

Child Abuse Review Vol. 21: 405–413 (2012)
 Published online 8 November 2012 in Wiley Online Library
 (wileyonlinelibrary.com) DOI: 10.1002/car.2239

Child Abuse in Irish Catholic Settings: A Non-Reductionist Account

The reputation of the Irish Catholic Church has been damaged, maybe irrevocably, by the extensive evidence of child abuse in its midst. This paper summarises the evidence for that crisis and goes on to offer a multi-factorial and non-reductionist account of the abuse in a wider context. By adopting a systemic approach, this account aims to discern those factors which are peculiar to the Irish case and those that have more general significance for child protection. The Irish case demonstrates a complex set of conditions of possibility for child abuse. Some of these were only relevant to Ireland and the Catholic Church but some were not. In particular, varieties of systemic isolation and the *a priori* social marginalisation of victims are important to consider as salient risk factors. Copyright © 2012 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

KEY PRACTITIONER MESSAGES:

- Religious settings are sites of vulnerability for children.
- The Catholic Church has been under particular scrutiny internationally about child abuse in its midst.
- The Irish Church warrants additional scrutiny because of the enmeshment of State and Church.
- However, child abuse can be found in other countries, in other denominations and in secular organisations.
- These general and particular features are best understood using a systemic framework to avoid reductionist accounts of abuse.

KEY WORDS: child abuse; Catholic settings; systemic approach to risk

This paper focuses on child abuse in the Irish Catholic Church but will note, where applicable, the more general relevance of the case study for Great Britain and other countries. Although the reports below depict a high prevalence of abuse, their content also indicates that only a sample of complaints was investigated (for both contingent methodological reasons and because obstructions to enquiries were commonplace). Thus, the reports should be viewed as evidence of extensive abuse but, collectively, they are not a measure of its full prevalence. We will probably never know how many children were abused by Catholic nuns and priests in Ireland (or any other country) during the 20th century.

* Correspondence to: David Pilgrim, Department of Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7XA, UK. E-mail: david.pilgrim@liv.ac.uk

David Pilgrim*

Department of Sociology, Social Policy and Criminology, University of Liverpool, UK

‘The Irish case demonstrates a complex set of conditions of possibility for child abuse’

‘Best understood using a systemic framework to avoid reductionist accounts of abuse’

‘A systemic analysis to the evidence made available to us publicly by official investigation’

The aim of the paper is to apply a systemic analysis to the evidence made available to us publicly by official investigation. Such an analysis begins with two fundamental assumptions. First, explanations in complex human systems will entail many relevant factors operating over time and at any point in time (respectively ‘diachronic’ and ‘synchronic features’). Second, an implication of that complexity in open human systems is that explanations which focus solely on one factor will be reductionist and therefore, for social scientific purposes, misleading (Bateson, 1972; Wilden, 1972). By the end of the paper, some overview of complexity in this case will be demonstrated and the pitfalls of reductionism highlighted.

The Irish Case Study

On 26 October 2005, the Ferns Report was published. It followed an investigation by the British Broadcasting Corporation in its documentary *Suing the Pope* and campaigning by victims of clerical abuse through the pressure group One in Four which highlighted relevant events and demanded justice. Thus, victim pressure and journalistic interest, not Church transparency, prompted the inquiry, which was commissioned by the Irish government. It examined over a hundred complaints of abuse over a 40-year period involving 21 priests in the Ferns diocese. (The latter is in the south east of Ireland and one of three in the Archdiocese of Dublin.)

A pattern of deceit was obvious, with successive local bishops not passing on complaints to the police and not separating those accused from new potential victims. Until 1990, the police were also unwilling to properly investigate matters brought to their attention. Witnesses had reported abuse to the police before that time but nothing was found recorded on police files. The pattern of evident connivance from state authorities suggests that the authority of the Church was being both enacted and respected by other sources of potential restraint and justice in civil society. Thus, a tension clearly remained in Ireland, until the turn of this century, between these competing forms of assumed or claimed authority and between secular and canon law (Aylward, 2003; Hammar, 2000; Lytton, 2007; O’Reilly and Strasser, 1994; Tentler, 2007).

On 26 November 2009, Judge Yvonne Murphy published her account of abuse in the Dublin archdiocese, having examined nearly 70 000 church files. She found that the Church authorities knowingly covered up child abuse. Her team was prevented by those authorities from seeing nearly 5000 files in 2008. A collusive web of obfuscation was exposed in the report, which implicated clerics, the Irish police force, health authorities and the Director of Public Prosecutions. No less than four archbishops in Dublin had known of abuse but they had failed to take corrective action, such as instigating a full and publicly transparent inquiry.

Police connivance was demonstrated repeatedly in the report. For example, a police commissioner during the 1960s failed to investigate a priest who took obscene photographs of children in Crumlin Children’s Hospital. The Metropolitan Police in London came into possession of the photographs but when passed to their colleagues in Dublin, the prints were relayed on to a

‘Victim pressure and journalistic interest, not Church transparency, prompted the inquiry’

‘A tension clearly remained in Ireland, until the turn of this century’

‘Police connivance was demonstrated repeatedly in the report’

named archbishop, without further investigation. Over 20 years later, after being at large and serially offending against more children, the priest was eventually convicted.

The investigatory work of Judge Murphy was then taken over and complemented by Judge Ryan. The Ryan Report (2009) focused on abuse in over 20 schools and residential facilities run by priests or nuns, dating back to the 1930s. It exposed a recurring culture of harshness and cruelty against children, with sexual abuse nesting episodically amongst punitive institutional routines. The children were intimidated by the religious and physical authority of those in charge. The residential institutions were isolated physically, a factor that the report considered causally important. It also noted that when child sex offenders or sadists were identified they were not expelled but moved on elsewhere, with no lessons learned or justice for their victims ensured.

The report has a special section which focuses on the culture of the Christian Brothers (the main order in Ireland responsible for male education). Many recruits to the order were very young themselves (as young as 14 years of age). They had had no experience outside of an all male culture, in which adult-child power relationships were constantly at the centre of daily activity. The Brothers offered free education to poor boys and they encouraged Christian piety. (Note that the Ryan Report also reported some positive recollections from those in their care, which highlights the capacity of some positive nurturance to survive even within dysfunctional institutions.)

Significantly, the founder of the order (Edmund Rice) initially and clearly eschewed corporal punishment and his schools were *not residential*. Later, the order shifted to a residential philosophy and incorporated the norms of 19th century child-rearing practices in Ireland. This included regular physical chastisement in a highly moralistic culture, where rule transgressions were easily defined by the Brothers in charge. That is, the Brothers were in a position to define misbehaviour and thus legitimise their obligation to respond with punishment. The relevance of the order is important globally. Starting as an Irish-only organisation, it went on to do educational work in 26 countries. With this came a universal pattern of harshness and abuse in its system of 'Industrial Schools' (Raftery and O'Sullivan, 1999).

Because emotional, physical and sexual abuse co-existed in these settings, even the official investigators sometimes made no clear distinction, especially in relation to perpetrators who were nuns. For example, here we find the Ryan Report (2009) noting a form of physical (*N.B.* not sexual) abuse:

'She ... (Sr X)... brought me upstairs, she'd throw you on the first bed inside the dormitory door, she put me across the bed naked, it was always naked, herself and Sr. ..Y... and tied me to the bed with a sort of a tweedy rope. She had this thing of tying you to the bed, an iron bed, you know, and you couldn't move then... She would beat you with the leather strap and count to 100 as she was beating... If you cried you got worse, so I learned not to cry' (p. 144)

The sado-masochistic connotations of this scenario are obvious enough but it is not classified by Ryan as sexual abuse. Nuns (i.e. not 'paedophile priests', the favoured stereotype of Catholic abuse in the mass media) were involved in stripping the girls and humiliating them in scenarios of enforced voyeurism.

'Sexual abuse nesting episodically amongst punitive institutional routines'

'Regular physical chastisement in a highly moralistic culture'

'Emotional, physical and sexual abuse co-existed in these settings'

Irish Culture, Catholicism and Child Abuse

Having outlined the empirical evidence from official reports about child abuse in Irish Catholic settings, we now turn to a systemic formulation. General systems theory is a useful framework to avoid reductionist reasoning. Complexity is expected with multiple factors operating at a point in time (the synchronic dimension) and under the influence of past determinants and future aspirations (the diachronic dimension). Personal, cultural, organisational, social and economic levels of influence can be considered. This framework allows us to make sense of the Irish case study, while avoiding risks of reductionism. The latter risks can now be considered, when personal (psychopathological) and cultural (Catholic) features are dwelt on to the exclusion of other factors.

First, whilst *patriarchy* is implicated in the crisis, it cannot be the *sole* explanation. The origins of the crisis must include, amongst other factors, the power adults hold over children. Note how some nuns, not just some priests, were perpetrators and so the 'paedophile priest' emphasis is incomplete as an explanation for all of the abuse. If female perpetrators are still part of a patriarchal system (arguably the case in the Catholic Church), then this means that in practice nuns, not just priests, could, and were found to, be perpetrators of child abuse. We are left to speculate whether a thoroughgoing matriarchal form of organisational power would have led to a different outcome. This sort of speculation has been evident in some feminist explorations of authoritarian female leaders, such as Margaret Thatcher (Campbell, 1987), and of the abuse of male prisoners by US female combatants in Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq (Ehrenreich, 2008).

Second, the Catholic culture of spiritual authority invested in the visible clothing ('cloth') of religious staff meant that children in these settings certainly experienced a *particular form of spiritual entrapment*, marking it out as different from abuse in, say, state residential homes, Scout groups and sports clubs (McLaughlin, 1994; Rossetti, 1995). Victimised Catholic children knew that religious personnel were God's representatives on earth. The religious cloth and learned rituals of piety and obedience meant that a conflation was experienced for some of the victims between an adult-dominated moral order and God's expectations of obedience and faith. As a result, some have noted that clerical abuse may create a special 'trauma bond', constantly implicating the victim's allegiance and sense of responsibility (Doyle, 2008; Kennedy, 2000). However, child abuse also takes place in non-religious settings and so the limits of this factor as a single explanation can be noted.

Third, the Catholic emphasis on *celibacy* is noteworthy (Cozens, 2006; Eberle, 2002; Haggett, 2005; Sipe, 2003), but we have no real evidence that celibacy *per se* causes adults to abuse children. What it does provide though is a cover for that abuse, because celibacy implies purity, not danger. Thus, what the role of religious authority, often along with systemic isolation, provides is *specific opportunities* for abusing power. This opportunity, not celibacy, is more likely to be the background factor in our case study. However, the question of celibacy and cultural assumptions about sexual repression may distract us from these more obvious conditions of possibility.

Fourth, the Catholic emphasis on *mortification of the flesh* may have encouraged rationalisations at times from Catholic abusers about the importance of both physical discipline, and even the transcendent power

'This framework allows us to make sense of the Irish case study'

'In practice nuns, not just priests, could, and were found to, be perpetrators'

'Clerical abuse may create a special 'trauma bond''

'Celibacy implies purity, not danger'

of suffering. However, physical abuse is not limited to Catholic childcare settings (Greven, 1992; Hidalgo, 2007). The issue here is not the denomination or, indeed, whether it is religious at all, because child abuse has emerged in a range of familial and residential settings, some religious and some secular. Thus, the mortification of the flesh argument about Catholicism is about the nuances of a wider phenomenon, rather than explaining its very occurrence.

Fifth, the discourse about 'paedophile priests' could reduce child abuse in Catholic (or any other) settings to the *aggregate of sexual psychopaths*. As far as psychopathology is concerned, this is a tautological matter: when exposed, child abusers invite psychological formulations and the need for corrective treatment and possibly that they warrant psychiatric labelling (Haywood *et al.*, 1996; Saradjian and Nobus, 2003). The cruelty and sexual orientation of abusers might invoke diagnoses of 'anti-social personality disorder' or 'sexual psychopathy'. However, this is a tautological account of psychopathology: Q. Why did this priest rape this child? A. Because he is a psychopath. Q. And how do we know he is a psychopath? A. Because he rapes children. Perpetrator pathology mainly has relevance in debates about predicting and reducing re-offending but its explanatory value about the *complex origins* of child abuse is limited.

Beyond Reductionism

If we move then from reductionist accounts about Catholic culture or the deviant sexual proclivities of the perpetrators, we can identify other systemic factors which increased the risk of harm to children in Irish institutions. As Martin (1984) demonstrated, when challenging such reductionist accounts, there is a risk of higher level and multi-factorial considerations being ignored or missed. He noted, when over-viewing the features of abusive psychiatric and learning disability institutions ('scandal hospitals'), a number of wider systemic features that have relevance to the Irish Catholic child abuse crisis. These places dealt with dysfunctional and unrewarding client groups, often over prolonged periods of time. They were often physically isolated. Their staff groups were intellectually and culturally isolated. Privacy provided the opportunity for the exploitation of power.

We can see exactly the same pattern in the findings of the reports cited in this paper (Pilgrim, 2011). The unrewarding client created a culture of warranted victim blaming. These children were already often wayward (and as children *ipso facto* still not fully socialised). As Ferguson (2007) notes, they were typically poor children who may have already been abused in the family: they were 'moral dirt'.

The challenging or unrewarding chronicity was also noteworthy in the McCoy Report (2007), which documented the abuse of children with learning difficulties by staff from the Brothers of Charity. The social marginalisation or exclusion of these chronic and unrewarding populations provides them with low social status and credibility and a tendency towards wilful blindness from the communities that have rejected them. This process itself makes its own contribution then to the overall picture of the isolation of abusive or neglectful sub-systems in society. That psychological distancing is compounded if the deviant group is shut away out of sight and out of mind; a cue for the next point.

'Physical abuse is not limited to Catholic childcare settings'

'This is a tautological account of psychopathology'

'Privacy provided the opportunity for the exploitation of power'

'They were 'moral dirt''

‘The physical isolation of the abuse was also noteworthy’

The physical isolation of the abuse was also noteworthy, with residential facilities being far away from the daily scrutiny of outsiders. The Ryan Report (2009) here describes the Christian Brothers’ school, Letterfrack, in County Galway which:

‘...was situated in a remote hillside location in Connemara, miles away from Galway or from public transport. The remoteness of Letterfrack was a common theme of complainants... It was an inhospitable, bleak, isolated institution accessible only by car or bicycle and out of reach for family or friends of boys incarcerated there.’ (p. 4)

As for intellectual isolation, it has already been noted that entering a religious order inevitably has this effect (indeed, the effect is intended to ensure group conformity and vocational obedience). The matter of privacy was variable: some of the abusers exploited private settings but we can also note that some abuse took place in groups. The abuse of girls by nuns at times included more than one staff member being present and the girls could be humiliated in whole groups.

Because there was systemic gender segregation, this shaped the type of abuse that would predominate (man-boy and woman-girl). The male abuse of girls was present but only in a minority of cases. This point is noted because it returns us to a caution about individual psychopathology; we might on very weak grounds explain the abuse as an aggregate expression of child sexual abuse by same-sex perpetrators (explicitly by priests and implicitly by nuns), whereas gender *segregation plus privacy* is the most important explanatory systemic variable. If boys and girls were separated and then men and women, respectively, placed in positions of power and authority over the children then this will have shaped the type of abuse occurring. (Note that the emphasis here was on institutional abuse that created the conditions for this pattern, but in a minority of cases children were abused by religious personnel when they remained in their own families or were in non-institutional settings.)

The final factor of isolation to consider is when there is no corrective feedback loop to the dysfunctional system. In principle, that loop existed (Church or police investigations following complaints from victims or their significant others). However, this was a loop that was defined not by the goal of client protection, which was eclipsed by other goals, such as the reputation of the Church. Indeed, even today those campaigning for justice for victims are frustrated by those goals tending to define the negotiating stance of the Church at times.

We can also note that police connivance with the Irish Church about abuse reflected a higher level form of enmeshment which was political and historical, albeit relatively recent. (The Irish Republic is less than a century old.) A particularly enmeshed relationship existed in Ireland between Church and State at the outset. The history of Irish nationalism is not reducible to the power of the Catholic Church. However, the two have been inseparable.

For example, De Valera’s constitution of 1937 emerged after extensive consultations with Catholic bishops and so subsequently the Church established clear lines of influence in political circles and led the delivery of public policy, for example, in health and education. This political enmeshment also meant that it has not been easy in Ireland to privilege secular legal authority over that claimed by the Church. Recent statements by Irish politicians in the wake of the official reports noted earlier suggest that efforts are now being made to place the

‘Systemic gender segregation, this shaped the type of abuse that would predominate’

‘A particularly enmeshed relationship existed in Ireland between Church and State at the outset’

expectations of modern democracy above those of the unquestioning feudal allegiances traditionally enjoyed by the Church.

This point is relevant but should not be overdrawn. Child abuse in Catholic settings has occurred in countries where political enmeshment with the State is evident but also when it is not. For example, in the latter case, the largest exposure of Catholic abuse internationally has been in the USA (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, 2004). And, for emphasis, an indication that this is not a peculiarly Irish problem, reports of abuse have emerged *inter alia* in Austria, Australia, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, France, Great Britain, Peru, the Philippines, Mexico and New Zealand.

As far as Great Britain is concerned, a number of points can be made about abuse there. For example, the cross-flow of Irish clergy to mainland Britain has occurred and so the religious orders originating in Ireland, such as the Christian Brothers and the Brothers of Charity, have been present in England, Scotland and Wales. Moreover, scandals about abuse on the mainland of Britain have been evident and protests continue. Despite the Nolan Report (2001) promising urgent action and transparency, ten years elapsed before English dioceses began to publicly admit problems in the mass media.

An example here is that of Fr Neil Gallanagh who abused boys while working at St John's School for the Deaf in Boston Spa, West Yorkshire in the 1970s. The abuse came to light in 2002, by which time he was working as a parish priest in Horsforth, Leeds and by 2011 the Church authorities had not de-frocked him. Thus, arguably, the English Catholic authorities have been less persistent and urgent in their response to findings of abuse than in Ireland. For example, by 15 September 2010, Channel 4 TV news in the UK reported that over half of the priests receiving custodial sentences for sexual offences against children, after the Nolan recommendations, remained in the Catholic ministry.

Thus, this abuse has respected no national boundaries and maybe this is to be expected, given the unifying credo for those keeping the faith of 'one Holy, Catholic and Apostolic church'. The latter has been translated on many fronts to universal Catholic organisations and actions. We would expect the same point about universal presence to apply to child abuse, as much as it would to say the Catholic Overseas Development Agency, because the totalising logic of Catholicism is that it is a single universal organisation. If there is an *Irish* significance, then it may be that of the Brothers of Charity and the Christian Brothers exporting models of isolated and risky education to many other countries.

Conclusion

This paper has sought to demonstrate that a non-reductionist account of child abuse in Irish Catholic settings can be created by the use of a systemic framework. The latter does not discount any individual factors evident, or being raised for consideration in this particular case, but it does imply a caution about their salience. The fact that it was in Ireland, with its particularly immature development of an enmeshed Church-State relationship, has some relevance but this cannot explain why Catholic abuse is now a global crisis for the Catholic Church and can be found as well in other parts of the British Isles. The fact that it was in Catholic settings has some relevance, but we also find institutional abuse

'The unquestioning feudal allegiances traditionally enjoyed by the Church'

'Ten years elapsed before English dioceses began to publicly admit problems in the mass media'

'Exporting models of isolated and risky education to many other countries'

in other denominational groups and in secular organisations. The fact that sexual predators were exposed eventually does not mean the extent of the abuse (much of which anyway was routinely and shamelessly physical and emotional not sexual) can be accounted for simply by a head count of sexual psychopaths in clerical cloth. Moreover, while indeed 'paedophile priests' were there to be found during investigations, the cruel role of some nuns was also exposed. Thus, while Church patriarchy and sexual psychopathy are tempting causal variables, they are only partially persuasive in the case we are considering in this paper.

All the above strands came to constitute the conditions of possibility for abuse, but they were strands not single explanatory variables. Moreover, by focusing on personal variables of the perpetrators, even when this is logically and empirically relevant to do so, there is a risk of psychological reductionism, which can divert attention from social systemic factors, especially about variants of *systemic isolation*. In this case study, that isolation was multiple. The abusive institutions were often remote and devoid of open scrutiny. Those staffing them were experientially isolated, with religious orders taking in and socialising recruits from a very young age. Moreover, the 'client groups' were already rendered isolated because they were in some way or other socially marginalised. Their deviance, by dint of their young age and lack of successful socialisation in the primary group of their family, made them ripe for 'victim blaming'. They were pregnant girls and impoverished wayward boys. Their status as 'moral dirt' meant that few questions were asked of venerated religious authority, when it degenerated, as it did so recurrently, into malign authoritarianism.

Finally to be clear in conclusion, the above anti-reductionist and holistic account in this case study does not mean that in *individual cases* of abuse counter-examples are absent. Reports of benign care were noted in the Ryan Report. Not *all* of the children abused were poor, dysfunctional or had chronic disabilities. Likewise, not *all* the abuse occurred in conditions of systemic isolation; some of it was in community settings. However, the group characteristics of the victims did noticeably *raise the probability* of their victimisation, as did the particular organisational settings in which the abuse took place. This probabilistic conclusion is valid, given the burgeoning evidence offered by official investigations into child abuse in the Catholic Church, some of which was cited in this paper.

References

- Aylward MF. 2003. Constitution, crime, clergy: first amendment implications of sexual abuse claims. *Defense Counsel Journal* 70: 196–205.
- Bateson G. 1972. *Steps To An Ecology of Mind*. Chicago University Press: Chicago.
- Campbell B. 1987. *The Iron Ladies: Why Do Women Vote Tory?* Virago: London.
- Cozzens D. 2006. *Freeing Celibacy*. Liturgical Press: Collegeville, MN.
- Doyle TP. 2008. The survival of the spirit while mired in the toxic wastes of the ecclesiastical swamp. Annual SNAP Gathering, Chicago, 13 July.
- Eberle R. 2002. *The Unnatural Law of Celibacy*. Continuum: New York.
- Ehrenreich B. 2008. *This Land is Your Land*. Picador: New York.
- Ferguson H. 2007. Abused and looked after children as 'moral dirt': child abuse and institutional care in historical perspective. *Journal of Social Policy* 36(1): 123–139.
- Ferns Report. 2005. *Report presented to the Minister for Health and Children*. Government Publications: Dublin.

'Church patriarchy and sexual psychopathy are tempting causal variables, they are only partially persuasive in the case we are considering'

'Their status as 'moral dirt' meant that few questions were asked of venerated religious authority'

- Greven P. 1992. *Spare the Child: The Religious Roots of Punishment and the Psychological Impact of Child Abuse*. Vintage Books: New York.
- Haggett L. 2005. *The Bingo Report: Mandatory Celibacy and Clergy Sexual Abuse*. Center for the Study of Religious Issues: Freeport, ME.
- Hannan RR. 2000. Application of child abuse reporting laws to ministers and lay church employees. *Church Law and Tax Report* 14: 1–13.
- Haywood T, Kravitz H, Wasyliv O. 1996. Psychological aspects of sexual functioning among cleric and noncleric alleged sex offenders. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 20: 527–537.
- Hidalgo M. 2007. *Sexual Abuse and the Culture of Catholicism*. Haworth Press: New York.
- John Jay College of Criminal Justice. 2004. *The Nature and Scope of the Problem of Sexual Abuse of Minors by Priests and Deacons*. USCCB: Washington, DC.
- Kennedy M. 2000. Christianity and child abuse- the survivor's voice. *Child Abuse Review* 9: 124–141.
- Lytton T. 2007. Clergy sexual abuse litigation: the policy making role of tort law. *Connecticut Law Review* 39: 18–25.
- Martin JP. 1984. *Hospitals in Trouble*. Blackwell: Oxford.
- McCoy K. 2007. Confidential report presented to the Western Health Board in relation to Brothers of Charity Services in Galway. Available: http://www.hse.ie/eng/services/Publications/services/Disability/MCoy_BOC.pdf [12 Nov 2011].
- McLaughlin B. 1994. Devastated spirituality: the impact of clergy sexual abuse on the survivor's relationship with God and the church. *Sexual Addiction and Compulsivity: The Journal of Treatment and Prevention* 1: 145–158.
- Murphy report. 2009. *Report by Commission of Investigation into the handling by Church and State authorities of allegations and suspicions of child abuse against clerics of the Catholic Archdiocese of Dublin*. Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform: Dublin.
- Nolan M. 2001. *A Programme for Action: Final Report of the Independent Review on Child Protection in the Catholic Church in England and Wales*. Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales: London.
- O'Reilly JT, Strasser JM. 1994. Clergy sexual misconduct confronting the difficult constitutional and institutional liability claims. *St Thomas Law Review* 7: 31–73.
- Pilgrim D. 2011. The child abuse crisis in the Catholic Church: international, national and personal policy aspects. *Policy and Politics* 39(3): 309–324.
- Raftery M, O'Sullivan E. 1999. *Suffer the Little Children: The Inside Story of Ireland's Industrial Schools*. Continuum: New York.
- Rossetti S. 1995. The impact of child sexual abuse on attitudes toward God and the Catholic Church. *Child Abuse & Neglect* 19: 1469–1481.
- Ryan Report. 2009. *The Commission to Inquire into Child Abuse Report*. Government Publications: Dublin.
- Saradjian A, Nobus D. 2003. Cognitive distortions of religious professionals who sexually abuse children. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 18: 905–923.
- Sipe AWR. 2003. *Celibacy in Crisis: A Secret World Revisited*. Brunner-Routledge: New York.
- Tentler LW. 2007. *The Church Confronts Modernity: Catholicism Since 1950 in the United States, Ireland and Quebec*. Catholic University of America Press: Washington, DC.
- Wilden A. 1972. *System and Structure: Essays in Communication and Exchange*. Tavistock: London.