

Spring 2019

Integrand of Incontinence: Towards a Classification of Ephebophile Abusers within the Clerical Abusers in the United States

Conor Coutts
Carroll College

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.carroll.edu/history_theses

Part of the [Catholic Studies Commons](#), [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), and the [Social History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Coutts, Conor, "Integrand of Incontinence: Towards a Classification of Ephebophile Abusers within the Clerical Abusers in the United States" (2019). *History Undergraduate Theses*. 108.
https://scholars.carroll.edu/history_theses/108

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the History at Carroll Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in History Undergraduate Theses by an authorized administrator of Carroll Scholars. For more information, please contact tkratz@carroll.edu.

SIGNATURE PAGE

This thesis for honors recognition has been approved for the

Department of History

Janette M. Fregulia 1 May 2019
Director Date

Janette M. Fregulia
Print Name

E. Glowienka 05/01/19
Reader Date

EDWARD GLOWIENKA
Print Name

Kelly Pawsey 05/1/19
Reader Date

Kelly Pawsey
Print Name

Integrant of Incontinence: Towards a Classification of Ephebophile Abusers
within the Clerical Abusers in the United States

Conor A. Coutts

History 499

May 2, 2019

This thesis is dedicated to all survivors of sexual abuse by Catholic priests in the United States and around the world, may they find peace.

Abstract

For the last five decades, child sexual abuse by Roman Catholic clergy has been a moral, pastoral, and institutional stain on the Church in the United States. From 1950 to present, over 15,000 formal reports of abuse have been made, implicating over 6,000 priests.¹ Moreover, the subsequent financial costs to Dioceses have been substantial, with payouts totaling more than \$3 billion dollars and at least 20 dioceses declaring bankruptcy.² Yet, the foremost consequences of such abuse culminate in a range of sequelae for abuse survivors, whose faith, trust, identity, and self-regard have been gravely wounded.

Though the child sexual abuse crisis is still ongoing given the long-term effects of childhood trauma and the several legal breeches made by the institutional Church, a vast majority of accusations consist of historical cases of abuse that largely occurred in the 1960s through the 1980s. My thesis seeks to explore the patterns within clerical culture during the child sexual abuse crisis in the US. Of particular interest to my research is the extent to which cases of abuse constituted ephebophilic abuse and to examine if ephebophilia represents a type of homosexuality.

¹ National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People. "A Ten Year Progress Report." *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.*, June 2012

² Montoya Bryan, *Susan*. "Bankruptcy filing provides rare window into diocese finances". *The Associated Press*
December 4, 2018

Introduction

For the last five decades, child sexual abuse by Roman Catholic clergy has been a moral, pastoral, and institutional stain on the Church in the United States. From 1950 to present, over 15,000 formal reports of abuse have been made, implicating over 6,000 priests.³ Moreover, the subsequent financial costs to dioceses have been substantial, with payouts totaling more than \$3 billion dollars and at least 20 dioceses declaring bankruptcy.⁴ Yet, the foremost consequences of such abuse culminate in a range of sequelae for abuse survivors, whose faith, trust, identity, and self-regard have been gravely wounded.

The crisis reached national prevalence in 2002 within the Archdiocese of Boston as a result of scrupulous investigative reporting by the *Boston Globe*, which was eminent in characterizing the abuse as a systemic crisis, precursing like investigations across the country and inspiring unprecedented reports of abuse allegations. In 2003, faced with outrage and mounting civil litigation, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) passed sweeping protocol to report abusive behavior by Church personnel in

³ National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People. "A Ten Year Progress Report." *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.*, June 2012

⁴ Montoya Bryan, *Susan*. "Bankruptcy filing provides rare window into diocese finances". *The Associated Press*
December 4, 2018

order to protect children. In what was termed the *Dallas Charter*, funding was provided for an unprecedented multi-million dollar academic study that would gather and contextualize data so as to grasp the nature of child sexual abuse with intentions of transparency and fortitude.⁵ The John Jay College of Criminal Justice, working with a robust staff of academic and criminal investigators released two versions of the namesake report; *The Nature and Scope* (JJR1), the quantitative report released in 2004 and the *Causes and Context* (JJR2) in 2011, which centered around qualitative analysis.

Although dioceses and religious orders continue to participate in litigation and out-of-court settlements regarding the residual effects of the crisis, the national publicity that occurred in 2002-2003 was without peer in the decade that followed. However, in August 2018 when the Attorney General's Office of Pennsylvania published a grand jury report concerning child sexual abuse in six out of the eight dioceses in Pennsylvania, the persistent national media attention was reclaimed, rivaling that of 2002. The Pennsylvania Report's publishing intersected with allegations of sexual abuse and harassment faced by disgraced ex-Cardinal Theodore McCarrick commenced a national debate both within and out of the Church regarding the transparency of the episcopacy and the causes and scale of sexual abuse. What some referred to as the "Summer of Shame" seemed to bring division between two main factions within the US: those who use the *John Jay Reports* to attribute the central reason for the abuse to homosexuality and those who attribute it to clericalism. I thusly endeavor to explore the former

⁵ "Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People" *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*. 2018

conjecture. Though *JJR2* was clear as to not prescribe homosexuality as the sole or even leading nature of abuse, the characterization of 81% of the abuse victims being male mean that there was an overall disproportionately large same-sex predation within the abuse crisis.⁶ However, the (widely acknowledged) disproportionate amount of homosexuals in the priesthood, and the historical increase in same-sex behavior in American seminaries, warrant a further examination of the extent to which clerical abuse constitutes homosexuality.^{7 8} The intention of this examination is to seek the truth about the different causes of the abuse crisis and to inform the measurement of how they intersect with other behaviors which are pervasive in the greater culture but to which the clerical state is contrary.

My research question is thusly:

(1) To what extent, as detailed in both *John Jay Reports*, did cleric offenders sexual abuse constitute ephebophilic activity, and does said activity constitute a type of homosexuality?

Methodology

The research design I will employ is an examination of the *JJR2* data on clerical sex abusers and to what extent their behavior constitutes ephebophilic behavior. *JJR2* concluded that a majority of clerical abusers profiled were “situational generalists”, who

⁶ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950– 2010” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team.* Washington,. DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 9

⁷ Kappler, S., Hancock, K., & Plante, A. (2013). Roman Catholic Gay Priests: Internalized Homophobia, Sexual Identity, and Psychological Well-Being. *Pastoral Psychology*, 62(6), Pp. 806

⁸ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950– 2010” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team.* Washington,. DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 38

had no targeted age group.⁹ Moreover, it also stated that only 3.8 percent met the characteristics of a pedophile and 18.9 percent were characterized as ephebophiles.¹⁰

However, the authors of JJR2 define clerical abusers as pedophiles if they had more than one allegation concerning a prepubescent child (under age 11) and defines abusers as ephebophiles if they had more than one allegation concerning a postpubescent child as the victim.¹¹ The condition of limiting these definitions of abusers to only having more than one victim is of particular contention, because it conflicts with literature that make no such quantitative clarifications, in fact, many scholars contend that one can be a pedophile or ephebophile and never act on their temptations.¹²

My research design will analyze the extent to which JJR2 may have conflicted with scholarly opinion in their qualitative conclusions. This is relevant because of the age of the victims, for example many characterizations of postpubescent individuals between the ages of 13 and 17, though legally considered minors, are regarded developmentally as adults. The intention of establishing a set definition regarding the JJR2 data is to determine how select age ranges of victims (that were male postpubescent minors) may constitute homosexual attraction and/or predation. Though sexual activity and sexual identity orientation are distinctly different, through comparative analysis on the available literature on the matter and the JJR2 data, I seek to observe any correspondence between postpubescent same-sex abuse and homosexuality.

⁹ Ibid., 22

¹⁰ Ibid., 55.

¹¹ Ibid., 55.

¹² Finkelhor, David and Sharon Araji. "Explanations of Pedophilia: A Four Factor Model." *Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 22, no. 2, May 1986 Pp. 146-147

The central methodologies by which I will achieve my research design will be largely comparative and analytical in nature. Though significant existing quantitative data will be utilized, my research will be largely a qualitative analysis and comparison of the data. The *John Jay Report*, in both of its versions will be heavily utilized as a primary source of data, because it is without peer in both scale and depth. Moreover, though quantitative literature on the presence of homosexuality within the priesthood is scant, there are several sociological and informal small-scale studies that have been done by which scholars deduce its prevalence within priestly culture.

In order to compare the clergy abusers that were classified as pedophiles and ephebophiles by JJR2, I will analyze data from Cartor, Cimboric, and Tallon in their 2008 study, "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." This data will allow conclusions to be made about whether specifically predatory ephebophilic behavior is more indicative of an adult relationship due to the maturity of victims.¹³ With this data, I will then engage with the research Sullins conducted in 2018 in his report, "Is Catholic clergy sex abuse related to homosexual priests?". In it, Sullins explores whether or not the disproportionately high number of homosexuals in the Catholic priesthood in the 1970's and 1980's was connected with heightened periods of abuse in the same decades. In utilizing both of these sources I will be more equipped not only to make connections between ephebophilic abuse and homosexual attractions based on the age groups

¹³ Cartor, Pam, Peter Cimboric, and Jennifer Tallon. "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 15, no. 4 (2008): 311-19.

involved, but also to consult and present the sociological trends and data that may explain such findings.

In the analysis portion I will present my findings with respect to my research question and demonstrate how the selected data and literature corresponds with the claims about homosexuality in JJR2. I will do this, in part, by examining another claim in JJR2 that times of high abuse correlated with times of high social problems.¹⁴ The rise in immoral behavior in the 1960's and how such changes were dealt with in society outside of the clergy population can aid to inform not only the rise of abuse but incontinent behavior that dishonored priestly vows of celibacy. Such connections will be made by analysis and management with many scholarly secondary sources. However, I will also utilize the work of an eminent social scientists within the American Catholic community, Dean Hoge, who was involved in survey-based research and wrote an article entitled "Changes in Satisfaction and Institutional Attitudes of Catholic Priests, 1970-1993" in 1995 that captured the sense of clerical culture at critical periods. This data is vital in presenting how Catholic priests have changed over the years and provides data for relevant subjects such as clerical celibacy and interior thoughts on sexuality.

History of the Cleric Abusers

The lexicon used to characterize the abuse crisis varies depending on the context and literature. The term I will employ is "child sexual abuse crisis", which much of the

¹⁴ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010" A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team.* Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 (36)

academic literature likewise uses.¹⁵ When using this term, it is imperative to reference the specific time period to which it is applicable. The sexual abuse crisis, in connection with the *John Jay Reports* and other data used in this paper, measures abuse from the 1950s to the present; however, the period of heightened activity for which the term *crisis* is used occurred from the middle 1960s until the middle 1980s.¹⁶ Though the child sexual abuse crisis is ongoing, given the long-term effects of childhood trauma and the several legal breaches made by the institutional Church, a vast majority of accusations consist of historical cases of abuse.¹⁷

In order to fully conceive the abuse crisis, it needs to be viewed within the theological context of priestly celibacy. When a priest takes the vow (if he is a religious priest) or promise (if he is diocesan) of celibacy, he promises to not marry. This is not merely refraining from sexual intimacy, which is also required under the commitment of chastity, which expects all members of the Catholic faithful to refrain from sexual intimacy outside of the bounds of marriage for procreative intentions. Though occurrences of celibate priests were well documented since the 4th century, it did not become an official Church practice within the Roman Rite until 1074.¹⁸ Though some historians have noted that mandated clerical celibacy was enacted due to minimize the complications of temporal inheritances to wives and families of priests, it maintains a

¹⁵ Plante, Thomas, and G. Daniels. "The Sexual Abuse Crisis in the Roman Catholic Church: What Psychologists and Counselors Should Know." *Pastoral Psychology* 52, no. 5 (2004): 381-93.

¹⁶ McChesney, Kathleen and Thomas G. Plante. *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A Decade of Crisis, 2002–2012 : A Decade of Crisis, 2002-2012*. Praeger, 2011. Abnormal Psychology. EBSCOhost. Pp.. 19

¹⁷ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950–2010* "A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 4

¹⁸ Hardon, John A. *The Catholic Catechism*. 1st ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1975. Pp. 529

theological significance within the Church today. The central idea of celibacy being freedom- if one is free from the responsibilities of marriage and childrearing they are enabled to care for their congregants and dedicate themselves fully to God.¹⁹

Although the abuse crisis about which is written only covers the late 20th century, there are many cases of priestly incontinence and involvement in gravely scandalous behaviors throughout the Church's 2,000 year history. As Doyle notes, instances of clerical incontinence after mandated celibacy was implemented were frequent, but were met with punishment. In the Middle Ages, clerics who were found abusing young boys were sent to live lives of penance in monasteries (a practice still occasionally used today) but punishments were more severe and sometimes involved exile, ostracization, castration, or even death.²⁰ Saint Peter Damian, a prelate and church reformer in the Middle Ages writes of sexual exploits of clergy specifically the abuse of young boys, abuse during the giving of sacraments, and lax superiors who do not discipline offenders, which are all familiar with the modern abuse crisis. Moreover, Doyle accounts that into the High Middle Ages occasions of homosexual exploits by clerics or abuse of youth was a particularly contemptuous crime that held severe punishments imposed by governing prelates.²¹ The situation here being that incontinence, especially same-sex abuse (which would often qualify as ephebophilia today) is historically common but not ignored or covered-up by prelates as they have been in modern times.

¹⁹ Ibid., 529-531.

²⁰ Doyle, Thomas. *Sex, Priests, and Secret Codes*. Los Angeles, California: Volt Press, 2006. Pp. 19

²¹ Ibid., 15-30.

The first widely covered instance of clerical sex abuse in the U.S. concerned Fr Gilbert Gauthe, a then-priest of the Diocese of Lafayette, Louisiana who was arrested and later convicted of the sexual abuse of 11 boys (though estimates count over 30 victims).²² From the public's perception, this incident was largely regarded as an outlier in Catholic clerical culture, despite the fact that not only had a majority of the documented abuse taken place by that time, but had ended.²³ That same year the American Bishops requested a report on child sexual abuse written by Doyle, Mouton, and Peterson which stated the severity of child sexual abuse within the clergy and especially implored bishops to be proactive in reporting it, warning grave losses in reputation and finances if the problem was ignored.²⁴ Although this report was neither comprehensive nor scholarly it did supply valuable advice to Bishops to act immediately and be aware of the criminality of sexual abuse. The Bishops never published the report and instead kept it internal with many bishops ignoring its suggestions. In 1992 the American Bishops DEVELOPED A 'five principle plan' that encourages all bishops to investigate all credible allegations, remove clerics in question for further examination, comply with civil law, reach out to both victims and their families, and be as public and earnest as possible about any credible allegations of abuse.²⁵ However, there was not enough of a sense that these rules

²² Moore, Evan. "Church abuse case haunts lawyer who defended priest" *USA Today*.

Oct 5. 2013

²³ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950–2010* "A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 4

²⁴ Doyle, Thomas. *Sex, Priests, and Secret Codes*. Los Angeles, California: Volt Press, 2006. Pp. 100-174

²⁵ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950–2010* "A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 4

should have been taken seriously and therefore its enforcement was not uniform in every diocese.²⁶

Starting around the time following the plan is when the study of clergy abuse started to become an integrative academic subject of research. Early conferences at the direction of Thomas Plante of Santa Clara University started to galvanize an interdisciplinary examination of why clerics abuse and to what extent they do. Though the extent of the crisis was still unknown to the public before the 2002 exposition in Boston. One of the major reasons for this is because at the time, according to polling the laity assumed that their clergy were chaste celibates and were understandably scandalized and angered when they found out when they were not, despite that lapses in chastity had been occurring for years in the presbyterate.²⁷ With the 2002 *Boston Globe* investigations and subsequent response by the US Bishops is when a semblance of responsibility for the crisis was taken. In the ensuing aftermath which continues today there are still concerns about diocesan transparency with regard to investigating, reporting, and publishing instances of abuse, no matter how historical they may be. That is why different groups of survivors such as BishopAccountability.org and Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP) have been persistent in their advocacy for transparency on the issue. Such movements have perpetuated more advocacy that lay people have positions on diocesan review boards in order to prevent a perceived or genuine occurrence of clericalism wherein priest and Bishops downplay abuse for the sake of the reputation or financial

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ *Bless Me Father for I Have Sinned: Perspectives on Sexual Abuse Committed by Roman Catholic Priests*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1999.

stability of the diocese. Although abuse has profoundly decreased in instance, formation of priests has been more thorough with regard to human formation, and the Bishops conference have mandated various oversight mechanisms and background checks, the crisis' effects still haunts the Church and the public trust of the Catholic Church though in recovery, remains damaged.

Profile of the Pedophile Abuser

The particularly horrific crimes of Fr. John Geoghan who became the cultural personification of the cleric abuser, with a well-covered trial at the apex of the televised crisis. However, with perhaps over 130 victims, mostly prepubescent, Geoghegan does not reflect the average abuser as only 3.5% of cleric abusers had over 10 victims, (though this cohort of frequent abusers were responsible for 26% of abuse allegations).²⁸

Therefore it is understandable though inaccurate that in the aftermath of the 2002 exposition of the Boston scandal, the American media originated the trope of the “pedophile priest” which became the subject of scorn and mocking in the general public. A brief contextual history of the classification of pedophilia and current theories of its causes will follow.

A pedophile is an adult who has a disordered attraction to prepubescent children. The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edition (DSM V) characterize as pedophilia (pedophilic disorder) as a paraphilic disorder when an adult of at least 16 years of age has a persistent sexual interest in prepubescent children who

²⁸ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950–2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004) Pp. 6

either act on said attraction or is greatly psychologically disturbed by it.²⁹ One who has pedophilic disorder and a child molester are not necessarily the same thing, as the latter acts upon their intentions with a victim and the former may not. There is a small movement to classify pedophilia as a sexual orientation, which would imply that it would not be psychologically or morally illicit to have and or nurse those attractions or act on them.³⁰ However, such a supposition will not be embraced here as the psychological and moral fractions that pedophilic behavior bring are far too grave and scarring to equate it as a legitimate expression of sexuality.

In order to gauge the encompassing facets of the problem, JJR2 tracked the early theories on pedophilia. What was most evident from that analysis is how the scholarly profile of the pedophile has evolved in the last six decades from single theory driven research regarding the environmental causes of pedophilia to a more pathological description in modern scholarship. David Finkelhor's Four Factor Model written in 1986 established the advent of a more integrated, pathological characterization of pedophilic behavior.³¹ According to Finkelhor, four factors must exist in order for a pedophile to abuse. They must: “have motivation to sexually abuse, overcome internal inhibitions to abuse, overcome external factors that may act as inhibitors to the abuse, and overcome the child’s resistance to the abuse”.³² This framework is still helpful and applicable to the

²⁹ Stines, Sharie. "Causes of Pedophilia" PsychCentral Aug 2015

³⁰ See Walker, A., & Panfil, V. R. (2017). Minor attraction: A queer criminological issue. *Critical Criminology*, 25(1), 37-53. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10612-016-9342-7>

³¹ Finkelhor, David and Sharon Araji. "Explanations of Pedophilia: A Four Factor Model." *Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 22, no. 2, May 1986

³² *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950– 2010” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team.* Washington,. DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 15

classification of pedophilic behavior. Since the Finkelhor model, research and ensuing theories on pedophilia have advanced in content and quantity.

Though the nature of the disorder can be complicated and is without a single cause, JJR1 acknowledged different theories that have emerged to explain the cause of pedophilia such as psychodynamic theory, behavioral theory, and attachment theory, among others.³³ However the theory that has been in particular development in recent years is biological theory that states abusers, often due to organic imbalances, such as in chromosomal makeup or of formation of the brain in utero. Research has found, for example that pedophile offenders have a greater likelihood to be left-handed, have had brain injury in childhood, and have lower levels of intelligence than non-pedophiles.³⁴ Moreover there is research that is still in the developing process regarding malfunction in different lobes of the brain causing pedophilic attraction.³⁵ The mentioning of the many theories about both environmental and physiological attributes of pedophilia is to give a sense that there's generally a pathological regard for (even though still disputed) such large-scale research does not exist with regard to the newer term ephebophilia which is characterized by the more mature status of the victims or potential victims of the ephebophile.

³³ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950–2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004) Pp. 170

³⁴ Blanchard, R., Kolla, N. J., Cantor, J. M., Klassen, P. E., Dickey, R., Kuban, M. E., & Blak, T. (2007). IQ, Handedness, and Pedophilia in Adult Male Patients Stratified by Referral Source. *Sexual Abuse*, 19(3), 285–309.

³⁵ Tenbergen, G., Wittfoth, M., Frieling, H., Ponseti, J., Walter, M., Walter, H., ... Kruger, T. H. (2015). The Neurobiology and Psychology of Pedophilia: Recent Advances and Challenges. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, Pp. 16

Profile of the Ephebophile Abuser

As research on pedophilia advanced into the 1980s, there became a need to be more stringent in defining offenders that still have the potential to victimize *postpubescent* minors, which is when Kurt Freund coined the term “ephebophilia” in 1982.³⁶ Just as a pedophile is one who has an attraction to prepubescent children, an ephebophile is regarded as one who has an attraction to postpubescent children, what is more difficult in defining what exactly is constitutive of “postpubescent”. Pubescent development usually begins approximately at the age of 11, which often marks the age that a child becomes “post pubescent.”³⁷ Though being older than 11 is the metric by which JJR2 defines postpubescence, it is not the metric by which it defines ephebophilia. Instead, “ephebophile” is the designation given to a cleric abuser who has abused a male between the ages of 13 and 17. This is perhaps in order to give some leeway in ages of pubescence, which occurs at different ages for different people. Though “ephebophile” itself is a fairly new term, as many have the urge to incorrectly use the word “pedophile” to describe anyone with an attraction to or involvement with a legal minor, the term hebephile has also been proposed. Hebephilia comprises an attraction to youth between ages 11 and 14, but for the sake of consistency and clarity, ephebophilia will be regarded as an attraction to minors in the ages of 13-17 while ages 11 and 12 will be unclassified

³⁶ Freund, Scher, Chan, and Ben-Aron. "Experimental Analysis of Pedophilia." *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 20, no. 2 (1982): 105-12.

³⁷ Blanchard, Ray, Amy Lykins, D. Wherrett, Diane Kuban, Michael Cantor, E. Blak, James Dickey, and M. Klassen. "Pedophilia, Hebephilia, and the DSM-V." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 38, no. 3 (2009): 335-50.

in order to be both consistent with the utilized literature and to recognize the differing ages of reaching pubescence.³⁸ According to JJR2, about 18.9% of the surveyed accused priests are ephebophiles, however, this figure only represents priests who had two or more male victims, between the ages of 13 and 17.³⁹ Such a clarification of having more than two victims presents the same problems previously mentioned with regard to measuring pedophilic offenders. However, according to the JJR1 data, 52.7% of the victims were between the ages of 13 and 17 and 77.4% were over the age of 10 at their first instance of abuse.⁴⁰ Although some priests had victims that were in multiple age ranges and were thusly called “generalists”, it can still be concluded that at least postpubescent abuse was the most pervasive category of abuse during the victims first time of abuse, comprising over three-fourths of allegations.

Age in years	Number of cases	Percent of all cases	Percent combined with precedent years
1	4	0.00%	0.00%
2	11	0.10%	0.10%
3	22	0.20%	0.30%
4	41	0.50%	0.80%

³⁸ Hames, Raymond, and Ray Blanchard. "Anthropological Data Regarding the Adaptiveness of Hebeophilia." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41, no. 4 (2012): 745-47.

³⁹ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team.* Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011

⁴⁰ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950–2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004) Pp. 70

5	82	1%	1.80%
6	158	1.80%	3.60%
7	220	2.50%	6.10%
8	369	4.10%	10.20%
9	362	4%	14.20%
10	752	8.40%	22.60%
11	895	10%	32.60%
12	1,323	14.70%	47.20%
13	1,141	12.80%	60%
14	1,188	13.20%	73.20%
15	1,042	11.60%	84.80%
16	769	8.60%	93.40%
17	577	6.50%	100%

The above table, courtesy of the Nature and Scope Report (JJR1) details the age of victims at the first instance of abuse.

Due to the stages of development that they are associated with, some scholars have concluded that ephhebophilia is a type of homosexuality, while others have dissented. For example, Blanchette and Coleman in a 2002 article grouped pedophiles and ephhebophiles in largely the same group in their descriptions, referring to each as “a

serious psychological and developmental impairment”.⁴¹ Moreover they state that ephebophiles, like pedophiles, “have no capacity for authentic heterosexual or homosexual relationships.” This may be because, according to Blanchette and Coleman they both often have arrested development, sexual immaturity, poor social skills, and a lack of knowledge of sexual intimacy.⁴² However, they also conceded that the classification becomes “especially difficult” when a victim is a male between the ages of 14 and 17 and if the offender has a homosexual attraction.⁴³ Rossetti says of the priest abuser involved with the 14-17 age range that they experience a “stunted” homosexuality, meaning that they are homosexual in orientation but their emotional immaturity and arrested psychosexual development rather than their homosexuality is the principal factor in their abuse.⁴⁴ Moreover, Cimboic and Cartor stated that opportunity could not account for the disproportionate presence of male victims, and therefore concluded that the preference of males was deliberate.⁴⁵ They made this conclusion by stating JJRI data that showed 58.3% of the victims from ages 1-7 were female while that number of female victims decreased to 28.6% when victims were ages 8-10, down to 14.6% when victims were ages 11-14, and finally down to 14.8% when victims were ages 15-17.⁴⁶ The high number of female victims in the 1-7 ages group to Cimboic and Cartor was indicative

⁴¹ Blanchette, M. C., & Coleman, G. D. (2002, April 22). Priest Pedophiles : Pedophiles and ephebophiles have no capacity for authentic sexual relationships. *America*, 186(13), 18. Retrieved from <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A84904499/AONE?u=hele54405&sid=AONE&xid=53d34c75>

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Rossetti, Stephen J. (2002). The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse : Distortions, Complexities and Resolutions. *America*, 186(13), Pp. 11

⁴⁵ Cimboic, Peter, and Pam Cartor. "Looking at Ephebophilia through the Lens of Cleric Sexual Abuse." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 13, no. 4 (2006) Pp. 351

⁴⁶ Ibid.

that priests had just the same amount of access to females than males and thusly concluded that males were specifically preferred as they became closer to postpubescence.⁴⁷ They also observed that both of the John Jay Reports represent one of the largest studies of ephebophiles, showing that the priest abuse crisis illuminated how postpubescent minors can be particularly targeted, but also concluded that the diagnostic measures for ephebophilia needed to be improved.⁴⁸

In order to contextualize the propensity of ephebophilic abuse by clergy offenders, it's important to gather a sense how legal definitions of adulthood vary in different stages of postpubescence. The point at which a postpubescent becomes legally able to consent to sexual activity and thusly inherits responsibilities of adulthood is globally variant. In developed countries ages of consent range from 13 (Japan) to 18 (US). Though this paper is focused on the priest offender in the United States, it is significant 13, (the youngest age within the ephebophilia range) is regarded in some instances in the global community as an adult. This suggests that the physical, emotional, and intellectual development of teenagers corresponds to sexual agency. Moreover, this raises the question of whether ephebophilic behavior was behavior with individuals who were young adults. For reiteration, this is not to suggest that in any way the abuse perpetrated against postpubescent victims was consensual or was morally licit, but rather to establish a background of the nature of the abuse.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 357.

Scholarly research has concluded that there are profound differences between pedophiles and ephebophiles not in merely their age preference, but also their respective psychological health.⁴⁹ For example, ephebophiles are documented to be more psychosexually mature compared to pedophile offenders, they are also more likely to offend due to stress, and are given better prognoses to stop offending due to the less pathological status of ephebophilia comparable to pedophilia.⁵⁰ All of these differences are indicative that an ephebophile has greater agency and maturity in their behaviors, and have greater attractions to minors who are closer to adults than a pedophile. This does not discount ephebophilia as a psychological disorder or lessen the moral and legal penalties but simply distinguishes the profound implication of an involvement with a postpubescent youth as opposed to one of prepubescence.

Pedophilic behavior is regarded as being pathological because of the young ages of those to which a pedophile is attracted, but that does not account for the explanation of the ephebophilic behavior, which was involved in many cases. In order to distinguish the pedophilic and ephebophilic patterns of abuse and how they represent different types of attractions, Cantor et. al conducted a comparative analysis between offenders who were designated as “pedophile” and as “ephebophile” as presented in JJR1. For clarity, (also within congruence of my own regarding of ephebophilic behavior), the researchers removed 11 and 12 year olds from comparison, only using data comparing victims under 10 and from 13-17. Cartor et. al compared the two cleric abuser groups using the survey

⁴⁹ Cimboic, Peter, and Pam Cartor. "Looking at Ephebophilia through the Lens of Cleric Sexual Abuse." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 13, no. 4 (2006): 347-59.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

data in JJR1 about how and where abuse took place. They found that abusers who were ephebophiles were more likely to be under the influence of drugs or alcohol when the abuse took place and were more likely to abuse in a hotel room, parish residence, or vacation home.⁵¹ In concluding their findings, Cartor et. al. made assumptions about the sexual maturity writing that ephebophile offenders may, "... justify their offending by viewing their victims as more willing participants and seeing the sexual activity as stemming from a relationship based on what the offender may want to perceive as shared interests and activities."⁵² These findings, though speculative and not backed by specific data are nonetheless insightful into how ephebophile abusers may rationalize their own abuse.

To give further context as to the extent as how the priesthood in the US have had a greater propensity of homosexuals than in the general American population, I examine one of the few examinations of data on this matter in the literature. In a 2018 report conducted by Sullins, he seeks to establish the link between the times that abuse peaked (in the 1970s and 1980s) with the amount of homosexuals within the priesthood. As aforesaid, the statistical information on prevalence of homosexuals in the Catholic clergy (be they chaste or not) is scant, but Sullins utilizes what is likely the best data on the subject, a 2002 survey conducted by the *Los Angeles Times*.⁵³ Sullins found a .90

⁵¹ Cartor, Pam, Peter Cimboic, and Jennifer Tallon. "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 15, no. 4 (2008): (314-16)

⁵² Cartor, Pam, Peter Cimboic, and Jennifer Tallon. "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 15, no. 4 (2008):317

⁵³ Sullins, Paul D. (2018). "Is Catholic clergy sex abuse related to homosexual priests?" *The Ruth Institute*, Pp. 25

correlation between incidents of abuse and priests reporting a same-sex attraction.⁵⁴

Sullins then measured data comparing incidents of abuse and occurrences of homosexual subcultures in seminaries, which JJR2 acknowledged, stating that 40% of seminarians in the 1980s and 1990s reported a “clear homosexual subculture in the seminaries they had attended”.⁵⁵ However, in utilizing the LA Times data, Sullins found that beginning in the 1940s at least 10% reported a homosexual subculture in the their seminary, and found that there an overall .96, almost perfect correlation between homosexual seminary subcultures and abuse.⁵⁶ Though these findings are not causal but instead corollary, they are significant in their refutation of claims in JJR2 because subcultures were most reported during times wherein ordinands would have been in the late 1980s and early 1990s, which were periods of decreased abuse.⁵⁷ However, JJR2 does acknowledge that large amounts of homosexual candidates entered seminary in the 1970s, which would correspond more with cases of increased abuse. Moreover, though more people may have “come out” in the 1980s due to societal acceptance of homosexuality, that does not mean that subcultures and same-sex activity were necessarily lower in previous years, but rather that they became either more open or obvious.⁵⁸ Last, Sullins takes JJR2’s acknowledgement that “only in-seminary (not pre-seminary) same-sex sexual behavior

⁵⁴ Ibid., 28.

⁵⁵ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010* A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 38

⁵⁶ Sullins, Paul D. (2018). “Is Catholic clergy sex abuse related to homosexual priests?” *The Ruth Institute*, Pp 27-29

⁵⁷ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010* A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 101-102

⁵⁸ Ibid., 38.

was significantly related to post-ordination sexual behavior” and “only in- seminary (not pre-seminary) same-sex sexual behavior was significantly related to the increased likelihood of a male child victim.”⁵⁹ One of the reasons that JJR2 could have included both pre and post seminary sexual involvement in their data was in order to determine if there was a difference in the two numbers, such as if priests who engaged in sexual activity before or during the seminary ceased it and took the vow of celibacy more seriously after ordination. Both of these claims, however are in line with Sullins’ many figures measuring number of homosexuals in the priesthood and levels of abuse, particularly the .96 correlation between seminary subcultures and abuse incidents. Thusly, Sullins concludes that “...an increase of the concentration of homosexual men by a factor of two relative to that of the general population approximately doubled the incidence of abuse.”⁶⁰

Analysis

In analyzing how the aforesaid data corresponds to the research question, an examination of the validity of JJR2’s claim that priests who had same-sex sexual relations either before or after ordination were more likely to have same-sex relations after ordination but that these relations were more likely with adults and that they “were not significantly more likely to abuse minors.”⁶¹ JJR2 explains the fact that over 80 percent of the surveyed victims were male by admitting that the acts of abuse constitute

⁵⁹ Ibid., 62.

⁶⁰ Sullins, Paul D. (2018). “Is Catholic clergy sex abuse related to homosexual priests?” *The Ruth Institute*, Pp. 41

⁶¹ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010*” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 4

homosexual acts but clarifying that the priest abusers did not have a recognition of their identity as being homosexual.⁶² Therefore, the central reason why JJR2 authors refrained from characterizing clerical abusers as homosexual is because they themselves did not identify as having a homosexual orientation. There are fundamental differences between sexual activity and sexual orientation/identity, and it would be irrational to immediately conclude that the large propensity of male victims automatically qualify each abuser with a victim as a “homosexual” as it ignores other factors such as convenience of victims, pathological mental disorders, and psychosexual development. However, JJR2’s seems to present contradictions in their conclusions that homosexuality relies on identity alone.

For example, clinical data of priests (abusers and non-abusers alike) who were treated for a variety of psychological problems were gathered and analyzed in JJR2 in order for results about surveyed priest’s sexual experiences to be utilized as a facet of the data and contextualization. JJR2 concluded thusly that the only population of priests whose sexuality was a risk factor in abusing minors were those who reported a “confused” sexual identity.⁶³ The authors stated that such a “confused” sexual identity was particularly associated with priests prior to the 1960’s. Therefore, priests who were identifying with a “confused” sexual identity grew up, attended seminary, and started their priesthood before the 1960s, when homosexuality was neither a socially acceptable nor public sexual identity. Moreover, the term “confused” implies unsureness or doubt about sexual preference, which would almost certainly mean having an identity that at

⁶² Ibid 36

⁶³ Ibid. 64

least deviated from heterosexuality, because a sense of heteronormativity dominated American society prior to the 1970s. In fact, marriage was the hallmark of society, with less than 10% of people in the 1950s thinking that one could be happy while unmarried.⁶⁴ Moreover, using sexual identity as the distinguishing facet of homosexual priests, is neither fair nor accurate as most of the priests associated with high times of abuse did not have the sociological agency to express themselves as homosexual, which could very well have contributed to the emergence of a “confused” identity.

Next to be addressed is the nature of ephebophilia, specifically in how it is distinctive from pedophilia and to what degree it may qualify as a type of homosexuality. The matter of importance is stating that pedophilia and ephebophilia are distinctively different things with different attractions, characteristics of offenders, and prognoses.⁶⁵ With reported higher intelligence quotients and better prognoses of treatment, ephebophiles are found to be more likely regressive rather than to be as fixated on their attractions. Fixation is regarded as a longstanding attraction to minors with little chance of having romantic or sexual relationships with adults, while regressive behavior is an attraction of children with a closer link to adult attractions and an aspiration for adult relationships.⁶⁶ This suggests that there is less (though still some) of a pathological or biological account for ephebophilia, given that the ephebophile is closer to forming (though they are still stunned and possibly blocked from) adult relationships, there is a

⁶⁴ Mintz, Steven, and Susan Kellogg. *Domestic Revolutions: a Social History Of American Family Life*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1989. Pp. 10

⁶⁵ Cimboic, Peter, and Pam Cartor. "Looking at Ephebophilia through the Lens of Cleric Sexual Abuse." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 13, no. 4 (2006)

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*

comparative flexibility in ephebophilia that perhaps is more characteristic of a (at times severe) psychosexual immaturity which affects but not completely destroys psychosexual development. The distinctive development of postpubescent minors are important in characterizing the ephebophile. This is because when puberty begins, minors become more like adults in their physical, intellectual, and emotional development. Given that over 77% of victims were either pubescent or postpubescent at the age of their first time being abused, there is a clear preference for minors who are closer to adulthood.⁶⁷

However, the expressly larger preference for male victims does not resemble just a preference for minors developing toward adulthood, but a propensity for males who are developing toward adulthood, which, as Cimboic and Cartor state, represent a deliberate preference of the males. This was done by observing that girls were actually preferred as victims in the ages of 1-7 but as the victim aged, there was a dramatic propensity of male victims, which disrupts the narrative that the propensity of male victims was only due to convenience.⁶⁸ Moreover, what seems particularly fitting is Rossetti's claim that ephebophilia was a type of homosexuality but one that was "stunted". This stunting, marked by a lack of self assurance, poor social skills, being uncomfortable or not knowledgeable about sex, and possessing large amounts of stress are in congruence with much of the literature on clerical abuse, including JJR2.⁶⁹ For example Eugene Kennedy's 1972 *Psychological Investigations* into American priests reported that there was a

⁶⁷ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950–2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004) Pp. 70

⁶⁸ Cimboic, Peter, and Pam Cartor. "Looking at Ephebophilia through the Lens of Cleric Sexual Abuse." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 13, no. 4 (2006) Pp. 351

⁶⁹ Rossetti, Stephen J. (2002). *The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse : Distortions, Complexities and Resolutions. America*, 186(13), Pp. 11

significant lack of “psychosexual maturity” and that two thirds of priests profiled were “psychologically immature”.⁷⁰ This also could correspond to the morale crisis in the priesthood immediately following after the implementation of the Second Vatican Council. That crisis, starting in the late 1960s and going to the 1970s was marked by a massive departure of the priesthood, as many priests had hoped the postconciliar period would permit optional clerical celibacy, with 1969 being the peak of exits from the priesthood, many of whom would later marry.⁷¹ In the postconciliar presbyterate there were also profound disagreements with church teaching, with 47% of priests ages 26-35 in 1970 reported that the way authority was handled in the Church was “a great problem to me personally”.⁷² Moreover, 85% of the clergy in 1970 between ages 26 and 35 answered that they thought celibacy should be optional, comparable to a much less 38% in 1993 for the same age group.⁷³ These numbers suggest that beyond the psychological development there was a poor sociological status of priests, with many opposing celibacy, suggesting a possible confused or negative feeling regarding the sexual expectations of chaste celibacy. Such a figure may also suggest that such a stark majority who oppose mandated celibacy could have been more likely to break their promise to being chaste, given the crisis in morale at the time. The sampled priest’s hostility toward

⁷⁰ Kennedy, Eugene. *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Psychological Investigations*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1972 Pp.3

⁷¹ *The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010*” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011 Pp. 37

⁷² Hoge, Dean R., et al. “Changes in Satisfaction and Institutional Attitudes of Catholic Priests, 1970-1993.” *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 56, no. 2, 1995, Pp. 203. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3711763.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 205.

their own celibate chastity could be indicative of a stunted sexuality, especially for those who both did not want to be celibate and did not leave the priesthood as many did.

In research by Cartor et. al, the observation that ephebophile abusers were more likely to use drugs and alcohol, may have been a numbing mechanism for the abuse, as they suggested.⁷⁴ This could display weak coping skills which may correspond with Rossetti's description of stunted homosexuals being steeped in adolescence.⁷⁵ Of significance of the desire to attain adult relationships by ephebophiles too is Cartor et. al.'s theory that given their maturity, ephebophiles may try to imagine their victims as willing participants in the abuse and possibly convince themselves that there is a reciprocal connection with the victim based in shared interests.⁷⁶ The ephebophile abuser's convincing of interest shown by victims are another suggestion that ephebophiles with male victims likely wanted to relive his own childhood, especially if it was perceived as traumatic or deprived from him.

Last, Sullin's presentation of his data is important in the scholarship of clerical sex abuse because it was one of (if not the) first to endeavor to examine the long-suspected relationship between ephebophilic abuse and homosexuality. Although this data provides helpful information in that there were strong corollary effects of homosexual subcultures and cases of abuse, there is not a significant differentiation of pedophile and ephebophile offenders in order to show evidence that certain types of abusive behaviors were more

⁷⁴ Cartor, Pam, Peter Cimboic, and Jennifer Tallon. "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 15, no. 4 (2008): (314-16)

⁷⁵ Rossetti, Stephen J. (2002). *The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse : Distortions, Complexities and Resolutions. America, 186(13), Pp. 11*

⁷⁶ Cartor, Pam, Peter Cimboic, and Jennifer Tallon. "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 15, no. 4 (2008):317

indicative of a homosexual orientation than others. Consequently, the LA Times survey compared with the JJR2 data which showed an almost perfect correlation does not address any direct causal effects and does not indicate which particular samples of cleric abusers are homosexual and how such a conclusion would be found.⁷⁷ However, Sullins offers a rare and needed contribution when he acknowledges JJR2's comprehensive nature and insightful data while simultaneously questioning some of its conclusions that are both speculative and potentially self-contradictory. The central conclusion being JJR2's claiming that because homosexual subcultures were widely reported in seminaries in the 1980's, that means that homosexual seminary subcultures were unrelated to abuse because abuse fell in the late 1980s, when these men would have been ordained.

However, an observation that I share with Sullins is that it is dubious to rely on identity recognition, "oumess", or a reported homosexual subculture in determining an accurate proportion of homosexual cleric offenders. Such a link can only be established from analysis of data of American priests who identify as homosexual, instead of comparing factors that are less precise.

Conclusion

It would appear that the amount of ephebophilic activity among the data provided by the John Jay Reports were underreported. Although JJR2 claims that 18.9% of offenders were ephebophiles, the fact that an ephebophile was defined as an abuser who solely had abused males between 13 and 17 more than once.⁷⁸ The qualification JJR2

⁷⁷ Sullins, Paul D. (2018). "Is Catholic clergy sex abuse related to homosexual priests?" *The Ruth Institute*, Pp 27-29

⁷⁸ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950-2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004) Pp. 70

used of having multiple victims in order to be classified as an ephebophile, (although presumably is derived from some informed methodology) does not align with much of the literature that confirms that one can be an ephebophile with one or no victims as the ephebophilic state rests in attraction not necessarily in actual abuse. Moreover, the percentage of victims who were between 13 and 17 at the instance of their first being victimized accounted for 52.7%.⁷⁹ Though this number comes from measuring ephebophilia from the victims standpoint as opposed it to the offender's, it nonetheless presents the graver reality that a majority of victims were postpubescent.

Ephebophilia differs from pedophilia not merely in attraction but also in the levels of research that has been contributed to each. As ephebophilia is a rather new classification it has not had the scholarly attention that it deserves, being accounted for such a large amount of abuse against minors in this sizeable sample alone. Moreover, the comparative analysis between pedophilia and ephebophilia indicate that ephebophiles are closer to adult relationships and have perhaps a better prognosis due to ephebophilia being associated with stunted sexuality as opposed to a fixated sexuality that is associated with pedophilia, which means that the pedophilic behavior or attraction present have seldom a chance of changing. The physical and emotional changes that take place in puberty resemble features associated more with adulthood especially as the age of the minor increases, therefore cleric offenders who had male victims between 13 and 17 were pointedly sought after males who happen to have a growing association with adulthood.

⁷⁹ John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950–2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004) Pp. 70

Moreover, such a concept of consensual sexual agency is not confined to 18 years old exclusively, as is dominated by the age of consent in Japan being 13. Though starkly different than 18 in many ways, perhaps even to a fault, it is still indicative of post pubescent being associated not just “older children” but rather “young adults”.

Last, JJR2’s conclusion that those engaged in homosexual acts of abuse were not necessarily homosexual only because they did not identify as is flawed because it did not account for the many reasons why a Catholic priest especially before 1960 might not identify as an open homosexual. Reasons such as not being accepted or tolerated within the magisterial church and not being accepted by society at that time are important factors that could have been offered as a qualifier in the JJR2 conclusion. Given the fact ephebophilia though often more manageable than pedophilia is still a psychological problem, whose population often suffer many social and psychosexual problems. Thusly, the qualification “stunted homosexuality” is befitting of ephebophiles at this juncture because it integrates the nature of adult homosexual attraction in ephebophilia while simultaneously recognizing the psychological deviance involved in adults who are attracted to minors and are often involved in abusive, non-consensual relations with them. However, more research is needed not only in the subject of ephebophilia and its treatments, but also in how much it corresponds with an adult homosexuality, which would be very informing and would likely demonstrate a scope in which a sexual identity and a sexual action can have differences and similarities within the ephebophile population.

Works Cited

Blanchard, R., Kolla, N. J., Cantor, J. M., Klassen, P. E., Dickey, R., Kuban, M. E., & Blak, T. (2007). IQ, Handedness, and Pedophilia in Adult Male Patients Stratified by Referral Source. *Sexual Abuse*, 19(3), 285–309.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320701900307>

Bless Me Father for I Have Sinned: Perspectives on Sexual Abuse Committed by Roman Catholic Priests. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 1999.

Blanchard, Ray, Amy Lykins, D. Wherrett, Diane Kuban, Michael Cantor, E. Blak, James Dickey, and M. Klassen. "Pedophilia, Hebephilia, and the DSM-V." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 38, no. 3 (2009): 335-50.

Cartor, Pam, Peter Cimboic, and Jennifer Tallon. "Differentiating Pedophilia from Ephebophilia in Cleric Offenders." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 15, no. 4 (2008): 311-19.

"Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People" *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops*. 2018

Clark, K. (1986). *Being sexual-- and celibate*. Notre Dame, Ind.: Ave Maria Press.

Doyle, Thomas. *Sex, Priests, and Secret Codes*. Los Angeles, California: Volt Press, 2006.

The Causes and Context of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests in the United States, 1950 – 2010” A Report Presented to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops by the John Jay College Research Team. Washington, DC: United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, 2011

Cimboic, Peter, and Pam Cartor. "Looking at Ephebophilia through the Lens of Cleric Sexual Abuse." *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity* 13, no. 4 (2006)

Finkelhor, David and Sharon Araji. "Explanations of Pedophilia: A Four Factor Model." *Journal of Sex Research*, vol. 22, no. 2, May 1986, p. 145. EBSCOhost, search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=5691869&site=ehost-live.

Freund, Scher, Chan, and Ben-Aron. "Experimental Analysis of Pedophilia." *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 20, no. 2 (1982): 105-12.

Hames, Raymond, and Ray Blanchard. "Anthropological Data Regarding the Adaptiveness of Hebephilia." *Archives of Sexual Behavior* 41, no. 4 (2012): 745-47.

Hardon, John A. *The Catholic Catechism*. 1st ed. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1975.

Hoge, Dean R., et al. "Changes in Satisfaction and Institutional Attitudes of Catholic Priests, 1970-1993." *Sociology of Religion*, vol. 56, no. 2, 1995, pp. 195–213. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3711763.

John Jay College of Criminal Justice, *The Nature and Scope of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Catholic Priests and Deacons in the United States 1950–2002* (Washington, D.C.: USCCB, 2004)

Kappler, S., Hancock, K., & Plante, A. (2013). Roman Catholic Gay Priests: Internalized Homophobia, Sexual Identity, and Psychological Well-Being. *Pastoral Psychology*, 62(6), 805-826

Kennedy, Eugene. *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Psychological Investigations*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1972

Mintz, Steven, and Susan Kellogg. *Domestic Revolutions: a Social History Of American Family Life*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1989.

- McChesney, Kathleen and Thomas G. Plante. *Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A Decade of Crisis, 2002–2012 : A Decade of Crisis, 2002-2012*. Praeger, 2011. Abnormal Psychology. EBSCOhost.
- Montoya Bryan, *Susan*. "Bankruptcy filing provides rare window into diocese finances". *The Associated Press* December 4, 2018
- Moore, Evan. "Church abuse case haunts lawyer who defended priest" *USA Today*.
- National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People. "A Ten Year Progress Report." *United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.*, June 2012
- R. Langevin, S. Curnoe, and J. Bain, "A Study of Clerics Who Commit Sexual Offenses: Are They Different from Other Sex Offenders?" *Child Abuse & Neglect* 24 (2000): 535-45.
- Rossetti, Stephen J. (2002). *The Catholic Church and Child Sexual Abuse : Distortions, Complexities and Resolutions*. *America*, 186(13), 8. .
- Plante, Thomas, and G. Daniels. "The Sexual Abuse Crisis in the Roman Catholic Church: What Psychologists and Counselors Should Know." *Pastoral Psychology* 52, no. 5 (2004): 381-93.
- Stines, Sharie. "Causes of Pedophilia" *PsychCentral* Aug 2015
- Sullins, Paul D. (2018). "Is Catholic clergy sex abuse related to homosexual priests?" *The Ruth Institute*, 1-45.
- Tenbergen, G., Wittfoth, M., Frieling, H., Ponseti, J., Walter, M., Walter, H., ... Kruger, T. H. (2015). The Neurobiology and Psychology of Pedophilia: Recent Advances and Challenges. *Frontiers in human neuroscience*, 9, 344. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2015.00344