

The media has to know just how distorted is the picture of the legion of pedophile priests shielded by an uncaring Church hierarchy. They know about cases involving other denominations, and they can see that the vast majority of clergy abuse stories involve older teenagers or young adults. They are also aware that a proportion of lawsuits against the Church are driven as much by a quest for multi-million-dollar damages as by any notion of justice, and that at least some charges are quite false.

The pedophile stereotype is so popular because it meshes so well with ancient images of Catholic perversion and inversion, stories that once circulated in anti-Catholic tracts and which more recently were confined to vulgar jokes. But the image is also politically and rhetorically useful in any political disputes involving the Church, conflicts that so commonly revolve around questions of sex and morality. The Church claims to speak for morality, yet (according to the stereotype) it puts the interests of its own perverts above those of innocent children. The charge that thousands of clergy are reputedly involved in the sexual abuse of youngsters and small children makes nonsense of the Church’s claims to moral authority or integrity. The legend of the pedophile priest is a powerful weapon for feminist groups in debates over abortion, for gay rights groups over proposed civil rights legislation, or anyone opposing the Church over matters affecting children or families.

Activists of various stripes attack the Church hierarchy, and these critiques are then echoed, uncritically, by the mass media. When the activists themselves claim Catholic credentials, this further erodes any restraint the media might have had about offering the most florid anti-clerical and anti-Catholic imagery. Catholic reformers themselves have enthusiastically accepted the pedophile priest motif. Since “everybody knows” that Catholic priests are so prone to perversion, internal critics of Church structures and policies can use that fact to add urgency to their calls for reform, which have been faithfully reported in most mainstream newspapers and television news outlets.

Many activists are currently speaking in terms of the abuse crisis launching a “new Reformation,” and perhaps their expectations are not too wide of the mark – though their historical knowledge is at best patchy. They are generally working with a common myth of the sixteenth-century Reformation that goes something like this. By 1500 or so, the Church was awash with corruption; ordinary lay people were appalled by their corrupt, depraved,

and ignorant clergy, and they demanded a radical change, which resulted in the establishment of new Protestant churches.

That is one way of looking at things, but for some years, mainstream historians have favored a much less simplistic approach. Many modern accounts of pre-Reformation religion stress how wholeheartedly the Church's role was accepted, how widely popular were Catholic beliefs and rituals, and how well the clergy fitted into their society. Generally, the clergy were respected and pious, did their best in difficult economic circumstances, and were open to the idea of reasonable reforms. There were scandals, to be sure, but the Church was accepted as a fundamental part of life. What lay grievances existed were limited and specific, and in no sense demanded a revolutionary reform. Popular though the idea may be today, European people did not overnight convert to Luther's complex theological notions as soon as he nailed them on the church door in Wittenberg. [see Eamon Duffy, *Stripping of the Altars*, Yale University Press, 1994]

However, the sixteenth-century Church came under increasing attack from vehement anti-clericals, who exaggerated and often invented tales about corrupt and predatory clergy: Some Church critics authentically wanted a systematic religious change, but many were demagogues or time servers who used the mass media available to them at the time, including scabrous cartoons and visual imagery. The attack on the Church succeeded in many countries because governments resented Church independence and its resistance to the new nationalism. When Church authority collapsed, governments ensured that the new religious establishments were totally docile. Other beneficiaries of religious "reform" included lay elites such as the lawyers, who enriched themselves through the massive legalized plunder of Church property. The main casualties of the reform were the ordinary lay believers, who saw their cherished religious practices prohibited and mocked by the new elites in the Church and in society. The parallels to contemporary realities are too numerous to detail here, but most obvious is the gulf that separates the popular allegations made against clergy from any kind of objective reality.

Many of the most damaging attacks against the Church derived from internal sources rather than external critics, who would describe themselves as faithful Catholics. Yet their rhetoric deploys an often ferocious range of anti-Church arguments, which are readily adopted and amplified by the most fervent anti-Catholics. In this view, the Church is of its nature un-American, abusive, and totalitarian; clergy are closeted perverts. The effects of the clergy abuse crisis, what *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd calls the "perp walk of sacramental perverts," have been far-reaching. Over the last fifteen years, we have seen the massive revival of an ancient anti-clerical and anti-Catholic image that had largely been excluded from respectable discourse. Today, though, the priestly caricature has returned to the social mainstream.

Philip Jenkins is Distinguished Professor of History and Religious Studies at Pennsylvania State University. He is author of *Pedophile Priests: Anatomy of a Contemporary Crisis* (Oxford University Press, 1996) and a leading authority on the clergy abuse issue. The above article is excerpted from the chapter "The Perp Walk of Sacramental Perverts" in his book, *The New Anti-Catholicism: The Last Acceptable Prejudice* (Oxford University Press, 2003). Dr. Jenkins identifies his religious affiliation as Protestant Episcopalian.