

## COVERING LETTER

I am grateful to my friends in the media who have been receiving these notes and have honored my request not to publicize any of them.

We come now to the question: After Drugs What? I told you that there has long been on the youth scene a phenomenon more significant and far reaching than drugs. In the past few years I have been making the effort to become more knowledgeable in case society or the Church should discern it and wish to do something unhysterically preventative about it.

The best kept secret of the counter-culture has been its changing sexuality. A rapidly increasing proportion of alienated young people has for some time been experimenting with bisexuality. Homosexuality, or rather the numbers of those openly professing themselves Gay has increased enormously.

When this phenomenon began to assert itself, I was still in the midst of unsuccessfully trying to convince adults that most of what they were teaching about drug use was myth. As often as I had predicted some new phenomenon the adults became more angry at me and accused me of putting the idea in the minds of kids. I wasn't about to talk publicly about this highly incendiary topic and bring the whole thing toppling down upon my head. Even now it is my intention never again to predict what is coming next since it is obvious that authorities never believe it and never act to prevent it. Changing sexuality is not what is coming but what has been here for at least three years.

When you read the list of the many reasons why kids do drugs, you will find omitted inevitably this one: guilt and confusion over homosexual tendencies. Yet in my experience, it is one of the major motivations in drug abuse.

As Gay Liberation becomes more vociferous (and more outrageous as it some times deliberately does) there is bound to be a white, Christian backlash. It is that backlash about which I am more concerned than the phenomenon itself.

Bisexuality is a condition far more calculated to frighten parents, incense the red-necks, invite contradictory medical opinions, stampede the legislators and confuse the judiciary than drug abuse was, yet for some time bisexuality (attraction to both sexes, sexually repulsion from neither) has been the least noted characteristic of changing habits among young people.

Can't you hear the war cry?" Beware overt inverts; covert perverts; kill a eazzie, hippie, nigger, Jew, Jap, quaser for Christ!"

The vote of Massachusetts, the most Catholic state in the Union, to the contrary notwithstanding, Catholics voted against the Democratic Party. They couldn't vote against the Church, so they voted against the Democratic Party historically associated with the Catholic Church. In November, Catholics went decisively middle-class and conservative. They voted for the establishment, for the status quo, for law and order, for the Protestant ethic, for the old values and against reform, against the women's liberation, against the youth movement, against the welfare state and against change; mostly against change. Change has become a dirty word. Rev. Msgr. George W. Casey  
The Boston Pilot.

Here is a recent article on my Ministry:

Paul Shanley: The Hermit of Terrible Mountain. Boston's street priest who gained a national reputation as the Catholic Church's only cleric assigned full-time to work with alienated youth on the streets. Father Paul is back in town again.

Father Paul left the street in Fall, 1969, amid a flurry of rumors. "He was a Communist. He went back to Russia. He was arrested for selling bad acid...He became a heroin addict...He was an undercover narcotic agent until the street people exposed him." The Associated Press, that official arbiter of misinformation, used its wires to promote a story that Father Paul had left because he couldn't stand working with the kids anymore.

He left the street telling people to whom he was close that he was beginning to see a new post-drug trip the kids were headed for - a trip he declined to describe.

His discovery will not be news to some segments of the community: Bisexuality and homosexuality have grown and continue to grow as the preferred sexual expression of young freaks. The sexually "deviant" person is going to be America's new nigger. Society's rejection of the young bisexuals is going to push them into homosexuality, with all the oppression that implies. The cost to the young kid who marches to the tune of a different drummer in his or her sex life is likely to be his or her life.

There's a reason why Father Paul has chosen to remain quiet about his discovery this long. It's the same reason he left a ministry he so obviously loved - the people wouldn't listen.

He had predicted a record number of runaway youths; the people and authorities ignored his warnings, and the next summer there were more than a million runaways on the street. He predicted that if the government dried up the pot supply, the kids would turn to heroin; the adults didn't listen, but it happened just like he said it would. He predicted the influx of heroin to the suburbs; the adults poo-pooed his prophecy. He told the adults that if they didn't act soon, there would be a wave of youthful violence; there was no response. He said there was wide-spread use of marijuana among the troops in Vietnam, and the government denied his charge. He warned that the soldiers' use of marijuana was going to lead to heroin, he was branded "unpatriotic" for his suggestion that any such problem existed...until the truth became known.

In each case, when his predictions were proven accurate, the authorities and elders turned to him for advice. In each case it was too late. "What I was trained for is prediction and prevention," he would explain. "Not rehabilitation."

So it was not surprising that Father Paul decided not to tell. "After drugs, what next?" In those days, all he would say is: "There is and has been a phenomenon on the youth scene far more important and astonishing than drugs, about which I

never elucidated since I was having so much trouble convincing people of the truth about drugs, alienation, violence and runaways."

Father Paul is aware that his forecast of new numbers and increased repression for bisexuals and homosexuals is not "news" to the gay community. "In no way do I want to speak for the gay community", he emphasized. "The only reason I'm saying anything now is that the gay community has asked me to speak, not for them, but for the bisexuals."

He's trying to be careful in the language he uses. "I don't like the term 'homosexuality' "he says. "I'd rather talk about homosexual acts, or heterosexual or bisexual acts. I don't want to categorize a person simply on the basis of his or her sexual preference."

But Father Paul is going to be carrying his new prediction primarily to the same people who didn't listen before. He is steeling himself for another round of rejections.

"Let me tell you what I'm saying to my audiences. Catholics have always had a nigger. We're temporarily embarrassed because we don't have a nigger right now. We started out with the red man, then went to the black man, and then we made the long-hairs our niggers until we found out we couldn't beat up on them because they're our own kids. But the adults want a nigger. I think our new nigger is going to be the person of different sexual preference. There are an estimated 20 million 'homosexuals' in the country, the number of 'bisexuals' is probably several times that. The adults are going mistakenly to confuse bisexuality with homosexuality; they're going to end up finding out their new nigger is their own kid."

It's going to be the same kind of mistake the adults made about the kids who used marijuana, Father Paul worries. "Years ago I was saying, don't associate pot with heroin. If you associate it with heroin and come down heavily on it, you'll drive kids into heroin. Now, by the same token, don't associate bisexuality with homosexuality."

Bisexuality, as far as I am concerned, and using the adult terms which I really don't understand any more, is 'normal', 'natural', is not 'pathological' and not 'neurotic'. It is none of the things the general public seems to think it is."

"Besides, he continued, "who are the adults to tell young people about sex? Masters and Johnson report that more than 50% of the adults are sexually dissatisfied. A quarter to a third of all marriages end in divorce, and 40% of all marriages are in trouble."

Father Paul's concern is also colored by his knowledge of how tough the street is, by painful experiences of seeing "predatory adults" work over the young, by how many kids are dying. He has seen them literally die, thrown away by society, into the Combat Zone and Kemmore Square and elsewhere.

"I'm convinced that suicide is now the No. 1 killer of young gay people" he began. "When I came back to Boston and started looking into all the gay groups, I found that apart from High School Gays United, nobody wants to touch kids under 21 because of the laws against contributing to the delinquency of minors. The gay people have all pushed me to stick with the bisexuals and concentrate on the ones under 21."

"Back when pot was the issue, he continued, "the kids came to the city because they couldn't find anybody at home who understood about drugs. Now there are hotlines, and counseling in the suburbs...and there's a new runaway in the city. Kids - average age 15 - are leaving home to come to Boston's gay scene. For the same reason: out in suburbia there is no one they can talk to about their sexual confusion."

I don't think sexual activity among members of the same sex is so much the problem, he concluded. It's what society says and does about it. We have kids being given shock treatments for having an interest in persons of the same sex! To me, that is like giving shock treatments to people who have become afflicted with the disease of adolescence. It is absurd. And I'm told prefrontal lobotomies are coming back in vogue."

Excerpts from PRIEST SEES YOUNG BISEXUALS AS NEW NIGGERS by Charles Lerrigo for the Boston Phoenix. Jan. 9, 1973.

When I returned to Boston and found myself inundated with kids who needed to talk about their sexuality, it was inevitable that I touch base with all the gay organizations since bisexuals wander back and forth between the gay community and the straight. I found general agreement among the professionals that there was a bias in the general gay population against the very existence of bisexuality. If a kid related to the same sex, then they assured him he was homosexual. Thus there are many young people who think they are Gay but whom I am convinced are not. In addition the only place a bisexual can find acceptance is the Gay community and so he tends to get locked in there.

The new runaway of whom I spoke is easily understood. Just as a few years ago when a kid let his hair grow, smoked a joint and became alienated, there was no one in his community to whom he could talk and so he ran away. Now there are half-way houses, hot lines and drop-in centers and so he can find in his own town people who can understand him. A similar thing is happening with kids who discover their bisexuality or homosexuality. There is no one in their suburban community who will not convict him of sin or sickness or both and so he runs away to the Gay ghetto of some city in order to find understanding. It is only a trickle and I don't expect it to become a major influx such as we had with the kids in the late 60's. But it is a devilishly tricky thing to work with since the predatory adults are still around (most homosexuals are not predators) and the laws are so prohibitive of assisting him. My oft-repeated saw still stands: If you make it a crime to help runaways only criminals will help them.

"Of all the stories and situations I've encountered in my three years activity in the gay movement, the plight of gay teenagers who become wards of the state and are rejected at every turn by society and social agencies is the saddest of

all," says Sidney Abbott, programming analyst for the New York City Dept. of Mental Health and founding member of New York's Identity House. "It makes me angry. It makes me want to change things."

Ms. Abbott says she became involved with the problems of gay teenagers when a social worker, who requested anonymity, from a New York area agency contacted her about a 16-year-old black boy who had been kicked out of his foster-care home after 12 years there because the elderly couple caring for him became upset over his occasional short disappearances and indulgences in homosexual activity.

"The boy had a good record" Ms. Abbott explains. "He attended school regularly, conducts himself conventionally, is not involved with drugs."

"After a child reaches early adolescence and starts acting out sexually, the feeling is you can't put a gay child in a regular foster home or a regular state institution because they will contaminate everyone else", Dr. Goodman said.

"It's a policy of the agency, not always the feelings of the agency staff members themselves. Sometimes it's an unwritten policy, sort of a de facto segregation. The kids usually end up in the temporary detention centers in the city and they're really horrible."

"It's a whispered about problem", one social worker volunteered after being assured that he wouldn't be quoted. "In meetings, they make statements like, 'Homosexual behavior is one of our biggest problems in the detention centers; 40 or 50 percent of the population is involved. And then they spend the rest of the meeting talking about other things. It's a subject they just can't cope with. They don't know what to do about it.'"

"Our contention is that there is no reason why a home shouldn't be opened up to a gay child," Dr. Goodman elaborates. "And of course we feel gay people should be eligible to have children to care for if they wish to. But it's all extremely complicated because it's all tied up in the bureaucracy."

Saddest of all - The gay kids whom no-one wants  
by Randy Wicker, N.Y.C. in The Advocate. Jan. 3, 1973.

Here is something I wrote three years ago but held onto until now: The area of my competence is quite circumscribed although people are always trying to get me to extend beyond it and are impatient when I will not go. I am neither very insightful nor clairvoyant in respect to the more profound and remote causes of trends. Rather I have had some success in defining events already here, but inchoate, incipient; I see the genesis sooner than most only because I have access to the events as they have begun and a fair knowledge of how youth will react to them, especially if society should react in certain ways. To ascribe to me prophetic powers, the power to foretell or foresee events which have as yet no reality is to pay me honor for an aptitude I neither have nor desire. It also places a burden on me I am incapable of carrying. It is no self-effacement to insist that my abilities are most limited and my apodictic statements unremarkable given the sources to which it has been my good fortune to have access.

With that in mind, let me make some guarded reflections:

- 1) Youth workers would be well advised to prepare themselves to counsel young people regarding bisexuality.

In a Seminar sponsored by the AMA's Committee on Medicine and Religion, Masters & Johnson noted that at least half of U.S. marriages are jeopardized by sexual dysfunctions involving one or both partners.

Yet until 1960, Masters said no medical school offered a course in the rudiments of sex counseling; and even today, a quarter of the schools have yet to inaugurate such courses. Seminaries, he added, have been just as laggard in recognizing the clergyman's role as sex counselor in their curriculums.

"How embarrassing", said Masters, "even how appalling it is that medicine and religion consistently have refused to accept every real or implied challenge to dispel the misconceptions, replace the misinformation, or neutralize the sexual taboos that represent a major threat to the quality and stability of marriage."

The revolution in attitudes toward the frank discussion of sexual matters, he predicted, will produce a massive demand for counseling. But as matters now stand, he declared, the professions "will not be capable of accepting this responsibility."

- 2) A veritable flood of solid scientific study and discussion is needed now.
- 3) The Church could again assume a role of leadership and relevance, not to mention compassion were she to sound the tocsin. At the very least she could by educating her people, prevent in large measure the suffering and violence with which her people are not undispensed to treat "deviants."
- 4) The most she could do, distinguishing between the sin and the sinner and loving the latter, is reach out to all who deviate sexually from her ideal and welcome them into her precincts.

Why am I suddenly surfacing on this issue? Because the Gay community has asked me to and feels that the time is ripe. I hope so. I went on a TV program with the Homophile Community Health Center and got little flack. Then I did a WEEI talk show for several hours with Howard Nelson and got mostly favorable phone calls. But evidently the negative reactors decided to write to the Cardinal instead of calling in to the station. The Cardinal wrote to me asking me to explain some of the statements I had allegedly made so that he could in turn explain to his correspondents their misinterpretations.

Here are portions of my reply to the Cardinal:

I am truly sorry that my radio appearance brought you new problems in the midst of your recent honors but in such a sensitive area people's emotions lead them to hear what they want. Machiavelli wrote: "The great

majority of mankind is satisfied with appearances, as though they were realities, and are more influenced by things that seem than by things that are." Yet it is so important to discuss these issues despite the danger of scandal since the scandal of silence causes far greater suffering than the scandal "in pusillorum" your letter reflects. "It is when we all play safe that we create a world of utmost insecurity."

On three occasions during that program I reminded Listeners that although I was certainly concerned about the questions of morality, it was with the larger question of what we Christians do to homosexuals rather than what homosexuals do with their bodies. Stoning a woman taken in adultery as the Old Testament advises would be a far greater sin than the one she committed. To attempt to restrain the stoners might well give the impression that one condoned adultery, but any degree of sophistication would induce hesitation in arriving at that verdict. Who can tell us why the Priest passed by the man lying by the roadside between Jerusalem and Jericho? Perhaps the victim was a homosexual, but the Samaritan cared not. By our silence we churchmen can ourselves encourage our people to walk by in silence or worse - to actually be the attackers of homosexuals. But it would be utterly outrageous then to turn back and attack the good Samaritan too.

I did not say that masturbation was not morally evil. Rather that few young Priests today believe or teach young people that it is mortally sinful as we did ten years ago. Your own Professor of Moral Theology, Rev. James O'Donohoe, would insist that this distinction is crucial and not contradictory. I did say that some reputable moral theologians, scripture scholars and even the NFPC are requesting the church to review her stand on homosexuality. Noivan, Curran, Kennedy et al. If their views are indeed contrary to doctrine, I would have thought they would be silenced or at very least repudiated. In any case the quarrel is with them not me. When a Cardinal Archbishop has an approved Mass for Gays in his Archdiocese (Chicago) without explanation, then perhaps the danger of scandal emanates from those who permit it rather than from those like myself who mention it.

I would welcome some statement from you or the Bishops on the position of the Church on masturbation or homosexuality since confusion reigns. According to an article appearing in The Boston Pilot some years ago premarital intercourse was not in the 13th century a bar to Holy Communion. Now it is. The primary purpose of marriage was procreation when I was in the Seminary. Now it is not, I am told. I am not a learned scholar but having invested large amounts of time and money over the last few years in study, I can tell you that the writings of Catholic theologians on masturbation and homosexuality have led to great confusion and a detailed explanation of the official church position needs to be elucidated. If I taught in Boston (which I did not) what scores of theologians, Priest-psychologists and scripture scholars are teaching with impunity around the world (that adolescent masturbation in se is not serious sin) I invite the charge of scandal. When a Bishop or many Bishops do not silence these theologians, then presumably there is room for that opinion.

As an example of what leads to confusion: Pope Paul speaks against birth control. Washington Priests publicly disagree. Their Bishop silences them and receives Papal approval. National Conferences of Bishops of several countries announce a policy that virtually coincides with that of the suspended Priests. Rome does not silence the Bishops... now confusion reigns. If I teach in Boston or Washington what the Bishops

of those several conferences taught, I am in error but they are not? I am suspended but they are not even verbally corrected? If I do not teach what those Bishops taught but simply advert to the fact that they, not I, said it, am I then in danger of "expressing views contrary to the teaching of the church?" What is the teaching? Further, can a Priest be suspended for agreeing with 50 Bishops if his own Bishop disagrees? If the teaching is clear and the Bishops in accord, then what are we to make of the fact that most Priests and people believe and practice contrarily regarding masturbation?

As you might expect of me, my words were deliberately chosen, detailed, not off-the-cuff or rash. I took great pains to allay fears and misinterpretations and was ever conscious of the sensitivities of the older, conservative Catholic. I hold no views contrary to the doctrine of the Catholic Church of which I am conscious and even if I did would never presume to preach them while pretending I was speaking as a Priest for the Church. That I am a Pied Piper leading youth astray has been an oft-alleged and mean-minded judging of my motives which deserves no reply.

Because I reached out to runaways, it was once said I approved of running away. Years later you yourself established a hostel for them. Because I once reached out to draft dodgers and deserters, I was once called a traitor. You yourself later established a ministry to counsel them. Because I once worked with drug abusers, I was accused of encouraging drug abuse. You yourself much, much later would appoint Me. Surette to do the same. Now to work with sexual variants, the new form alienation has taken will be to incur wrath of Catholics and it will be said that I encourage it. Jesus was killed because He ate and drank with sinners and He told us that if we love those who love us, act like us, wear their hair as we do, subscribe to the same political or patriotic stance as we, adopt the same sexual morality as we -- if we love those people we are no better than the pagans or the tax-collectors. We must love those who disagree with us.

Your original estimation of my genuine concern for youth needs in no way to be re-assessed as a result of this radio program. Surely you are aware that I have more than my share of detractors (as do you) and despite bone-weariness find the energy to walk back into the fray knowing full well the consequences.

My immediate Superior, Father Robert Bullock, heard the program and can recall nothing that appeared to him contrary to doctrine. The Urban Sisters heard the same talk several days later and could find no error in it. Ironically, Monsignor John Sexton wrote to congratulate me on the program but to complain that I didn't get into the morality question. ("You insisted on disassociation of morality from the gravamen of the discussion. Maybe you could talk me out of it, but I don't see how morality can be detached from any realistic study of homosexuality.") So I am damned for doing it and for not. From textbooks used in your own Seminary and from verbatim class notes taken in seminary lectures, I can establish if need be that rightly or wrongly the same sources I quoted on the air are taught in seminary courses. Those who would come to take me away will find a heavy load.

Since you mention that informants are "good people" not cranks, I imagine that you must reply to them, (I too would like the opportunity to confront them since I think calumniators and detractors have as much responsibility as I to defend their accusations) I suggest you send them



copies of the enclosed U.S. Catholic article, "A Christian Response to Homosexuals." At some point in the future you might be available to talk with me about the plight of this growing minority group in the Archdiocese. As you mentioned, you are the Shepherd of the faithful and God will hold you accountable for their spiritual welfare. But I suspect that you must be somewhat unaware of what is happening -- of the new sexual runaway, average age 15, who is trickling into Boston's gay ghetto; of the suicide rate which is now the first cause of death among gay youth. (enclose a typical letter of a boy who took his own life before I could get to him.)\* Of the hundreds of young hustlers who sell their bodies on our two meatracks and of the increase in hustling among Junior High Schoolers in the suburbs. I am sure you have neither time nor interest in the rock music but David Bowie, Lou Reed, The Dolls, Alice Cooper and the Midler girl have all expressed their homosexuality, bisexuality, transvestism, ambisexuality or whatever and they are the top drawing musicians on the local scene. Decadence will be the next form alienation takes.

One in three men has had some homosexual experience, one in five has had extensive experience and one in twenty is exclusively homosexual. Twenty million homosexuals in America. The American Psychiatric Association is considering removing this from their list of emotional illnesses. There are three or four times more bisexuals than homosexuals. Three male to two female homosexuals. The second worst thing to be in America is gay. The worst is to be black and gay.

What happens to the homosexual youthful offender? I have had several talks with the Dept. of Youth Services and the Division of Child Guardianship on this matter. In reform schools, they are inevitably raped. In Half-way houses, they are emotionally destroyed. There are three solutions which occur to me and which I am proposing but the point is that we, the Church, must be aware and concerned.

The greater proportion of violence visited upon Gays comes from the Christian (in Boston read Catholic) community. Just as young Catholics in my boyhood felt it an act of piety to beat up a Jew on Blue Hill Avenue or stens a protestant church, so today's Christians think they do God a service when they beat up a fag. If you have the purity of angels, and the abortionless, monogamous church-blessed marriage; if you have the faith of Peter and the education of parochial schools; if your speech be devoid of four letter words yet you have no charity toward homosexuals then...tinkling brass...sounding cymbals... Catholic but hardly Christian. Have you ever received any mail from any of these critics protesting what we are doing to homosexuals or is their concern only about what homosexuals do? There are degrees of sin. Please God I am found among the latter rather than the former, if it must be one.

Please support and encourage me. I need to know that you, as did your predecessor, will presume that the love of God and His Church which alone could have kept me in the priesthood against seemingly insuperable adversaries and conditions, still motivates my activities among the disenfranchised of this world. I am not unaware that I am an embarrassment to you and my brother priests. It is no small source of sorrow to me, yet no other path seems consonant with my obligations. You above all others must know the enervating tension of misunderstanding and prejudice. Jesus knew it.

Sincerely

\* Dear Father Paul:

You do not know how happy I am to have heard your radio program. I cannot go to my family or even my parish priest on this matter as I am from a small town in Missouri. I really do have a problem. I think I am Gay. I like girls and go out with them and have even gone all the way but then when I am in the locker room after a football game, I have desires for men.

I hope you will advise me. I am 21 and in my last year at (a Catholic college) and next year I will go into professional basketball out West. I hope you can help me get straightened out before then.

It is bad. I am goodlooking (not conceited), muscular, tall girls all over the place and I only think of men. Please, please help me. Maybe this is what I really am but I am not sure. Is this a sin to like men more than girls? I don't know. I hope you do. I feel from listening to you on the radio that you must really mean what you say - that you want to help people like me. I need help.

I do not want to give you my name and address right now as I am too ashamed but I have a mailing address you may use if you feel you can help me. If not, I thank you anyway for reading my letter. Thank you.

Jim

On the eve of his departure for Rome, the Cardinal asked me to come to supper at his residence and assured me of his interest and concern for my work and ended by giving me every encouragement to continue. While he maintains a conservative approach to the morality of the acts of homosexuals and dismisses, I think, too lightly the conflict between the theologians and the bishops, he sees that the resolution of that conflict is not my job and my mentioning that conflict is not wrong. Certainly he was adamant and even vigorous in his denunciation of those "Christians" who persecute the homosexual in the name of Christ.

The last words spoken in "The Boys in the Band" a fine movie about one type of homosexual, are these: When I held my father in my arms as he was dying, he said to me: "I don't understand it all. I never did." Meaning he didn't understand life. But his son was applying these words to homosexuality. I make no pretense to understanding it either. There is next to no scientific study of any worth. There is no telling how much of what we feel about it is natural feeling and how much cultural accretion. It has been so taboo a subject that we are bereft of the clarifications that come with openness. But I do know quite a little about human suffering as it suffuses and suffocates the disenfranchised. It seems to me that one needn't have a medical knowledge of cancer to commiserate with the victim of its ravages. Nor need Christians wait for guidance, documentation, explication or leadership in reaching out to the sexual variant.

It remains truly astonishing to me how easily summed up is the moral code of Jesus, yet how difficult it seems of application to the best of Catholics: love the sinner while hating the sin. No one seems to have been less in favor of sin than Jesus, yet He found no contradiction in loving the sinner. Nonetheless, blood-thirsty

religious people found Him worthy of death for eating and drinking with sinners.

Then as now we are quite ready to praise God by stoning sexual transgressors yet incapable of loving not only sinners but those who reach out to them.

The intensity of ferocity toward this particular type of sinner borders on the maniacal and certainly reflects the diabolical for it is inflicted in the Name of the Lord... "people walkin up to ya... shcutin glory halleluyah... then they try to sock it to ya... in the Name of the Lord..."

Despite all attempts to remove it from the mind, one continues to wonder whether or not Catholicism actually breeds this mentality, so strongly entrenched, widespread and brazenly announced is it by the churchgoing crowd. Worse still, that it is so seldom reproved or repudiated by those in authority. All this concentration on the morality of what homosexuals do is akin to Catholics in Germany being outraged by the sexual mores among the prisoners at Dachau while oblivious of the larger moral question of what they were doing to Jews by incarcerating them in the first place.

That article about me appeared in the local underground newspaper; The Boston Phoenix, and was subsequently picked up by the National Catholic Reporter. Evidently it was later to appear in the London Tablet since the accompanying vicious letter was forthcoming.

London, England.

Re: Article in the Tablet.  
Dear Father Shanley,

We read that you, as full-time Minister in your Archdiocese to Youth warn that there will be dire results if there is no new understanding of your people's Sexual Confusion and Exploration. Sexual excesses and an accompanying New Terminology do not surprise me. What does surprise me is the phrase New Understanding, for if as I suspect this phrase means condoning and sympathy, then I find it strange that this should be the attitude of a priest, particularly as Archdiocesan Director of Youth.

Psychology was always, and still is, a fascinating subject. So is Theology. Catholic Priests of a bygone day had sufficient of both to be able to guide the young and the old, the clever and the stupid. But Paternalism is now an opprobrious word. You, obviously, will not be guilty of using this term. But I wonder what term could be applied to you if moral aberrations call for a New Understanding. The Exploration in which these young people are indulging should give them an edge on their director (if he is a moral priest). YOU and they should logically change places. You should certainly change your title which, in the circumstances, is a misnomer.

There are undoubtedly misfits in our society - there always have been - and always will be. Assuming that the majority of people have been normal, down the ages, this would be compatible with the truth that if they broke the Ten Commandments they would be either unfaithful or immoral... a new understanding did not have to be sought, other than a reminder that man is free to act according to the Law of God or not. If there are exceptions... then culpability is also affected.

What you are implying Father Shanley, is that there is now a pre-

ponderance of homosexuality and bisexuality and the addicts cannot help themselves. This is a sad commentary on America's Youth, but a sadder commentary on guides like yourself who appear to be no different from your Protestant contemporaries.

If the Blind lead the Blind, do they not both fall into a PIT? You are obviously bewildered, Father Shanley. You should quit your job, for the worst thing you or any other director of youth can do is to give the impression to those under you...that you are not sure of yourself. It may not be sympathy these young people are craving... but Encouragement.

Yours sincerely  
W. Walsh, Teacher and Convert.

P.S. If, as is generally admitted, this is a licentious age. Many marriages are breaking down because of marital infidelity. The guilty partners would welcome a director like you, for after all, these too would welcome under pressure a word of comfort. There's nothing like it for the Erring. Away with all morality and away with bisexual, homosexuality and all the other fancy terms. Away with Directors for they are an absurdity in the enlightened psychology. Let's be honest and have a free for all with no new or nasty names. Dear Fr. Shanley... you're not living in an ideal world. A director above all must not be NAIVE...You'd be well advised to avoid all the beggars on the streets of your native Boston, for their hard-luck stories may not always be true.

I answered by writing him the following:

PARABLE

When Jesus was asked what a man should do to receive everlasting life He emphasized wholehearted love toward God and then neighbor.

A certain homosexual was going down from New York to Boston and he fell in with red-necked Irish Catholics who beat up faggots both for entertainment and as proof of orthodoxy, who after both stripping him and beating him went their way leaving him half-dead. But as it happened a certain priest was going down the same way; and when he saw him he passed by. Why? Obviously the man was a quaser and anyway the priest was on his way to an important radio program where he was to give the official church condemnation of homosexuality lest Christians be seduced into it and lose their souls. And likewise a layman also when he was near the place and saw him, passed by. For he was on his way to a legislative hearing on abortion where he was to thunder about the immorality and thus prevent the evil that accompanies sexual licentiousness.

But a certain Samaritan as he journeyed came upon him and seeing him was moved with compassion. And he went up to him and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine.

But the priest and the layman who had passed by saw from afar what it was that was transpiring and they took alarm saying: this man must also be a fairy; obviously he approves of this unspeakable vice. They returned to whisper to the gathering crowd and then stood by softly disapproving of violence while the crowd beat senseless the hapless Samaritan. Regrettably, they opined, that Catholics should be so