

**Saint Brendan Parish**  
384 Hartford Avenue  
Bellingham, Massachusetts 02019-1217  
Tel. 508-966-0260; Fax. 508-966-4404

As a priest of the Archdiocese I request that my shepherd see this letter with his own eyes.

November 15, 2007

His Eminence Sean O'Malley, OFM Cap.  
Archdiocese of Boston  
2101 Commonwealth Avenue  
Brighton, Massachusetts 02135

Your Eminence,

I would like to begin by thanking you for your strong comments regarding the Democratic Party's exclusion of pro-lifers from its leadership and their insensitivity to the teaching of the Catholic Church regarding the life issues. The strong statement of the USCCB is greatly appreciated and is just what the flock needs.

It has been five years since the "Talking About Touching" (TAT) program was chosen by the Cardinals Commission for the Protection of Children and subsequently imposed upon the parents and parishes of the Archdiocese of Boston. This program has even continued after the Catholic Medical Association, in their report on safe environment programs entitled "To Prevent and to Protect", criticized all such child-empowerment programs as ineffective and "*inconsistent with Church Teaching and the science of child development.*"<sup>(1)</sup> TAT has now been joined with another program, "Keeping Children Safe" (KCS), which is for older children. Both programs are used with children in their latency periods. Both programs initiate children into knowledge of sexuality under the guise of safety by implying that they can be targets.

Both programs disturb the natural tranquility of children by introducing by introducing ideas to children about how one may be molested, and hence can encourage experimentation. In the grade six program (11 year olds) of KCS the teacher is suppose to offer these examples of inappropriate touching "*if the students do not mention them*": "*hugging too hard, pinching or tickling too much, caressing someone's body who doesn't want to be touched in that way, touching a person's private body parts – the parts that are covered by a swimsuit, or asking or forcing someone to touch their private body parts.*"

# Saint Brendan Parish

Another TAT example is Lesson 9, for grade 3 (8 year old olds), it includes the following scenario: *“This is Kerry. She is worried about something that happened to her last week when she spent the night with one of her friends. Her friend's older brother came into the bedroom, put his hand under the covers of the bed Kerry was sleeping in, and touched her vagina (private parts). She said, ‘Stop that!’ in an assertive voice. He stopped, but then he told her to keep it a secret. Kerry is wondering what she should do. Teacher's Question to the Children: How do you think Kerry felt when her friend's brother touched her vagina?”*

The CMA points out that in such lessons, *“These programs interrupt the age of innocence with sexually distorted ideas that stimulate the child to think and talk about sex with their peers. This desensitizes the child to sexual perversions.”*<sup>(2)</sup> Apparently one of the services that the Office of Child Advocacy offers through KSC is instruction for 11-year-olds on how to experiment sexually with others. Not only is this occurring, but the child is being groomed for future abuse by this desensitization; very much akin to the “grooming” done by sexual child abusers.

Both programs are based on the illusion that children can protect themselves from predators. The CMA commented on this in its report: *“Church and school educational programs that focus on teaching the child how to prevent abuse are not consistent with the current knowledge and research on the sexual abuse of children. Research of the last two decades demonstrates that it is not effective to ask the potential child victim to prevent the abuse. Children cannot control or change the factors that cause sexual abuse. Children cannot be empowered or expected to prevent abuse, either in the Church or society.”*<sup>(3)</sup>

One of the more horrendous aspects of these programs is that they imply that children will be molested by their relatives. TAT in grade 1, lesson 9, has a picture of a young boy, Alex, looking warily at his "uncle" while both are sitting on a couch. The caption under the photo reads, *"Let's see how the boy in our story used the Touching Rule and the Safety Steps. This is Alex. He was visiting his aunt and uncle. Alex and his uncle were watching television and eating popcorn. His uncle told Alex that he had a special game they could play. He called it the 'touching game.' He said, 'Let's take off our clothes and touch each other's private body parts.' Alex knew this game wasn't safe. So, in a strong voice he said, 'No, I don't want to do that.' Then he got off the couch and left the room. When he got home, he told his mom and dad what had happened. Alex's parents were glad that he said 'no' to his uncle. They were also glad that Alex told them what his uncle asked him to do."*

Not to be outdone by TAT, KCS features a booklet for children entitled No More Secrets. This booklet focuses on a stepfather touching his stepdaughter

# Saint Brendan Parish

under her nightgown as he “*tucks her in*”. KCS also has a lesson for grade 4 (9 year olds) that features a film called Now I Can Tell You My Secret. The problem of one girl in the film, Jennifer by name, is that her father was “*touching her private parts*”. What kind of persons and what kind of agenda are they advancing when they dare to suggest to little girls that their father may molest them? Well, if we look in the mirror we will find out what sort of persons would do so.

I sent a letter on TAT to Bp. Lennon in June of 2003. I gave a detailed analysis of the problems with the program, years before the CMA report. I specifically mentioned where TAT was divergent from the directives given by the Holy See, that we are bound under the pain of sin to follow. (I have enclosed a copy of this letter.) This letter was also sent to you when you became our Archbishop. My letter has never been responded to.

I ask you again the question I posed in a letter I sent to you in October of 2003, What sort of priests do you want? Do you want priests who believe that the word of God is superior to the plans of men? Do you want priests who are obedient to the Holy See? You seem to be getting at this question with your emphasis on the identity of priests as the subject for the Convocation on November 20th.

My identity is that I am a Roman Catholic Priest. When I took the oath of fidelity as pastor I meant what I swore: “*I adhere with religious submission of will and intellect to the teachings which either the Roman pontiff or the College of Bishops enunciate when they exercise their authentic Magisterium, even if they do not intend to proclaim these teachings by a definitive act.*”<sup>(4)</sup> In my letter to Bishop Lennon of June, 2003, later copied to you, I pointed out specifically where TAT comes into contradiction of the directives of the Sacred Congregation on Education and the Pontifical Council on the Family. This “*authentic Magisterium*” I have sworn to follow, and I will follow.

We have been told in the official communications that the Archdiocese made agreement with the U.S. attorney, and that TAT is part of that agreement. Besides the obvious question of *who thinks that he has the authority to give away the rights of the Church and Catholic citizens in this regard*, there is also the question of who determined that a “*safe environment*” program necessarily must follow the form of the Planned Parenthood/Committee on Children/Culture of death mode? Whose agenda is being served?

Your eminence, you have been badly served by your advisors. Opposition has been created by the imposition of TAT and KCS where it was absolutely unnecessary. And it causes parents not to trust you. Do you think that the bureaucrats of the Chancery are more interested in protecting children than their own parents and pastors? Do you think that they want their children molested, so

# Saint Brendan Parish

that is why they oppose TAT and KCS? Or is it that the parents and pastors see the whole of each child – body, soul, intellect, emotions, and psyche? Could it be that we are not being gratuitously rebellious, but that we do not want their innocence to be taken away just in order to please lawyers, insurers, and the Planned Parenthood ridden paper pushers of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

I could describe each active family of my parish, including what the parents are like and what the kids are like. I can tell you what hobbies the kids have, what sports they like, and where they go to school. I could tell you the strengths, weaknesses, and challenges of each family. I could recite for you the comments and questions the children make at the family Mass, and who their best friends are. Do you think that I don't care if these children are molested and it is out of sloth that I don't institute TAT and KCS in this parish?

Over my 25 years of priesthood I have counseled many adults and children, and have a great reputation in that area of pastoral work. I have dealt with many adults who were molested as children, sometimes by strangers, but usually by men brought into the household unwisely by lonely women. I have seen the deep wounds that have been inflicted upon children in their latency period. The wounds often lead to self-hate because even as adults they believe the emotional lies instilled by the acts of their abusers. These lies cannot simply be countered by reason, because their root is in the pre-rational emotional life of the child. (This is the same time of life in which the crude lessons of TAT and KCS can do their damage to children.) I have also counseled those who were abused by priests, and those who were the victims of Satanic Ritual Abuse. Do you think I want to see this kind of abuse continue with anyone?

I have been involved with the pro-life and pro-family movements for thirty years. For most of my twenty-five years as a priest I have been on the Board of Directors of Massachusetts Citizens for Life. As a college student I was on the Archdiocesan Pro-life Council established by Cardinal Medeiros. I have read voluminously on all family issues, including every copy of the Human Life Journal up to the present year. (It is the best there is on the life and family issues.) I was mentored by the great Dr. Joseph Stanton, father of the pro-life movement in Massachusetts. He particularly cautioned me about Planned Parenthood. TAT and KCS have the putrid stench of Planned Parenthood all over them. (Which is the same smell as that of the **Culture of Death**.) They have *always* used “safety programs” as a way to teach sex to kids.(4) That is what TAT and KCS are doing, no matter what the intention is of those who are imposing it on the parishes.

I can see clearly how bad these programs are; I have no excuse. If I were to bring them into St. Brendan's I would have no defense before the judgment seat of Our Lord, my condemnation could well be in my own words. Clearly I would go

# Saint Brendan Parish

to Hell. When I was ordained a priest I knew that I would have to fight the abortion culture and the sexual revolution, but I thought that I would be backed up by a sort of ecclesial “band of brothers”. I never dreamed that as a priest that the Archdiocese of Boston would try to force me into what I know is sin. We live in strange times.

It is amazing to me how much damage has been done to the Archdiocese by the attempt to impose these programs: how the concerns of pastors have been cast aside, how the parents have been ignored, and how the children have been emotionally and spiritually scarred. (Not to mention having their view of sexuality poisoned at the earliest possible stage in life.) And it is all unnecessary. If only we had first looked at what the Church taught and what natural law teaches. Then we could have had a cooperative effort diocesan-wide to produce a parent-based program. But no, when the bureaucracy of the Archdiocese of Boston makes a decision they never back down, and the wounds just get deeper.

I am not against good Catholic programs on morality for children. We have often, delicately dealt with sexual morality at the right age, according to the prescriptions given us in The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality<sup>(5)</sup> and Educational Guidance in Human Love<sup>(6)</sup>. St. Brendan’s was a pilot parish for “See, God Makes All Things New”. Nor am I against safe-environment programs that are parent-based (as the Church teaches they should be<sup>(7)</sup>). I have developed such a workshop call “God Made Me Holy” and have used it here in the parish.

Please believe me, Your Eminence, if I could conduct these programs without sin, I would. It would save me a lot of anxiety, caused by the constant harassment of the Office of Child Advocacy. I long to be allowed to be a Roman Catholic priest, and not a facilitator of a Planned Parenthood style sex-ed program, not a cog in the chancery machinery. My parents taught me to be a man and not take the easy way out. They taught me always to first seek the truth and goodness of a thing. I must honor their memory. But ultimately it all comes down to love. I love God and I love the kids of this parish and I respect their parents. I love all of them, and every part of them, body and soul. I will not steal away their innocence.

Bishop Vasa of the Diocese of Baker, Nebraska announced that he would not be in compliance with the safe environment part of the Dallas Charter because he judged it to be against Catholic moral principles: “This goes directly to the clear words of Article 12: ‘Dioceses are to maintain ‘safe environment’ programs which the diocesan bishop deems to be in accord with Catholic moral principles.’” **Precisely because I have deemed that group education of children in matters related to child sexual abuse violates the Catholic moral principles outlined in The Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality, I will be found to be not in compliance with the demands of the Charter.** My work on ‘Healthy Families -

# Saint Brendan Parish

Safe Children' is the morally appropriate alternative I am proposing.”<sup>(8)</sup> He sees what many pastors and parents in this diocese see. Why can't the chancery of the Archdiocese see this?

I don't know if this letter will make a difference. In fact, I don't know if you will read this or have read any of the significant letters that I have sent you. I have no record of a response. Maybe your advisers don't let you see some of the mail you get from your priests. Perhaps we are not important enough to receive a response. I guess that you are going to have to decide how you are going to punish us priests who are guilty of wanting to protect the innocence of our parish children from the ravages of the programs imposed on us by the Office of Child Advocacy.

Obediently yours,

Rev. David J. Mullen  
Pastor

cc: Most Rev. Walter J. Edyvean  
Most Rev. Francis X. Irwin  
Most Rev. John P. Boles  
Most Rev. Emilio S. Allue  
Most Rev. Richard J. Malone  
Rev. Msgr. Francis V. Strahan  
Rev. Mr. Anthony Rizzuto

(1) *“We conclude, from study of the pertinent research, that child- and adolescent-empowerment prevention programs are not effective and are inconsistent with Church teaching and with the science of child development. These programs disrupt the most delicate and intimate elements of child and adolescent life and interfere with parental rights and responsibilities. Child empowerment programs are, therefore, in clear conflict with the Church's traditional support of the family and recognition of parents as the primary educators and protectors of their children. We therefore recommend that U.S. bishops rescind the safe-environment mandate as it applies to children and adolescents and discontinue all child-empowerment programs for preventing child sexual abuse.”* To Prevent and Protect, Catholic Medical Association, 2006, p. 49

(2) Ibidem, p. 46

(3) Ibidem, p. 45

(4) *“Parents should also be attentive to ways in which sexual instruction can be inserted in the context of other subjects, which are otherwise useful (for example, health and hygiene, personal development, family life, children's literature, social and cultural studies etc.). In these situations it is more difficult to control the content of sexual instruction . . . But catechesis would also be distorted if the inseparable links between religion and morality were to be used as a*

# Saint Brendan Parish

*pretext for introducing into religious instruction the biological and affective sexual information, which the parents should give according to their prudent decision in their own home.” # 41*Truth and Meaning of Human Sexuality (TMHS), Pontifical Council on the Family, 1995,

(5) Pontifical Council on the Family, 1995

(6) Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education, 1983

(7) ***“The normal and fundamental method, already proposed in this guide, is personal dialogue between parents and their children, that is, individual formation within the family circle. In fact there is no substitute for a dialogue of trust and openness between parents and their children, a dialogue, which respects not only their stages of development but also the young persons as individuals . . .” #129, TMHS***

(8) Catholic Sentinel, 2007