

Appendix S

Sexuality, Spirituality and the Gay Subcultures of St. Paul Seminary:

The confusing world of Bill McDonough, Michael Papesh, and Thomas Krenik

Fr. William McDonough Professor, Sexual Morality St. Paul Seminary
1991-1997

Convener: Society of Christian Ethics, "Gay and Lesbian Issues Interest Group"
sessions 1997-2005

*Author of journal articles **Toward a MacIntyrean ethic of same-sex life partnerships**, and **Acknowledging the gift of gay priestly celibacy***

In 1999 provided archdiocesan Catholic high schools in-service sessions for teachers on "An adequate Catholic moral response to homosexuality and homosexual persons."

Not currently active as a priest. His status is unclear regarding holy orders or diocesan pension plan. He is brother to Vicar General Fr. Kevin McDonough.

Professor of theology at St Catherine's College in St. Paul - headed for tenure

Michael Papesh Spiritual Director, St. Paul Seminary 1992-1993

*Author of book **Clerical Culture** and **America** article **On the Demise of Clerical Culture***

Presently a pastor in the Archdiocese of St. Paul & Minneapolis

Thomas Krenik Spiritual Director, St. Paul Seminary 1994-1999

*Author of **Formation for Priestly Celibacy: A resource Book***

Presently a pastor in the Archdiocese of St. Paul & Minneapolis

“The Purge” and the Gay Subculture

Sometime in 1990-1991, the open homosexuality at the St. Paul Seminary became an embarrassment to Archbishop John Roach. Seminary bulletin boards advertised gay events. The revolution was out in the open. The archbishop (in a manner we have not fully documented) intervened. A number of the more notorious seminarians were expelled or asked not to return the following year. It was very clear this was a “purge.” This was the end of the open homosexual cult which seemed for some of the exuberant youth to be a logical move toward authenticity in a seminary culture where celibacy was being flaunted and sexual repression compared with the evils of racism.

Many archdiocesan priests, when asked about homosexuality at the seminary, will say, “Oh that was a problem once but they corrected that.” Actually the purge was the end of the *open* cult and the resumption of the gay subculture which had existed for about a decade. The rules of the gay subculture can be understood by reading the writings of the men we entrusted with the souls and formation of our seminarians. The purpose of this appendix is to show how mistaken sexual and psychological theories replaced Catholic anthropology for at least fifteen years in our diocesan training of seminarians. These are all after the “purge”.

We will pass over the tenure of the most recent spiritual director, Fr. David Kohner. During Fr Kohner’s reign the continued influence of Sister Paul Theresa Saiko was dominant. She remains a continued reminder of the in house feminists who blow themselves up as “woman in authority” that all young priests in training must learn to psychologically appease. It was her indiscretions that gave Ryan Erickson a serious argument that his internal forum had been broken making it more difficult to discipline him.

We want to be clear that under the rectorship of Msgr. Aloyious Callahan, new spiritual director, Fr. Paul Sirba and vice rector and moral theologian, Fr. Peter Laird, that a very different course is been set for the future. The confused legacy however remains for many of our priests, most of our high schools, and many of our college faculty at the Universities of St. Thomas and St. Catherine. Our seminary still has faculty members who

have done significant harm to the Church and should be removed politely and quickly. Our seminary is reforming but our other Catholic teaching institutions are in a time warp treating the misguided errors of the recent past as scientific truths of modern psychology. We hope some of the more honest men of that era might see these ideas in context and come to repudiate them with a vigor mindful of St. Paul who had to correct a few errors of his own before evangelizing the Mediterranean world.

Reading the confusing works of professors McDonough and spiritual directors Krenik and Papesh at the St. Paul Seminary in the nineties is a depressing venture. One's thoughts go to the young men who had to listen to this confusion and treat these men as authorities. It gives rise to the urge to call a huge public meeting and invite all the spiritual directors and psychologists who have so mangled our seminarians and confront them in public with some adult questions from men who need no grade or approval from them. How could we have turned our young men over to these soul killers? The deep invasion of their interior lives in the name of modern psychology may only be avenged by a massive dose of public large group male therapy. If the young priests in our parishes today absorbed what these men taught, they are very confused priests! The seminary may have to offer, instead of continuing education, a day of apologies and reeducation for any seminarian subjected to the inanities of these tortured teachers.

We will start with Fr. Michael Papesh—a priest in the diocese who begins both his book and article in *America* with a story of being sexually molested by a priest when he was a seminarian in the late sixties. Who was this priest? Has he gone on to rape again? Are there other men as broken as Fr. Papesh who still bear the wound of an unanswered assault from Father? Did the vicar general follow up on this public accusation with an investigation? Papesh was just eighteen. Does that put him beyond the age of our concern? Maybe since we have read about this before it is “old news.”

Fr. Papesh is considered something of an expert. He wrote the article on clerical culture in the Jesuit magazine *America*, but it is his book that reveals the mind that was entrusted with souls at St. John Vianney Seminary and then St. Paul Seminary, until he suddenly (and we mean suddenly) left his post. In Fr. Papesh's writings his primary complaint is that the clerical culture does not tell the truth about sexuality. He blames this on the exclusively male group that is afraid of homosexuality. Papesh argues that homosexual men can relate better to the oppressed and minorities (fellows in persecution), better to males (not into sports so can talk feelings and wounds better) and they seem to relate better to women also (pp157-158). Apparently, the gay guy says, "Hey girlfriend," and suddenly a bond is made that no straight man could ever understand.

Fr. Papesh exaggerates the number of homosexuals in the archdiocesan priesthood and suggests that they be acknowledged for "who they are." He sees their presence, not as a failure of vice rectors and seminary admission committees, but as a gift from God. He turns the language of gift to something insipid and then blames it on God. In the *St Paul Pioneer Press*, he described the priestly fraternity as follows:

The clerical culture is simply afraid of homosexuality. ...The culture is officially and formally afraid of homosexuality because the culture is male and it is closed.

Fr. Papesh was a seminary spiritual director. The most popular magazine among priests in America gave him a front page cover article and the local press goes to him as an expert when dealing with priestly formation and homosexuality. There has been no attempt by the archdiocese to discipline him or correct his views. Fr. Papesh has been damaged by abuse and his confused apology for the hidden gay is not uncommon for men abused as he was. He deserves sympathetic fatherly correction but he has no fathers. He treats Fr. Bill McDonough as an expert theologian. The ever-whining Dick Rice is a spiritual advisor and Fr. Kevin McDonough is his vicar general. The brotherhood of priests he so desperately needs is nowhere in sight. Fr. Papesh is right – the clerical culture he belongs to is

afraid to talk to victims like him about homosexuality. They are scared to death. But it is not because the system is “all male and closed.” It is because the system has lost its Catholic imagination and vocabulary. It is anti-masculine, anti-patriarchal, and anti-fraternal. It is not the apostolic brotherhood united in Christ but a fractured fraternity which has been opened to the smoke of Satan.

One February day in 1993, the SPS seminarians woke up and Fr. Papesh was gone. The rector asked that the students refrain from discussing the reasons that the guru had vanished.

Fr. Krenik to the rescue

Fr. Papesh was replaced as spiritual director at SPS by Fr. Thomas Krenik. Fr. Krenik was the spiritual director during most of Ryan Erickson's conflicted stay at the seminary. Fr Krenik's basic work is: *Formation for Priestly Celibacy: A Resource Book*. He starts the book with three vignettes:

Fritz is a 25 yr old seminarian who is seeing his spiritual director to figure out a troubling incident. He was counseling a 14 yr old boy who was crying as he shared that he had been beaten by his dad. Fritz went to give him a hug and found himself crying also. "He then realized the intense emotion he felt and was aware he was experiencing an erection." Fritz thinks he is heterosexual but isn't sure. What does the incident mean?

Chuck is 43, good grades and wants to be very orthodox in his theology. Thinks the faculty are lax. He is trying arduously to rid himself of masturbation and having fantasies about women. Women should be mothers and "know their place in the service of the church." (ed: Fr Krenik's way of saying Chuck doesn't think women should be priests) Many of Chuck's classmates are distant from him, intimidated by him and afraid they will get a taste of his "massive rage."

Finally, Arnie, is a 33 yr old seminarian. Told admissions board he is gay and has been abstinent for two years Admits to spiritual director he goes to gay bars, does porn videos and is angry that "my own church considers me disordered." Arnie is worried he might be HIV +.

The twisted vignettes are not the whole of the booklet. Several sections of the book are fairly good. Archbishop's Flynn paper on celibacy to a bishops' synod at the end is excellent. Paragraphs of Fr. Krenik's discussion on prayer are eloquent. But the whole schema rests on a depraved psychology which renders "spirituality" as a series of emasculated pieties. Fr. Krenik's booklet is a manual planting the psychological seeds for a culture of deceit.

Reading through this painful verbiage revived old memories. As a left wing radical in 1970, I went to Glide Methodist Church in San Francisco with my girlfriend, who was an organizer of “Woman’s Liberation.” There we heard the beginnings of a whole new “liberating approach” to sexuality. The presentation, which we both thought advocated a preposterous anarchy in personal relationships, was sponsored by Methodist church workers, staffed by psychologists and attended by opinion makers and radicals around the country. Ten years later, when I went to medical school, much of the same program was part of a weekend mandated for all first year med students called SAR (Sexual Attitude Reassessment), headed by the newly developed University of Minnesota Sexuality Institute. Pornographic video clips were followed by seminars conducted by homosexual couples and other deviants we were learning to first tolerate and then affirm. The clueless sexual ethics I had come to despise in the left wing movement had become all the rage in a highly ranked medical school. I suspect Fr. Krenik has been to a sexuality institute too. The seminary program did not include the desensitizing movies but the smell of Glide Methodist and the U of M SAR is all over the manual. Indeed the secular psychology of sexual identity determined by fantasies and dreams, which must be adapted to by the healthy individual, were right out of our pot smoking days in the New Left. The theories were promoted by homosexuals especially through psychiatry and psychology conferences and then sold to the church under the guise of SCIENCE. Medicine, which had lost its moral grounding as a profession in the name of serving patient autonomy, was no match for the acid solvents of modern psychology. Catholic theologians who should have known better were too ready to twist their own tradition to justify their own proclivities. That seems pretty much the storyline at SPS. A man has his desires - and later finds his reasons.

Fr. Krenik’s booklet purports to integrate spirituality and sexuality but that is exactly what it cannot do, since it has no trace of masculinity or fatherhood in its vocabulary. That is because the vocabulary is deliberately devised to treat homosexuality and heterosexuality as equivalent experiences of human sexuality. Once Catholic anthropology is abandoned, Krenik finds all sorts of “useful” definitions of sexuality. There is the theory of the three dimensions of sexual identity—gender identity, sexual orientation and sexual intention. The key to sexual health actually lies in the last of these categories. He views “conventional” erotic intentions which show peaceable mutuality and tenderness as showing health. Unconventional intentions of

“raw or disguised aggression” are red flags. In his view, a heterosexual male who admitted to fantasies about sexual aggression would be highly suspect, whereas a homosexual who enjoyed fantasies of mutual “fun” homoerotic play would be praised for his sense of awareness and integration.

“Sexual integration for a priesthood candidate means awareness and honesty about his gender identity, orientation and intentions. He must EMBRACE them as they are - not as he wishes them to be. For many this means acknowledging a homosexual orientation, some homosexual attractions or homophobia. A person is either egosyntonic or egodystonic in his sexual identity.” **FPC by Krenik**

Each seminarian must work at resolving any internal conflicts, guilt shame, anxiety or dissatisfaction concerning his sexual identity. Another system favored by the system-laden Krenik is the Keith Clark, three levels of being sexual—biological urges, bio-psychological drives and personal spiritual needs. He splits biological needs from romantic needs and the final need for intimacy, which is the sharing of feelings, hopes, fears, successes and failures. We have responses and pursuits in all these areas. The good celibate will respond biologically and romantically but not pursue. He will pursue intimacy, for intimacy is needed for sexual integration and fulfillment. To deny or get rid of sexual feelings is a faulty approach. We should let ourselves experience the physical and romantic responses without pursuing them, without doing something about them. (This is nearly a direct quote used by Ryan Erickson when he explains to an eighteen year old why it is ok to come up close to him if he gets an erection: “It is ok to feel it, it is what you do with it that matters.”)

Then there are the six dimensions of development—physical, cognitive emotional, social, moral and spiritual. “Sexuality and spirituality are not enemies but friends.” Have we driven the adult males out of the room yet?

Let’s go on to the “Multi dimensional nature of Homosexuality.”

“There are three identifiable dimensions of homosexuality: 1) same gender sexual behavior, 2) same gender desire and sexual attraction as internal psychological states and 3) self identity as a homosexual person. This third identity can be a) one’s internal identity and b) one’s public social role. We are searching for ego-syntonic here, so he is quick to note that especially in the homophobic society one might adopt a heterosexual social role even if one has predominate homosexual identity and fantasies. He says this is fine, but “at the same time it would be very difficult for a person to feel genuinely close to a small number of people without them being aware of this sexual orientation. Personal support is critical.”

Reading these belabored theories seems to be a manual for the exact strategy of Fr. Bill McDonough, who kept his gay identity from his rector but shared with his other friends who were in the know. The policy of the seminary, which was also taught, was to be comfortable with your homosexuality and if you weren't something was wrong. Be comfortable but be discreet—tell a few friends. The Church cannot run a public gay culture or eventually someone will come through and run us all out of the priesthood. That was the lesson of “the purge.” So be a gay but only tell a few people. There will be, of course, interlocking groups of little friends. We will need a way to tell incoming seminarians that gay identity is fine, but don't be “active” or an open crusader. There will be parishes where gay identity will be an asset because gay partners are embraced in a network of parishes called the “reconciling parishes.” There are new rules since the purge—learn the rules. You are not alone; you have friends in very high places. Men who cannot adapt to your affectional nature will be chastised as homophobic and rigid. Don't let them shame you. They probably have anger issues and dirty violent thoughts of their own.

A major emphasis in the Krenik formation is developing “capacity for intimacy in human friendships.” “Authentic intimacy with others necessitates self disclosure, vulnerability, and mutuality.” There are many impediments to intimacy –fear of self disclosure, poor self image, low self esteem and expecting to be perfect. Topping off this Saturday Night Live theory of human psychology is a category apparently not meant as satire. “Homophobia impedes intimacy. The irrational fear of homosexuality, fear of persons who are gay or lesbian or fear of our own attractions to persons of our own gender can lead to hostility and anger. Myths fears and stereotypes abound in this area.” **FPC by Krenik** That was the spiritual director talking in the new reformed seminary of the nineties. Heterosexuals were taught to distrust the natural repulsion a man feels to another man who looks at him like a girlfriend!

SPS POLICIES

Now we will examine some policies of the SPS and then try to make sense of this teaching. Policies are called “Behavioral Expectations”.

No genital activity

No porno bookstores

No pick up bars

Any such behaviors can lead to dismissal. (Ed. Note: This is progress from the days of Bunnell and Sagenbrecht and in fact are policies developed in response to their indiscretions.)

Participating in or advocating homosexual subculture is unacceptable. (Here by subculture they mean the open version of gay pride like marching in Gay Pride Day. You have to wait to be a priest or sister of St. Joseph to get to do that)

A broad range of friendships is necessary for living celibate chastity. Seminarians may not restrict friendships based on sexual orientation.

1) Sex abuse 2) Sexual exploitation and 3) sexual harassment are psychologically pathological and illegal. (Interesting that we are finally using the word “pathological” but it is not used for same sex desire but for violations of Minnesota employment and criminal statutes).

“Under no circumstances may a student report to a third student his concerns regarding another student’s sexual orientation or behavior. If there are concerns this must be brought directly to the student himself or if serious tell the rector.” **FPC by Krenik** (Thus two heterosexual students may not discuss with each other that Billy seems a little sweet in his affections. If they tell Billy to his face as mandated, he can report that their evaluation of him has made him uncomfortable and he feels they are not accepting of him because he might be gay. If someone tells Fr. Krenik that he is wondering about Billy then Fr. Krenik writes down that the guy is fearful of intimacy because he is homophobic. The culture is set up for close living with homosexuals who are encouraged to share their proclivities with self selected friends while heterosexuals may not criticize or shy away from such disordered affections. The heterosexuals may not discuss with one

another if they suspect a seminarian is eroticizing the *philia* of male friendship. This is neither a masculine nor a Catholic anthropology.

It is a completely normal and healthy reaction for a man who wants to be the brother of a man, to be repulsed by erotic desires from him communicated in body language or speech. Just as a brother would blanch from any such intimations from a sibling—a man is not expected to consider such attractions as “something to get used to.” Priests are building a brotherhood and it is absolutely necessary for Peter to note if Roger is more interested in building spousal love rather than group fraternity. It is part of brotherhood for Peter to tell John if Roger is acting like Rhonda. The Catholic anthropology is well stated in the Vatican’s commentary on the statement on the inadmissibility of homosexuals to the seminary. This was given the day after the instruction in *L’Osservatore Romano* by Msgr. Tony Anatrella. The argument here goes much deeper than asking if men are sexually active or marching in the gay pride parade. He argues that the homosexual inclination itself is seriously disordered and not only renders a man unfit for the priesthood but a real danger to the brotherly maturation needed in the close but not intimate relationships which men develop during seminary formation:

“Candidates who present 'deep-seated homosexual tendencies,' that is, an exclusive attraction with regard to persons of the same sex (a structural orientation) - independently of whether or not they've had erotic experiences - may not be admitted to seminaries and to sacred orders," Anatrella wrote.

Anatrella criticizes the "permissive attitude" that says as long as a candidate is capable of celibacy, he may be ordained. In fact, Anatrella asserts that gay priests experience a whole host of other difficulties.

He offered these examples: "Closing oneself off in a clan of persons of the same type; exaggerated affective choices; [becoming] a narcissistic position in front of a community that [the gay priest] disturbs even to the point of dividing it; a mode of vocational discernment that seeks candidates in his own image; relations with authority based on seduction and rejection; ... an often limited vision of truth and a selective way of presenting the gospel message; particularly in the areas of sexual and conjugal morality, these are habitually zones of relational and intellectual confusion and

ideological combat, disapproved by a correct search for truth and the wisdom of God."

On a more theological level, Anatrella argues that gay priests cannot effectively incarnate a "spousal tie" between God and the church, nor the "spiritual paternity" a priest is supposed to represent."

Monsignor Anatrella: meet Fr. Thomas Krenik—he needs some spiritual direction and a course in Catholic Psychology 101.

Schuth, Krenik and willful lies

Another SPS faculty member, Sister Katerina Schuth is also considered a great expert on American seminaries. Both she and Fr. Krenik were interviewed by the *New York Times* to help digest the Vatican statement on the admission of homosexuals to seminaries. She said "The Vatican document specifies that all candidates must attain sexual maturity and overcome homosexual tendencies at least three years before diaconal ordination. To my mind these would not represent new requirements." That of course is a bold faced lie by Sister. Obviously at St. Paul Seminary men are not in any way asked to overcome homosexual **tendencies**. Sister Schuth knows this perfectly well. In fact seminarians are asked to become comfortable with their homosexual tendencies so they can be egosyntonic. Their classmates are supposed to get comfortable with the same sex attractions of their classmates in the shower and after a nightcap or they will be labeled incapable of intimacy with all kinds of people.

Sister also said "That statement does not say to me that homosexual men are barred from the seminary or Holy Orders only that certain conditions be met." Now that is the real Sister Schuth and the seminary we have been investigating. But it is not Catholic teaching.

The 1961 seminary guidelines had a single line that homosexual men should not be admitted to the seminaries. A 1985 letter from Cardinal Baum said

latent and repressed homosexuals should not be admitted—he wasn't talking "active". He was saying the tendency itself was unacceptable. This is what the Church's policies have always been. But why was the 2005 document even needed? It was because many seminaries like the St. Paul Seminary and many experts like Sister Schuth and many spiritual directors like Fr. Krenik and many moral theologians like Bill McDonough and many admission directors like Ron Bowers were ignoring this rule and treating homosexuality as a simple variant in the great sexual garden of humanity.

The Vatican instruction was, is, and always has been *–keep active and inactive homosexuals out of the seminary*. "Inactive" homosexuals are psychologically incapable of spiritual paternity. A student who cannot intellectually get into St Thomas College is not accepted in the seminary. The seminary has intellectual standards. It is even more crucial for the candidate, the seminary formation culture and future pastoral life that there be a maturation standard in affectional life. But just like some African dioceses wink at concubines for priests and polygamy in the laity, we have just passed through an era where the power structure of a whole diocese winked and winked at male homosexuality-- treating this ancient taboo as a form of love.

The 2005 document was meant precisely for the Fr. Kreniks and Sister Schuths who, contrary to church doctrine, had made their separate peace with this fundamental disorder. This is why the document spelled things out for those who deliberately contravened the longstanding policy reiterated in 1961 in a single line. The new document explains that the homosexual inclination is in itself a sign of not achieving affective maturity. The document defines affective maturity in terms of spiritual paternity a concept that neither Sister Schuth nor Fr. Krenik discuss in their various interviews. They know, as would any honest reader of the document, that the Catholic anthropology of masculine sexual maturity is spiritual paternity and a fraternity that binds men as brothers in battle formation not as potential erotic playmates. They know that the Catholic anthropology of masculine sexual maturity is spiritual paternity and the homosexual is incapable of affectively portraying father or spouse in his arrested state. That is why neither the sister nor the padre use "**spiritual paternity,**" the key term in the document when explaining the document to the secular press. Any honest reading of Fr. Krenik's book on celibacy formation shows no hint of fatherhood and a strong bias toward the acceptance of homoerotic feelings as part of an identity that a man should internalize. The words of the Vatican

document could not be plainer. To square these words with Fr. Krenik's words in the St. Paul Seminary book on celibacy formation, one would have to create a hidden gay subculture based on personal disclosure among gays and public denial of their existence. There would have to be a deliberately neutered language that is mute about the full-souled maturation of fatherhood. In short there will have to be a gay subculture sustained by dissent and deceit in opposition to a public fraternity fostering spiritual paternity. Welcome to SPS in the nineties.

The psychological world of Fr Thomas Krenik is the atheistic psychology of the twentieth century with a little dollop of spiritual whipped cream added at the end to help swallow this thin gruel. From Maslow to Erickson, the hierarchy of needs paradigm that begins with man as a physical being with biological urges and then progresses up to "higher tasks," is the secular displacement of religious anthropology. The study of the soul starts with man as a creature of God, defined as a soul meant for God, but with a fallen nature. This anthropology does not consider every inclination as a part of one's identity that must be accepted for a person to be egosyntonic. A religious understanding of man and reality cannot tack spirituality on top of the real stuff—physical, cognitive emotional etc. This is the worst kind of dualism which is compounded by the lack of any masculine or Catholic anthropology in dealing with sexuality, spirituality and celibacy. There is in Fr. Krenik a studied attempt to make statements not only gender neutral but homo/hetero indistinguishable. The person is left floating around detecting his feelings and getting in touch with the meaning of his sexual fantasies to better understand his "sexual intentions." No allowance is made for the idea that a man might have a sexual fantasy or experience that is perverted (turned away from its proper goal) and that should be suppressed, avoided or even considered shameful. This idea is rejected as not knowing oneself. But the notion that there might be feelings and thoughts which are better left unexcavated is as true as saying there are boxes which Pandora should leave closed or a tree of knowledge where the fruit should not be tasted. But such a basic religious truth smacks of repression in the Krenikian spiritual universe. The student shall conquer all by knowledge of his desires, with a special plug for dreams and masturbation fantasies as a locus of self discovery. It is indeed the miniature world of the solopist that is to be

discovered. Put on your fallen fantasies and become yourself—so much for putting on the mind of the church to be formed in Christ.

In secular psychology there is no soul—no receiving principle of a creature. The anima (feminine in all of us) as a capacity for receiving God’s life and presence is considered a feudal pre-scientific concept. It is beyond this discussion to explore the radical misogyny of both secular rationalists and gay theorists, but let us say that the same culture that despises the masculine bond which builds fathers is also blind to the feminine center—the interior temple of the Holy Spirit and the real locus of “intimacy” with the Trinity. The secular psychology taught by Fr. Krenik establishes intimacy as the goal of human relationships with no modifier in terms of maleness and femaleness. The fact that celibate men renounce the sacrament of conjugal intimacy is described as a forgoing of “genital affection.” The gay twist on celibacy does not understand that the male-female intimacy of marriage is a form of love not replicable by men. They cannot understand what is given up because they cannot really imagine masculine desire for the feminine. The gay world is as anti feminine as it is anti masculine. That is why gay spirituality after murdering the father must always replace the personal experience of Marian devotion with an ideological assent to feminism.

The intimacy which men seek in the Krenik manual is fostered by “the sharing of faults.” That is a great definition for dramatic serial gay disclosures but it is pretty much a psychological death camp for masculinity. Not to worry—we don’t get carried away with notions of masculinity and fatherhood among priests or in the Deity. We have outgrown that metaphor as we sort through the six (or is it five) steps to sexual development and the three (or is it four) steps to sexual identity. The Catholic birthright of the revelation based theocentric human soul was traded for the poor gruel of atheistic psychology. Fatherhood and masculinity were lost in the same bad deal.

Krenik’s Teaching and the Conflicted Homosexual-failing Ryan Erickson

Let us now consider the psycho-sexual world of the 1990’s at the Saint Paul Seminary, the world where Ryan Erickson was educated, the world that was supposedly reformed from the bad old days when homosexuality was rampant and overt. That is the environment which recommended for the priesthood a certain Ryan Erickson, a very conflicted Wisconsin man with strong and unwelcome homosexual proclivities.

According to the Vatican document on admitting men with homosexual tendencies to seminaries:

The spiritual director has the responsibility of evaluating all the qualities of the candidate's personality, and to make sure he does not present disturbances of a sexual nature which are incompatible with the priesthood. If a candidate practices homosexuality or presents with deep seated homosexual tendencies, his spiritual director and confessor have the duty to dissuade him from ordination. The spiritual director represents the Church in the internal forum.

There is no question that none of the spiritual directors of the last 20 years at the St. Paul Seminary would see this as their duty. Certainly from his own writings, Fr. Krenik would not. The Krenikian spiritual director is the friend of intimacy and self disclosure. He excavates and validates the man—rather than help that man put on the mind of the church. Fr. Krenik thought a seminarian should embrace his homosexual tendencies. Ryan Erickson's attitude was closer to the mind of the Church than to that of his spiritual director. Ryan Erickson did not embrace his disordered proclivities. He knew they were wrong.

Fr. Krenik writes, "A man with a dystonic sexual identity is not a candidate for celibacy." Clearly if the seminary was following even the twisted theories of Fr. Krenik, Ryan Erickson would have been refused ordination. Ryan Erickson was betrayed by hirelings posed as shepherds. The school for fathers had been turned into a place to discern "gifts" and Ryan Erickson was caught between the Church that said homosexual feelings were disordered and a seminary staff that said having those feelings was a gift from God. He was confused when he came, and the secret renegades of SPS kept him in the dark till he met a real father several years later in a Hudson mortuary. Both Ryan Erickson's parents and Dan O'Connell's children have a right to know that this deceitful culture of contradiction has been vigorously repudiated. Both dead men have a spiritual claim against seminary and chancery officials who willfully disobeyed the Church to teach the modern lies of the sexual revolution. Their deaths are the fruits of a culture of death. It is not enough to move on. Repentance and contrition, not retirement parties for the guilty, are needed ---because the crime goes on.

This crime against the conflicted homosexual male is repeated in our urban parishes where confused men with more or less deeply ingrained

homosexual tendencies are told to embrace their gayness and the church will catch up with their experiences of love. Even more nefarious are the similar programs in Catholic high schools encouraging young teens to self identify as “gay.”

Ryan Erickson needed serious therapy. He was ordained in clear contradiction of Catholic tradition and law. The admission application processed by the vice rector, Ron Bowers, would have been rejected by any priest trying to follow the guidelines of the Church in dealing with homosexuality. But this was St Paul, Minnesota. Fr Bowers had learned the lessons of the sexual revolution all too well. He and the spiritual directors and the theologians and the admission psychologists were all smarter than the “pre scientific and pre psychological” Vatican. The great paradox is that the Sister Schuths and Father Bowers thought they were rejecting an outdated understanding of religion in the name of science when in fact they were rejecting science and religion to pay homage to the twisted bias of the contemporary cultural elite.

The admission of Ryan Erickson to the seminary was clearly a violation of Church teaching and was allowed because in this archdiocese the acceptance of homosexuality as a gift was deeply entrenched at the most powerful levels—the Seminary admissions director and Judicial Vicar as well as the Vicar General. It helped that the Vicar General’s brother set a good deal of the seminary’s tone as a moral theologian and arbiter of social justice. In fact it was exactly the blurring of masculine-feminine differences and the tolerance of homosexuality that defined *social justice for sexual minorities*—a key value holding together the desacralized and emasculated priesthood of the brave new era.

Fr. William McDonough-theologian of the gay subculture

The rector of the seminary didn’t know that Fr. Bill McDonough was gay till he had left the seminary. But lots of other people did because Fr. McDonough knew who to tell and how to tell and when to tell. He taught the sexual morality course from 1991-1997. From 1992 on, his brother was Vicar General. He was well connected. In 1992, Catholic and Evangelical activists sought the help of the archdiocese in defeating a St. Paul gay rights bill that was used in Minneapolis to ban the Boy Scouts. Fr. Kevin McDonough made sure the activists would meet with him as chancery

representative and a theologian of his choosing (who turned out to be brother, Bill). With Bill doing most of the talking, the brothers McDonough let the activists know the Catholics would not be helping them in this campaign which they thought was heavily tainted by a desire to discriminate. The seminary rector didn't know Bill was gay but his vicar general brother knew who the diocesan expert was on gay rights in shaping the political life of the city.

For seminarians it was more troubling that professor McDonough developed over the years a deeply flawed notion of the priesthood and celibacy torn from the masculine priesthood. As he said in his *Two cheers for celibacy* article: "My bias in this article is that I think priests' contemporary experience of our celibacy is skewed and made increasingly eccentric by the continued exclusion of women from holy orders."

The wordy introvert had no understanding of the priesthood and apostolic fraternity as the sacramental form of masculine communion. Fr Bill had a very different idea of male *communio*. Fr. McDonough's students frequently comment on his fastidiousness-- the long single spaced notes-- the droning tortured lectures. He was tortured and nuanced but notions like spiritual paternity and affective maturity were not part of his vocabulary.

From his 1996 article, *Acknowledging the Gift of Gay Celibacy*, he begins by establishing the language of the homo/hetero world where he is a prince. He praises the confused book on celibacy by Donald Goergen as a "classic." Part of the reason is the "broader" definition of celibacy that Goergen introduces: "A choice to forgo genital love." Goergen agrees with McDonough that celibacy is about sexuality not marriage. That of course allows us to consider homosexuals and heterosexuals in a single breath— always an unstated strategy for Fr. McDonough. That this rips celibacy from marriage and fatherhood and reduces the spousal fructifying love of husband and wife to a choice about genital love is of no concern to these two "classicists." They shrink the rich poetic reality of Catholic sexual practice to their miniature masturbatory world of "genital satisfaction."

Fr. Bill McDonough personally and intellectually, is a pathetic figure but what he did in setting the diocesan tone for discussing sexuality is nothing short of criminal. He did it by lying about who he was and what he did. He is not flamboyant, but very self-effacing and now he teaches college girls

at St Catherine's College in St Paul. Lucifer did not scare the woman. He tricked her with his clever tongue. This isn't funny anymore.

In the Catholic sexual order, the intimacy of **eros** is found in heterosexual monogamy and the wide radius brotherhood of **philia** is ordered in the masculine priesthood. This is the shape of Catholic love. Fr. McDonough's published synopsis of his own love life is very different.

I can express my sexual energy by committing myself to particular non genital and lifelong friendships with a handful of persons whose future I must guard and nurture. It is enough for my happiness and my health to do so and that my doing so has significance that is precisely institutional: it mediates meaning to the world.

And thus the man who rejects the institutions of heterosexual marriage and the male priesthood as eccentric and incoherent, raises his self disclosure with a few close friends to the level of INSTITUTION.

Fr McDonough helped shape the gay subculture of deceit with this St Paul seminary policy which he approvingly quotes in his publications.

“Ministry in the Catholic Church for priests who are widely known to be homosexual is seriously compromised.”

So the table is set. It is fine to be homosexual but choose who you tell. The various gay subcultures that exist are to be kept secret because the laity is not quite ready for the truth. The institutional rationale for a culture of deceit is well in place. This is love indeed but we can't tell most of the lay people and we certainly can't ever talk about this in public. All the priests heterosexual and homosexual will share the dirty little secret. There is one tempting response to this nonsense: “Bring back Mao Tse Tung's cultural revolution so we can send the college professors to the fields for the cleansing therapy of physical labor.”

Free the Seminarians-a return to Catholic Sacramentality

The exploration of self and nurturing of a few friends substituted for the Christian narrative, the real community of the diocesan priesthood and the daily encounter with God in prayer and liturgy. Cogitating one's experience rather than putting on the mind of the Church became a way of life. There was no separation of one's misguided inclinations from the formative truth of the Word of God. Misguided inclinations do not have to be explored—they certainly have to be recognized but then suppression and obliteration are healthy strategies. As every heterosexual man knows there are all sorts of feelings we might have, thoughts or images from the past which we don't want to get comfortable with in any way. Receiving the Word of God demands personal discipline which cultivates the listening heart in which the Word can grow.

Man must separate the sewer from the drinking water, reproductive tract from the digestive tract, male from female, adult from child, the sacred from the profane. At one level these separations are necessary for health. At another level these acts of separation are the prelude to the encounter with the sacred. Maintaining these categories establishes human culture and the religious vocabulary. Blurring the categories deprives us the vocabulary of patriarchal religion: Fatherhood, fraternity, spousal love and Marian femininity. These categories put sexuality at the service of the Father's plan to return all to his household. A good deal of religion and a significant element of priestly culture is exactly this separation in life, time, space and person to create an arena in which the divine might be more fruitfully encountered.

The sad project of the SPS spirituality team debunked the profound categories of sacramental sexuality until all they had left was a love defined as sharing "non genitally" with a few old school chums. The most profane of desires came to be the secret that was protected. The Basilica of Mary, the reputation of the Church, the sacred Eucharist, the soul of the abused and the unborn—all these were left unprotected. I would think some men would begin to show some righteous anger that the sacred feminine of Catholic life -- *Maria, ecclesia*, and *anima* have been so dishonored. A fundamental reason there is a male priesthood is to protect the feminine. The destructive misogyny of the gay cult proved as deep a bias as its fear of patriarchy. These confused fellows were good feminists in their war against both the authentic masculine and feminine. They were soldiers of the individualistic death cult that destroys the male- female dyad of life. Their own affectional immaturity rendered them incapable of fully

receiving a tradition too sophisticated for their adolescent categories. They could never appreciate the Chestertonian paradox of a masculine priesthood. The priestly masculine relationship was instituted to protect a space for the feminine where the sacred could be encountered. Fathers Bill McDonough, Thomas Krenik and Michael Papesh were deaf, dumb and blind before the sacramental reality.

Remember back to the three sick three vignettes of Fr Krenik. Understand the full horror. For two decades the experts on spirituality at the St. Paul Seminary deserted the lush land of Catholic sacramental sexuality for the twisted province of gay fantasy. Dan O'Connell, James Ellison and Ryan Erickson were not their only casualties.