On June 30, 2006, I received a telephone call from Fr. Michael Knotek, pastor at St. John De LaSalle Parish, reporting that a parishioner had approached him, and in confidence claimed abuse by a priest [Rev. Thomas Swade] when the parishioner was a minor [in the '80s]. After discussing the mandated reporter issue, the parishioner agreed to speak with me. I agreed to call after Fr. Knotek provided his telephone number.

I called today and left a message that I would call back, or if he wished, could initiate a call to the office. I left my direct phone number.

To date, and I have yet to talk even though each of us have tried at various times to return each other's calls.
Phone Call

March 7, 1997

To: Bishop Goedert

From: [redacted]

Don't believe issue is about - Swade as a person it is about the fear it is putting into our children. They are taught about stranger danger and bad touching. They are told a priest did these things, but he won't anymore. They see TV cameras at their playground and see a Catholic priest on TV saying Father Swade's coming is a bad thing. Their teachers say he is ok but the priest can't come into the school and he can't be around children without other adults. Children are very perceptive and are perceiving danger. On a Saturday afternoon if the ball gets kicked underneath the rectory window which child will volunteer to get it? Our children are scared and this is not being Christian to our children. Bishop Goedert stop this as soon as possible.
The Most Reverend Raymond E. Goedert
Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago
155 E. Superior Street
Chicago, Illinois 60611

March 6, 1997

Your Excellency,

For over 10 years I have been an active parishoner at Saints Faith, Hope and Charity in Winnetka. For over 100 years our family has been active in the Archdiocese of Chicago contributing both time and financial support. For over 75 years we have been products of Catholic education in the Archdiocese. My mother and father and my wife and I were married at Holy Name Cathedral.

Morality is not taught in public schools. Our society has reflected this in the steady deterioration in the moral fabric of the nation from our President and Congress, through our corporations and even, in some infrequent instances, into our Catholic Religious. Giving a grade school child a strong foundation in moral values is a character anchor that will enable them to ride out many of the storms that they will face in life.

On Wednesday of this week, there was a news story about the possible reinstatement of Fr. Tom Swade into our Parish. The story was immediately followed by the requested resignations of two very senior executives at one of Chicago's largest corporations because of sexual harassment. Their offense was using bad language in the workplace. This is a common response for inappropriate conduct in Corporate America today. In Congress, where almost anything is forgiven, a person of the status of Senator Robert Packwood of Oregon is censured due to inappropriate kissing of fellow adult women.

I am sure there are many families in our Parish, just like any other Parish, who have been touched by the difficult adjustment problems implanted from childhood sexual abuse. Some of those people have coped with it well...others have not. For some, no amount of expert testimony is going to calm their fears.

I have heard many great comments about Fr. Swade from friends whom I admire and respect. I accept those comments. If they are convinced that Fr. Swade is cured, I accept that. As I said, however, some will not...cannot.

The issue is not about whether Fr. Swade is cured or a risk to our children. This issue is not about Fr. Swade at all. This issue is about protecting the innocence and respect very young children have for their priests. As adults they will learn more about the real world and will find out that this type of conduct from a priest is very rare. As a child, a priest is not just a human role model; he is a role model for God Himself. In the last few days, our children have had their anchors shaken badly with respect to their view of priests. Please stop this...
Our children are told that this priest is a good man, now, and he is a friend of Fr. Ventura's. Our children also are told that Fr. Swade is not allowed in the school. If he is around children there will always be an adult present (guards is a term that came home from school yesterday). Children are told he is fine, but not allowed anywhere near them. The natural response to this is fear and now our children fear. Isn't the world going by a little too fast if the subject of sexual misconduct with children has to be discussed before the subject of sexual education?

This whole notion of reinstating a priest with this background in a Parish with children will not work and, as I understand it was even a guideline cited by the Archdiocese in these situations. Due to today's legal environment and the requisite branding of Fr. Swade with a bright scarlet “A”, it makes this impossible and is also absolutely barbaric treatment for Fr. Swade.

For the members of Saints Faith, Hope and Charity, our faith has been questioned on television. We probably have done more for the Archdiocese than any other Parish in the Archdiocese. My Christianity has been questioned by the growing chasm that has been created in our Parish. I resent that. Some families are even split mother vs. father, parents vs. children.

If Fr. Swade still wants to come and live in our Parish after realizing the effect his presence will have on our children, I question his Christianity. I pray that you not allow this to continue because I certainly would not want to question yours.

Sincerely,

CC: Rev. Thomas Ventura
Parish Council
Parish School Board
Religious Education Board
13 March 1997

Dear [Name]:

Yesterday, I received the copy of the letter you addressed to Bishop Goedert. As you know, I serve on the Religious Education Board at Ss. Faith, Hope & Charity, where I have also taught Religious Education for some six years. I hope you take this letter in the constructive and empathetic spirit intended. I, too, am a parent. My children—[redacted]—are all in the Religious Education Program.

Without trying to address each and every point you made, I'd like to tell you a story from my seventh-grade class. Early this year, I mentioned in passing that none of them should ever believe anyone who says growing up today is easier than it "used to be in the good old days." As proof, I said I remembered the first time I ever saw a person my own age drunk. I was a junior in high school and vividly recalled the scene of funny behavior one moment, and vomiting the next. Four boys in the class quickly said, "Oh, I've seen that plenty of times!" It was apparent they were being totally honest.

What struck me like a brick was the weight this put on my own back and that of my fellow teacher. Unlike those who taught us so many years ago, we couldn't anticipate these young men and women would have three or four more years of adolescent innocence during which their faith and moral values could slowly grow and build in strength. Indeed, while we try very hard to present to our class as much of the richness and beauty of our religion as we can, I believe we do the young people a disservice to "hide from their eyes" some of the moral challenges of the day. Probably like you, I wish none of them would see a drunk of their own age until college or beyond. But I'm afraid that really is just a "wish."

In this spirit, last Sunday we read Fr. Ventura's letter about Fr. Swade to our class. Without trying to lead their decision-making in a heavy-handed fashion, we did give them as much information and perspective as we thought helpful and appropriate. By an overwhelming majority, they felt Fr. Swade should be given "a second chance." We went on to explain that if Fr. Swade came into residence in the parish, they could expect to hear from their peers at school how "Faith, Hope" had a "pervert priest" or a "child-abuser in the rectory." We wanted them to know that
the peer pressure they feel so profoundly at their age would accompany Fr. Swade. None of those who wanted to give him a second chance changed their mind as a result. I must say, I was very proud of them.

To say the least, this is a difficult time for the parish. Yet, it seems to me that little good ever comes from turning away from challenges, or simply trying to wish them out of existence. I hope and pray that somehow the experience we are all now sharing can be a source of renewed faith and religious strength, rather than a divisive and hurtful episode.

Sincerely,

Copies:

→ Bishop Goedert
  Fr. Ventura
  Parish Council
  Parish School Board
  Religious Education Board
January 29, 1996

Dear [Name],

Thank you very much for your letter of January 11. It was eloquent in describing the work that Father Thomas Swade has done over the years at St. Dorothy's and with LINK. I have received many such letters and have so much evidence of that good work.

Unfortunately, the events that occurred in a few instances have cast a deep shadow over that undoubtedly good work. The allegations that came forward were taken seriously and Father Swade dealt with them over the last several years. I think I can say that he will be returned to ministry in the Archdiocese, but the nature of that ministry will be partially determined by the recommendations of the Professional Fitness Review Board. I have re-appointed a commission to review those policies and procedures of the diocese and that is presently taking place. It may well be that I will have greater latitude in sending Father Swade back into ministry when the commission's recommendations are made. But for the present, I have to follow the policies and procedures that are in place.

I can make no guarantee of what Father Swade will be doing, but that he will have the opportunity to once again exercise his priesthood in the Archdiocese is a certainty. This whole process has taken a very long time and I know many people who have been helped by Father Swade are in his corner.

I can only promise that I will do everything in my power to see that there will be a return to ministry, though again I cannot promise what exact ministry at this time would be available.

Again, I thank you for your continuing interest in Father Swade's welfare as well as your deep concern for the youth with whom he has worked in the LINK program. As you describe it, LINK has been a marvelous program.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

[Signature]

[Name]
Archbishop of Chicago
MEETING WITH JOSEPH CARDINAL BERNARDIN & RECONVENED COMMISSION
ON CLERICAL SEXUAL MISCONDUCT WITH MINORS
OCTOBER 2, 1996

1. The Cardinal thanked the Commission for their work.

2. The Commission then discussed the recommendations beginning on page 29 of the Report.
   a. The Commission expressed its concern that the Professional Fitness Review Board refused to meet with priests and/or alleged victims and/or therapists.
   b. The Board was also disappointed in the use of the questionnaire.
   c. Chicago is the only Diocese that gives a list of lawyers (paid for by the Diocese) in dealing with the Board before there is any indictment or civil suit.
   d. The Board has not had the courage to insist on seeing full reports before voting to return to ministry; the Board has not had the courage to meet with priests/victims.
   e. The Commission thinks the Board should be smaller; it has become too cumbersome. Also, the Board seems to be giving too much deference to the mental health experts. Instead of being voting members of the Board, the experts and representatives of victims' groups would be on panel(s) of consultants. The concern of whether or not a quorum could be regularly achieved with only 5 members could be addressed by having a very committed board who will make this a priority.
   f. The Commission's continued involvement would be for a limited time to help with training of new board.
   g. The "case manager" should select the mental health professionals and receive their assessment/therapeutic reports. This should be done in collaboration and cooperation with the Vicars for Priests. The "case manager" should be more involved as a full member of PCAG.
h. The Board feels one good facility for assessment and treatment would give greater consistency. There should be enough trust in the treatment provider to do the assessment as well, especially since the treatment center will probably do their own assessment.

i. The procedure could be simplified by combining the first and second stage review into one hearing regarding withdrawal from ministry. Return to ministry would be reviewed at a separate hearing initiated at the priest's request.

j. Issue most troubling to the Cardinal: Return to ministry question. He has difficulty grouping all of these cases together. I found no evidence of any "new developments" in the research which would justify returning a priest to full parish ministry. Even Father Steve Rosetti of St. Luke Institute in Suitland was insistent that a priest who has abused minors should never be returned to full parish ministry. (But this is inconsistent with their recommendation in Father Swade's case.)

The Commission had some specific observations regarding Father Tom Swade, whom they interviewed; they believe the Cardinal is faced with a dilemma: he has permitted Father Callcott to return to parish ministry, why would Father Swade be different? Perhaps the Cardinal needs to make another exception "for pastoral reasons." However, any return to LINK would be a mistake: even in an administrative capacity like fund-raising, he would be held up as a model and a hero for youth. Given his history, this would not be appropriate.

4. The Cardinal said he wanted to view their draft as an "internal report of a work in progress." The Commission accepted this and John Madden agreed to print another 12 copies.

5. The Commission agreed to continue to be part of the dialogue with various groups, e.g., PCAG and the Review Board.

---

Thomas J. Paprocki
Dear Brother Joseph,

I remember meeting you for the first time fourteen years ago, the evening before your formal installation, across the street from the cathedral in a tent set up for personally greeting well wishers among the clergy. I was impressed and full of hope for the Church in Chicago, the priesthood, the African American community, for those who ministered there and for myself personally.

Much has come to pass during these fourteen years, in the Church in Chicago, in the priesthood, in the African American community and those who minister there and in my own personal life. Our lives and ministries have mingled together in ways I never dreamed of back then. I have come to know better who you are because we have worked together, fasted and prayed together, mourned and rejoiced together, despaired together, and hoped together, disputed and have been reconciled together.

Shortly after your arrival in Chicago you kindly granted me permission to work full time with Link Unlimited so that I could more intensely foster and nurture its growth, development and effectiveness. You graciously attended and spoke at our annual Link banquet in 1983. You enthusiastically participated in and delivered the vision talk at our initial workshop on racism created by four of your priests here in Chicago. You came to St. Dorothy's Church for Confirmation and later for our 75th anniversary as a parish faith community. You officiated at Link's 25th anniversary celebration at St. Dorothy's in the spring of 1992 and visited our newly built office building shortly thereafter.

Then darkness came in June in 1992 with accusations of sexual misconduct. I came to know you better as we mourned, despaired and disputed together. Through it all we hoped together, reconciled together, and hopefully will soon rejoice together when I am reinstated.
Looking back I would say your initial hope fourteen years ago has been realized in me. I have come to know you as a friend, fellow priest and bishop. I have come to know that you love me in good times and in bad for you are Joseph, my brother.

I am thankful to God because He has blessed me with your presence in my life these past fourteen years. I regret that I have caused you anxiety, embarrassment or grief because of my past conduct. I ask your forgiveness. As you prepare yourself to meet our brother, Jesus on the other side of this vale of tears, know that you have been and continue to be an inspiration and a support in my life and ministry both in happy days and sad ones. Your presence will remain active in my life as I continue to appreciate the variety of ways God reveals His love for me through others, until I too, shake off this mortal body.

My prayers are with you that God our Father will sustain you during this time of sickness, pain and dying with the promise of life He has given us through Christ our Lord.

Gratefully your brother,

[Signature]
The Cardinal's Reconvened Commission

December 19, 1996

Most Reverend Raymond Goedert  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
155 E. Superior Street  
Chicago, IL 60611

Dear Bishop Goedert:

It has come to the attention of the Commission that some misconceptions exist as to our findings and recommendations regarding the return of child abusing priests to some form of ministry. We write this letter to you with the purpose of making as clear as possible what was said by us in both of our reports to the late Cardinal Bernardin and what our position is on these matters.

Our consultations with the most widely respected and preeminent researchers and therapists working with child molesters, in both 1991-1992 and in 1996, yielded the same information and recommendations. Not one person we spoke with thought that return to ministry with access to, or contact with, children or teenagers was supportable given the current research and follow-up studies.

We stand by our statements in both the first and second reports that there should never be a return to full ministry and only very limited, monitored and supervised other ministry should be considered for priests who have engaged in sexual misconduct with minors. To do otherwise puts the youth of the Church and the children of the faithful at an unacceptable risk of future harm. It allows a molester to pose as a role model for youth. It creates a major financial risk for the Archdiocese because those who administer are on notice that these priests have engaged in sexual misconduct in the past.

We do not agree with the assignment of a priest who has been in treatment and after care for about four years to a parish with a school, even if only as a resident. We do not agree with the reassignment to a parish with a school of a priest where the Archdiocese had to negotiate a money settlement with his victims. To make matters perfectly clear, we do not agree with the prior reassignment to the same parish of an offending priest who was treated for less than a year, and we do not agree with the reassignment without any treatment of the two pastors where the original commission found probable cause to believe they had abused youth. They were allowed to finish out there terms as pastors for various reasons. We were led to believe they would not be reassigned to parishes with schools and that they would be monitored and participate in treatment. That never happened with either one as far as we have been able to determine.
Our interviews of the one priest who was returned and the one priest with return being contemplated have convinced us all that they are still engaging in cognitive distortions about their offenses and are very much still evading responsibility for what they did. We have not interviewed the two former pastors but we have been told that neither has participated in any treatment. We note that the full Professional Fitness Review Board has not interviewed any of these individuals. They all pose significant risk to the children and the Church. As regards the monitoring - we have little faith in it and what we do have is further reduced when a friend is designated as the monitor. This puts both in an unacceptable position.

We urge you to take our reports seriously and not establish any further in this Archdiocese what appears to be a policy of putting priests who have engaged in sexual misconduct with minors in parishes where they have access to minors in parish schools. We would deem all three who are currently in parishes a risk to children and reach the same conclusion about the individual who is recently under consideration for return.

We remain, as we told the late Cardinal Joseph Bernardin, more than willing to meet with or assist you in any way you may deem appropriate regarding these matters. We ask that you include this letter with our second report in any files pertaining to these matters which are being maintained by the Archdiocese.

Sincerely,

Julia Quinn Dempsey

John R. Gorman

John P. Madden

AOC 005545
MEMO

To: Fr. Paprocki
   Mr. Bonaccorsi
   Mr. O'Malley
   Mr. Quakenbush

From: Fr. McBrady

Re: Conversation with Fr. Ventura

Date: February 18, 1997

I spoke with Fr. Ventura over the weekend to convey our plan for wrapping up the communication issues in preparation for the mailing of Fr. Ventura’s letter on March 1.

Fr. Ventura was not happy with our decision for a number of reasons:

1. He had already indicated to some parish leaders that the letter was going out this week.

2. He said that the word is spreading through the parish and many parishioners are aware of what is coming.

3. Fr. Ventura feels the leadership people have been through enough preparation.

4. He asked me to share this parable: During the Korean War, many American planes were shot down by the faster moving Migs. After a time it was determined that our planes moved more slowly because they were so encumbered with safety devices. In order to make them comparable to the Migs, they had to be stripped of their safety features.

5. Media people in S.S. Faith, Hope and Charity include [redacted] and [redacted] of the Tribune and [redacted] of Ch.

6. The final draft of Fr. Ventura’s letter is included with this
fax.

7. Fr. Ventura, the principal and the chairs of the boards will meet with Fr. Paprocki and Mr. Quakenbush on Friday, February 21 at 9 a.m.
Father Thomas Swade was withdrawn from parish ministry in 1992 following allegations of sexual misconduct with five teenagers, males and females. After these allegations were made public, a sixth accusation was made. According to these allegations, Father Swade on several occasions during the 1970’s and early 1980’s inappropriately touched five of these six youths. The extent of the physical contact ranged from hugging to genital touching, however, there was no intercourse or violence in any sense. The incident which did not include any touching involved an allegation that a teenager had seen him naked coming out of his bathroom.

Father Swade admitted some inappropriate contact, but indicated that there was no sexual intent on his part. He also denied some of the specific details of the allegation.

Extensive psychological testing and therapy indicate that Father Swade is not a pedophile. Based on his participation and cooperation with therapy, the psychologists and the Review Board believe that Father Swade does not present a risk of sexual misconduct with minors.
The nine-member independent Review Board which oversees the Archdiocese of Chicago's policies and procedures regarding clerical sexual misconduct with minors has recommended that Father Thomas Swade be permitted to return to ministry at the Archdiocese of Chicago Pastoral Center and reside at a parish in Winnetka. Father Swade will be assigned to the Archdiocese of Chicago Ethnic Ministries office, and will reside at Saints Faith, Hope and Charity Parish.

The process of considering Father Swade’s return to ministry began while Cardinal Bernardin was Archbishop of Chicago. Cardinal Bernardin had expressed his hope that Father Swade might be returned to ministry, as long as he was returned to ministry in accordance with the recommendation of the independent review board.

A series of independent professional evaluations has concluded that Father Swade does not pose a threat to children. Father Swade has voluntarily undergone intensive counseling.

Archdiocesan officials have met with parish officials, the parish council, school board, and religious education board at Saints Faith, Hope and Charity. The Archdiocese -- more --
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is grateful for their willingness to consider Father Swade as a resident at the parish.

Bishop Raymond Goedert, Diocesan Administrator, has accepted the recommendation of the Review Board. Father Swade’s assignment is proposed to begin in the spring of this year.

Father Swade, who formerly resided at St. Dorothy Parish in Chicago, was placed on administrative leave by the Archdiocese in June, 1992, following allegations of sexual misconduct with minors.

###
Dear Parishioners,

Each year Lent reminds us that we are a Church of "second chances". Jesus himself is our model for this. One of his last acts on the Cross was to forgive the Good Thief. He also accepted Peter back after he had denied him three times.

Last July Cardinal Bernardin spoke to me about his desire to give a "second chance" to one of my classmates, Father Tom Swade. As many of you know, Father Swade was the founder of Link Unlimited which enables talented Inner-City students to get a quality high school education which is paid for and mentored by generous sponsors, many of whom are in our parish.

What you may not know is that in July, 1992, a former Link student accused Father Swade of sexual misconduct with him many years ago when he was 14 years of age. This involved improper touching. It did not involve sexual intercourse. After investigating the allegations, the Archdiocese placed Father Swade on an indefinite leave of absence from priestly ministry.

The Board of Directors of Link Unlimited also mailed a letter to the more than 1,000 students who had been involved in their program over the past 25 years to ascertain whether there were any other allegations. Five people came forward. Three said that they had been disturbed when Father Swade hugged them inappropriately. One young woman stated that she had seen Father Swade emerge from his bathroom unclothed. Another complained of improper touches in a swimming pool. (Father Swade denied this last allegation.)

During the past four years, he has profited from an intense rehabilitation program. Moreover, he has had three separate evaluations of his suitability for someday returning to pastoral ministry. These were at the University of Chicago Clinic, the St. Louis Consultation Center and the Isaac Ray Center here in Chicago. Their conclusions were that a) he is not a pedophile; b) he is not a danger to children; c) he does not have personality disorders.

Why then did this happen? It seems to have resulted from very poor judgment, naivete, and a basic lack of awareness. All of these issues have been addressed in his treatment program.

Cardinal Bernardin reviewed this material and expressed his hope that Father Swade could be returned to ministry. The independent Professional Fitness Review Board of the Archdiocese recommended to the Cardinal that Father Swade could be returned to ministry under certain circumstances. (It has nine members, of whom the majority are lay people.) The Archdiocese then asked
if we would give Father Swade a "second chance" and accept him as a resident priest here at our parish while serving as the Director of the Office of Ethnic Ministries at the Archdiocesan Pastoral Center downtown. He would say Mass and administer the Sacraments here. Also his previous experience in the Inner-City could be a valuable resource to our Sharing programs.

We began a series of six consultation meetings about this proposal with our Parish Council, School Board and Religious Education Board. Our School Principal, Director of Religious Education and Youth Minister also attended these meetings. The members of these groups had two extensive meetings with Father Swade and three representatives of the Archdiocese who were thoroughly acquainted with his case. The main concern was to be certain that his coming here would in no way be a risk to our youngsters.

Even though the Professional Fitness Review Board believes that Fr. Swade does not present a risk, they recommended that the Archdiocese establish guidelines both for the protection of our children and Father Swade. For example, he is not to be active with any youth groups or organizations. He is not to be in the presence of a minor without another responsible adult. Furthermore, all of this is to be evaluated by the Archdiocese and myself at regular intervals.

After careful thought, much prayer and extensive deliberation, the Parish Pastoral Council, the School Board and the Religious Education Board recommended that we give Father Swade a second chance and welcome him to our parish. Therefore we are attempting to communicate this information regarding this proposed assignment as effectively as possible to all of our parishioners in this letter. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me or Father Grob or one of the people listed on the enclosed list. All of them participated in this process. Your input is important to us.

Thank you for reading this letter. It is a difficult and complicated issue. However, my hope is that we can function well as a parish that provides a "second chance" for this priest and for one another whenever we stumble on the journey of life.

Sincerely,

Father Tom Ventura

P.S. By the way, this assignment would in no way impact on the position of Father Jeff Grob. He will continue to be our Associate Pastor for his full term.
PASTORAL COUNCIL

RECTOR
Fr. Tom Ventura 446-7646
Fr. Jeff Grob 446-7646

SS. FAITH SCHOOL BOARD

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION BOARD
MEMO

To: Bishop Raymond Goedert
   Diocesan Administrator

From: Fr. Lawrence McBrady
   Vicar for Priests

Re: Fr. Thomas Swade

Date: December 6, 1996

I have some information pertaining to Fr. Tom Swade’s situation which I thought might be of some help to you as we continue to give consideration to Tom’s possible re-entry into limited parish ministry.

On Wednesday, August 21, 1996 I received a call from Cardinal Bernardin. The Cardinal, who was at that time on retreat at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House, called to inform me that he had agreed to meet with Tom at the retreat house on the following morning. The Cardinal said he had promised Tom on several occasions that he would be returned to ministry and that, because of the Commission’s delay, he was tempted to return Tom to some form of parish ministry without waiting for the release of the report. He asked me what I thought. I urged the Cardinal not to do this because it would create a serious problem for him in his relationships with the Commission and the Fitness Review Board. The Cardinal agreed that asking for Tom’s continued patience was the more prudent course but he reiterated his point that Tom needed to be back in a parish soon.

On Friday, August 23 the Cardinal called again. He told me that he had spoken with Tom on Thursday and had, once again, asked for Tom’s patience. He told Tom that he supported his return to ministry and was merely waiting for the Re-convened Commission to release its report. The Cardinal concluded the conversation with me by reiterating his feeling that we needed to get Tom into a parish soon.
Comments, questions @ mtg. of 1/7/97:

1. Do it realistic to say he should never be alone w/minors w/o another responsible adult present?

2. Couldn't another parish be found w/o a school?

3. How can this be articulated for school parents concerned for the safety of children w/o going too much detail?

4. This is a community of successful, competitive people who will not be satisfied until they have all the answers. Suggestion was make that members of the school board + rel. ed. board be listed w/their phone numbers so others can phone them.

5. How a removed priest was been returned before? If so, how there been a failure, i.e. recurrance of problem?

6. Compelling arguments in F. Swede's favor: 1) pull of 1000 posts, enforced only 6 allegations, some of which are not very substantial; and 2) F. Swede's determination of continuing and not going pg.

7. Some people will have a hard time believing this was necessary.

Schools board approved going forward by strong majority, but not unanimous. Good advice needed for teachers and parents. Minority opinion questioned by why F. Swede couldn't be sent to a smaller parish w/o a school.

Rel. Ed. board didn't take vote, but consensus was to go forward. Members would like to see letter before it goes out. If list of names is provided, it shouldn't be suggested that anyone on list endorse the proposal, but rather is listed for info. Such info would have to be provided in Q&A in order to answer questions.
MEMO

To: Professional Fitness Review Board
From: Fr. Dan Coughlin & Fr. Larry McBrady
Re: Fr. Tom Swade
Date: November 16, 1996

In light of a positive decision on your part to grant Fr. Tom Swade's request for a return to limited parish ministry under supervision and monitoring protocols, we wish to bring your attention to a specific parish, Sts. Faith, Hope and Charity in Winnetka which, we believe, is well suited for Fr. Swade for these reasons:

- Fr. Swade has been asked to divorce himself from the LINK program. By contrast, this parish, located in a northern suburb, has an extensive sacramental ministry which would allow Fr. Swade to minister in a totally new parish setting.
- The pastor, Fr. Thomas Ventura, served previously as a Vicar for Priests and is well versed in matters pertaining to ongoing supervision.
- Fr. Ventura would be willing to assume the role of monitor and to meet with the Fitness Review Administrator and the Vicars for Priests on a regular basis.
- In addition to Fr. Ventura, Fr. Bill Flaherty (a member of the PFRB) lives in the rectory. This would be a very supportive house for Fr. Swade during this time of transition.
- Sts. Faith, Hope and Charity has a large number of parishioners with college degrees. As such, there is a strong interest in parish adult education programs. Fr. Swade is well versed in developing programs dealing with Catholic social teachings due to his work with the Office for Ethnic Ministries of the Archdiocese.
- Fr. Ventura has already obtained the approval of the Sts. Faith, Hope and Charity Pastoral Council. They voted unanimously to accept Fr. Swade.
- Fr. Ventura is prepared to inform the entire parish of the circumstances that bring Fr. Swade to the parish. Fr. Ventura would work with the Vicar for Priests, the Fitness Review Administrator and the Victim Assistance Minister in crafting a public announcement.
Fr. Swade is prepared to sign and abide by a detailed protocol developed by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator.

Sts. Faith Hope and Charity Parish does have a grade school. In light of this fact we make our recommendations based upon the following considerations:

- Fr. Swade would have no contact whatsoever with the school and Fr. Ventura is prepared to monitor this situation.
- The Vicar for Priests Office has made a diligent effort to seek out a parish without a school. Seven such parishes (which were regarded as good sites) declined our request to accept Fr. Swade. A number of other parishes without schools are viewed by our office as lacking the strong leadership needed to both monitor and challenge Fr. Swade. Additionally, a number of parishes in the African-American community are without schools but

In summary, we believe this parish is well suited for Fr. Swade and we are prepared to assist the Professional Fitness Review Administrator in ensuring Fr. Swade's compliance with all the expectations of the Professional Fitness Review Board.
February 2, 1999

MEMORANDUM

To: File  
From: Kathleen Leggda, PFRA  
Re: PFR-43, Tom Swade

On January 29, 1999, Dr. Larry Gorski, Rev. Larry McBrady and I met to discuss status and treatment options for TS.

Discussion focused on TS's opportunity to say Sunday Masses at the Metropolitan Correctional Facility. LG agreed with Vicars, et.al. that this will be an opportunity for TS to develop a sense of community among the people in the three separate groups for whom he will say Mass: male prisoners, female prisoners, and maximum security prisoners.

There was some discussion regarding return to ministry. LM presented the option of conducting a "Focus Group" at Immaculate Conception in Lincoln Park area. He would use group to generically discuss issue of return to ministry for priests currently under jurisdiction of the PFRB. Thoughts would be "collected" to test acceptance in parish.

LG responded with the concern that it may be that continued discussion of return to ministry in a parish could prevent an individual like TS from moving forward in areas where opportunities already exist. No final recommendation was made.

cc: Members of the Review Board  
    Rev. Thomas Paprocki  
    Archbishop's Delegate to the Review Board  
    Rev. Lawrence McBrady
March 31, 1999

Reverend Thomas Ventura, Pastor
SS. Faith, Hope and Charity Parish
191 Linden Street
Winnetka, IL 60093-3832

Dar Father Ventura,

I am writing in response to your letter dated March 24, 1999. I did try to reach you by telephone on March 29th and am aware of what a busy time of year this is.

I would like to clarify that the recommendation to consider the advisability of Father Swade’s participation in the Ethnic Awareness Program at your parish came from the Professional Fitness Review Board (PFR Bd.). I was asked to communicate this recommendation to Father Baumhart since I am the Administrator for the Professional Fitness Review Office and my responsibility is to monitor and ensure protocols are followed.

Ironically, the recommendation was made in an effort to avoid such public response from the 30% vocal minority, which you describe in your letter. The intent was to be proactive relative to potential negative publicity for Father Swade, not discriminate against him or your parish.

I hope this response allays some of your concerns.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Leggdas
Professional Fitness Review, Admin.

KL/Inp

Cc: Francis Cardinal George
    Rev. Thomas Paprocki, Chancellor
I just saw that this was copied to the Cardinal - Do you want a written response? I was going to call TV.
Ms. Catherine Leggdes  
Fitness Review Board  
Archdiocese of Chicago  
1 East Superior Street, Suite 51  
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Ms. Leggdes,

Perhaps you can help me, please.

I was informed recently that the Board has made a decision that, if and when our parish participates in one the Archdiocesan weekends regarding Racism, the Director of the program, Fr. Tom Swade, would not be allowed to be involved with us.

If that information is inaccurate, please let me know that as soon as possible.

However, if it is accurate, I would have a number of substantial problems with such a decision:

First, our parish should be consulted as part of a decision-making process which directly affects us.

Second, we would resent being singled out as different from all other parishes. Discrimination of any kind is reprehensible. If Father Swade's work is considered appropriate for so many other parishes, why would it be any different in our case?

Third, this would deprive us of a credible opportunity for reconciliation. I remind you and the Board that at the time of the controversy about Fr. Swade's proposed assignment to our parish, approximately 70% of those parishioners expressing an opinion favored his coming. The reason we honored "minority rule" was the fact that those opposed tended to be young families with children in our Catholic School.

Fourth, aside from three or four persons who employed alarmist tactics, all of our parishioners on both sides of the debate behaved with respect and dignity both during and after the controversy. Moreover, even today many people continue to express the hope that we can have some kind of involvement with Father Swade and his program.

Fifth, I realize that you have a challenging job. However, I hope you will seek felicitous balance between excessive carelessness on the one hand and excessive caution on the other.

Looking forward to your response, I remain

Sincerely,

Rev. Thomas Ventura

Copy: Cardinal Francis George
Dear Cardinal Bernardin,

For more than a year now, Tom Swade, a friend and classmate, has not been able to function in his priesthood.

Along with many others I would like to give Tom my support and affirmation. There is no doubt in my mind these are very crucial times, especially for Tom. Decisions do not come readily. But to see one of our own, and sick brother priests, being treated the way they are, shoved around like animals from one pen to another brings tears to my eyes. It seems we have much more compassion on the sick we minister to than to those who might be sick among ourselves.

I have know Tom for over forty years. He is a man of action, of concern, and dedication as you well know. Whatever he does, he does with great passion, a passion that has grown rather than diminished over the years. I wish I had his energy and determination.

Over the years he had aways been an open outstanding person throughout the seminary and in the priesthood. If ever there was a man who dedicated his life to Jesus and the church, he is the one. Look at what he has done in the years of his priesthood.

And rather than being bitter about the way he's being treated now he spends his day in prayer, study and writing with the same vigor he has done everything in the past. He has no doubt he will be a better man for what has happend to him.

Tom’s in the desert and God willing I would like to see him come back to the ministry because now he is more humbled and fill with the Spirit than he was before.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Rev. Eugene L. Keusal

cc: Rev. Patrick O’Malley
    Rev. Thomas Swade
September 12, 1994

Dear Tom,

I want to thank you for your recent letter. Your reflections were very thoughtful and moving. I know from talking with Father O’Malley that these past few months have been very significant for you, and I am very happy that so many good things have happened during this time.

From your letter it sounds like the trust you experienced from the people in [Redacted] was key to your growth. It enabled you to do the work that you needed to do. Tom, I want to assure you of my trust and support for the days ahead as you continue to do the work you need to do to care for yourself and prepare for your future ministry here in the Archdiocese.

I am sure it is difficult to have to live with the future undefined at this point, but I want you to know that I have every confidence that you will continue your work and eventually come to a point where once again you will be active and contributing full time in ministry here in Chicago.

Again, thank you for your letter and I look forward to seeing you. Keep me in your prayers.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

[Signature]

Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend Thomas Swade
Cardinal Stritch Retreat House
P.O. Box 455
Mundelein, IL 60060
January 24, 1996

Dear Jack,

I wish to acknowledge your letter regarding Tom Swade. I am very sensitive to the situation in which Tom finds himself. I spent an hour with him last week.

I agree that Tom should be reinstated in some way. I am doing all I can to bring this about but I have to be careful so that I will not undermine the process. What I am waiting for now is the evaluation of the present policy by the Commission which I have reconstituted. My hope is that recommendations will be made which will give the Review Board and me a little more leeway in certain cases.

Thanks, Jack, for sharing your concern with me.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Fraternally in Christ,

Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend Monsignor John J. Egan
Holy Name Cathedral
730 N. Wabash Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

a:\eganjohn
JLB:jb
Dear Cardinal Bernardin,

Happy New Year. The first part of every good prayer is praise. I hope you are feeling stronger. The Archdiocese needs your caring and strong leadership. We in St. Joseph's-Homewood, pray for you very often—we love our bishop.

Having said that, I would like to tell you the purpose of my letter. I am writing to you on behalf of Fr. Tom Swade. I have known Tom since he was a teenager. His brother and I were good friends in the seminary. I also served with him as his pastor for 20 years at St. Dorothy's parish. I know him better than most people and can truly say he is no pedophile or any danger to the community. As a matter of fact, the work he has done for the church in the African American community is outstanding, second only to Msgr. Cantwell. The "Link" program is unique and has given opportunities to young black students which would never have been possible without his help.

As far as whatever he has been accused of, I can only say he may used poor judgement but would never do anything morally wrong. I am not saying that the alleged victims' rights should come second, they should come first. But in my judgement, Tom Swade did not deserve the treatment he received. He has been away from the active ministry for almost three years. He is fifty-nine and in good health. The Church of Chicago is being deprived of his creative energies.

He has gone through all the and all the things asked of him. I don't know if I or many other priests would have gone through that extensive program and kept their sanity. The reason he did was because he loves his priestly ministry that much.

Your Eminence, enough is enough. I understand that you are to meet with him later this month. I plead with you to return him to full active ministry where he belongs and if possible, in some way with the "Link" program which he fathered and loves dearly.

Sincerely

Rev. Michael Nallen

Rev. Michael Nallen
January 17, 1996

Dear Mike,

Thank you very much for your supportive letter of Tom Swade. I can concur with almost everything you expressed in your letter; however, we have to face up to the fact that issues of abuse of children, no matter what the motivation of the priest himself, are seen as very grievous offenses both against the children themselves and in terms of the priest’s ministry. We can never get away from that reality.

Tom has worked diligently and hard and it is my hope to restore him to some kind of ministry as soon as possible. I know Tom is not a pedophile nor do I believe he would ever do anything like this again. Nevertheless, I have to be consistent with the policy set up in the archdiocese. I have been consistent with those policies up until now even in the return of one of the priests to parish ministry.

The simple truth is that while there are many people who would love to see Tom back in unrestricted ministry, there are others who see things in a different light. Somehow I have to walk the thin line and acknowledge the people and the feelings on all sides of this issue. It is not easy but I will do all I can to see that Tom will be able to function again in some kind of ministry as a priest. You are right in saying that we need his energy and his love of the priesthood.

In the meantime, I hope your health situation is remaining stable. I am aware that you are much improved over where you were two years ago. That is the grace of God’s healing working in you. I hope that I too may continue to experience that same grace. I am reasonably healthy, except for the back problems right now. Keep me in your prayers, Mike, and I shall do the same for you.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Fraternally in Christ,

[Signature]

Archbishop of Chicago

Reverend Michael Nallen
St. Ethelreda Parish
8754 S. Paulina Street
Chicago, IL 60620
Dear [Redacted]:

Your letter of November 8, 1996 to Cardinal Bernardin has been referred to me. The Cardinal was very anxious to see Father Swade returned to some form of ministry, so I am sure he would have appreciated your comments very much.

At this very time, discussions are being held to determine just what Father Swade's ministry will be. Like you, I hope it won't be too long before the matter is resolved. Please continue to keep him and all of us in your prayers, so that a decision beneficial to all concerned will be reached soon.

With cordial best wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

[Signature]

Most Reverend Raymond E. Goedert
Diocesan Administrator
Memorandum

To: File

From: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Archbishop's Delegate to the Professional Fitness Review Board

Re: Review Board Meeting - Case Review
    Rev. Thomas Swade

Date: October 20, 2001

Rev. Lawrence McBrady, Vicar for Priests, met with the Review Board to discuss the efforts of some people who are advocating the appointment of Father Tom Swade as Pastor of Holy Family Parish, 1080 W. Roosevelt Rd., Chicago.

The Review Board suggested that this would not be prudent since the likely negative public reaction would adversely affect not only Father Swade personally, but also could jeopardize the important ministry that he is doing now in the Office of Racial Justice. However, if the Cardinal wishes the Review Board to make a determination on the merits of Father Swade’s fitness to serve as pastor of a parish, the Review Board would ask that Father Swade receive [REDACTED].
Client Case Review  
Professional Fitness Review Office  
March 14, 2002

PFR-43  Rev. Thomas Swade

Three allegations of sexual misconduct have been made against Father Swade. One with a teen and college aged female alleging partial nudity in front of her, hugging and kissing. Two others by males 12 – 16 years of age. Allegations span the years of 1972 – 1982. Father Swade resides at a Jesuit Residence where the supervisor of the religious community serves as an on-site monitor. Father Swade must obtain permission from Professional Fitness Review Administrator and Vicar for Priests for all public celebrations of worship. He works full-time in the Office of Ethnic Ministries.
Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board Meeting, March 20, 1999:

Ralph Bonaccorsi and Fr. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests, met with a focus group from Immaculate Conception Parish on North Park. The group was presented with a hypothetical situation (similar to Father Swade’s, but without identifying him) in which the priest was requesting a return to ministry. The group did not want a priest with this history returned to ministry in their parish. Father Swade will be informed of group response.
Larry Gorski and Tom Swade both spoke to PCAC as we begin consideration of Tom’s return to limited ministry.

Gorski advocated for recognition that "full disclosure" will never work. There are probably victims of sexual abuse in every parish congregation. (2 of 5 women; 1 of 5 men). Let Tom start out as a "supply priest" helping (but not living) in a parish. Let the congregation grow de-sensitized to Tom’s presence. Over a period of time there could be a "graduated re-entry." A bulletin article should be general in its wording: "There was a previous admission of misconduct followed by long-term treatment."

Swade emphasized that he has chosen to remain in the priesthood because he wants to be able to celebrate the sacraments again. He would like a ministry beyond Ethnic Ministries i.e. some parish involvement.
August 17, 1998

Reverend Joseph W Altman  
Ascension/St. Susanna Parish  
15234 Myrtle Avenue  
Harvey, IL  60426-3194  

Dear Joe:

Congratulations on your appointment to a second term as pastor. I wish you all the best as you continue in your ministry at Ascension/St. Susanna.

It has been sometime since we have spoken and I want to take this opportunity to make you aware of recent developments concerning Tom Swade. At the present time, the Archdiocese is considering a way to allow Tom to serve as week-end Mass help in a highly supervised setting. Let me make it perfectly clear, this level of supervision is intended for Tom’s welfare and in no way implies that he is a risk.

It now appears Tom will not be able to function as an associate pastor living in a parish any time in the next couple years. For this reason I would say it is quite unlikely Tom will ever be able to come to your parish. If it ever does happen it will be at least a few years from now.

I appreciate your interest in this matter and your willingness to put yourself on the line. Unfortunately, the Archdiocese feels a much more incremental return to active ministry is appropriate in this case.

Joe, I hope things are going well for you. Thanks for your generous offer of help.

Fraternally,

Reverend Lawrence P. McBrady  
Vicar for Priests
Meeting, Saturday, May 17, 1997
10:00 AM - 12:58 PM
Office of Professional Fitness Review

MINUTES

Members Present:

Others Present:
Bernadette Connolly

I. Approval of Minutes
A. The Review Board approved the Minutes of the April 19, 1997 meeting.

II. Review Board Matters
A. Matter of

B. Matter of

C. Matter of

D. Matter of

.........continued
E. Matter of PFR-43, Thomas Swade
The Board conducted a Supplementary Review pursuant to Article 1104.11 of the Review Process For The Continuation Of Ministry. The Board recommended Fr. Swade can reside at the Jesuit Community located on Clark Street, Chicago, IL provided the Administrator finds the arrangements appropriate. In addition to Tom Swade’s current protocol, the Board recommended Tom Swade be permitted to stay overnight on Saturday evenings at his family home.

III. Other Matters
A. The Administrator informed the Board that Archbishop Francis George will meet with the Board on October 19, 1997.

Our next scheduled meeting is Saturday, June 21, 1997.
I. Approval of Minutes

The Review Board approved the Minutes of the September 21, 1996 and October 26, 1996 meetings.

II. Review Board Matters

A. Matter of PFR-43, Thomas Swade

Pursuant to Article 1105-1 of the Review Process For Continuation of Ministry, the Board conducted a Supplementary Review. Based upon the information received and the Administrator's reports, the Board recommended that it is reasonable to return Fr. Swade to a limited ministry with specific restrictions. The Board also reviewed materials, at the request of the Vicar for Priests, for consideration of ministry at Sts. Faith, Hope and Charity parish in Winnetka, IL. The Board recommends Fr. Swade could serve as an Associate Pastor at Sts. Faith, Hope and Charity only if full disclosure is made to the Parish Council, the Principal and the School Board. The Review Board suggested that Fr. Swade could release [Redacted] report to the above-mentioned.

The Board recommends a return to limited ministry only if Fr. Swade agrees to abide by all of the following conditions:

1) Fr. Swade must never be in the presence of a minor without another responsible adult present;

2) Fr. Swade is not allowed to be active with youth groups or organizations;

3) Fr. Swade must continue [Redacted] for as long as deemed necessary by the Review Board;
4) An on-site monitor is required to reside at the parish and report to the Professional Fitness Review Administrator;

5) Fr. Swade's presence at the parish and his compliance with this agreement shall be monitored by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator, the local Episcopal Vicar and the Vicar for Priests;

6) Fr. Swade must live with at least one other adult, and this individual and their residence must be approved by the Professional Fitness Review Administrator;

7) The Archdiocese will provide training for the parish and school staff regarding Fr. Swade's monitoring restrictions;

8) Fr. Swade, the on-site monitor, and the Professional Fitness Review Administrator will discuss, in detail, Fr. Swade's Individual Specific Protocol which he will be expected to follow;

9) Fr. Swade will submit any future requests to modify these restrictions to the Professional Fitness Review Board for consideration, and recommendation from the Board to be sent to the Episcopal Vicar for review and acceptance;

10) The Review Board will conduct a review within ninety (90) days on Fr. Swade's progress and, thereafter, every six (6) months.

The Board recommends the above restrictions be entered into by signed agreement between Fr. Swade and the Archdiocese.

B.

Our next scheduled Board meeting is December 21, 1996.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: October 21, 1995

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:
Bernadette Connolly Thomas Paprocki

A) Matter of 

B) Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

Pursuant to Article , the Review Board initiated a Supplementary Review as requested by T.S. The Board reviewed all oral and written reports, with T.S.'s permission. According to our current policies, T.S.'s situation falls under Article Five - "Return to Ministry", which states that a priest, who was withdrawn from ministry after a Second
Stage review, shall never return to parish ministry or a ministry that includes access to minors. T.S. could be returned to a restricted ministry, but not parish ministry. According to the Administrator, T.S.'s wishes are to return to parish ministry and to live in a rectory. The Board suggested the following:

One, for T.S. to wait until the Commission has finished their final report and, if the policy would be revised, to include that after two years of treatment a priest may return to parish ministry.

Two, that T.S. be assessed by Trinity House as a possible candidate for group therapy.

Three, for the Administrator to meet with T.S. to discuss these issues.

Our next meeting is scheduled for November 18, 1995 at 10:00 AM.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: April 29, 1995

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki          Bernadette Connolly

* At our last Board meeting (4-29-95), we were unable to form a quorum, and so several important matters were postponed until the next meeting. However, the Board discussed several important issues as outlined below.

Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1. Pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry, the Board completed a Supplementary Review on February 18, 1995. Cardinal Bernardin has accepted the Board’s recommendation that T.S. remain withdrawn from ministry.

2. The Cardinal also accepted the recommendation that T.S. should be allowed to work in conducting training workshops addressing racial harmony. The Administrator informed the Board
that Cardinal Bernardin has decided that T.S. will conduct the first workshop himself at St. Victor's Parish. T.S. will be supervised by staff personnel from the Office of Ethnic Ministries.

3. In addition, the Cardinal accepted the Board's recommendation that T.S. would have no involvement with LINK. The Board received  

4. The Board was informed that the Cardinal did not agree that T.S. engage in group therapy based on  

Matter of  

Matter of  

Respectfully
Submitted By
Bernadette Connolly
Acting Professional
Fitness Review Administrator
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: February 18, 1995

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

[Redacted]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

* The Review Board approved formally the Minutes for its January 21, 1995 meeting.

Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1) Pursuant to Article 4.12 of the Review Process For Continuation of Ministry, the Board completed a Supplementary Review.

2) The Board determined that it is reasonable that T.S.’s withdrawal from ministry should continue. Basis: Given all of the circumstances at this time including that the Board previously did not recommend T.S. return to parish ministry or ministry with access to minors in its Second Stage Review of this matter, T.S. should remain under restrictions and receive [Redacted] while being allowed to engage in work activity as recommended by the Board.

3) Recommendations to the Archbishop: T.S. should be allowed work in training adult trainers and/or presenters of the workshop addressing racial harmony which T.S. conducted in the past and described to the Board; T.S. would work in assisting the Archdiocesan Office of Ethnic Ministries' staff in further developing such a workshop training aspect/program as part of the “Decisions” goal for implementation of programs in the area of racial/ethnic harmony; such training by T.S. should be considered a work component of T.S.’s therapeutic treatment program; T.S. should not actually conduct the workshops himself in parishes or otherwise however. T.S.’s work in training adult trainers, etc. should not take place in the presence of minors; T.S. should not provide any training to or in conjunction with the LINK organization as has been previously recommended in this matter; T.S. should also attend group therapy while continuing with his address T.S.’s seeming need to control situations, related to his sexual misconduct with minors’ issue and otherwise.
Report From Vicar for Priests Regarding "Old" Pre-Review Board Cases of Archdiocesan Priests (who have not resigned, died or otherwise left the priesthood) Who Engaged in Sexual Misconduct With Minors:
Matter of
Article 4.7(c) Reports to the Board:
* Miscellaneous Information:*
- It was noted that most Board Members had suggested that March 18, 1995 would be a good meeting date when Office Administrative Assistant Rita Mongan had inquired of Board Members if it was a good meeting date for March; the Administrator asked if the April, 1995 meeting could perhaps be April 29, 1995 in that the Administrator's wife was expecting their second child in early April and that he would be needing to take time-off from work following the child's birth - it was agreed that A.A. Rita would contact Board Members to see if a firm majority could make that date for another Board meeting (later it was determined that a clear majority of the Board can make April 29, 1995 for the April Board meeting so it is now set).

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski-
Administrator

The Review Board unanimously approved these minutes on 3-18-95.
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: November 19, 1994

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

* The Review Board formally approved the Meeting Minutes for the Board meeting of October 15, 1994.

Matter of

Article 4.7(c) Report on
2. Matter of Article 4.7(c) Report on
Update On PFR-43 Matter (T.S.):

The Administrator distributed the Board copies of the Questionnaire answers subsequent to T.S. completing his. T.S. had also released to the Board copies of his final report submitted to the Vicar for Priests from August, 1994 as well, and so the Administrator distributed copies of that to the Board as well. The Administrator suggested the possibility that a Supplementary Review might be initiated in this matter by the Board (although not completed) or that the information at least be received for informational purposes at this point. The Administrator also provided the Board with written and verbal reports related to T.S.'s involvement at the

The Administrator further informed the Board that pursuant to a recent phone conversations with the Vicar for Priests Rev. O'Malley, T.S. had begun who the Administrator had also just been in contact with and would be sending additional information regarding T.S.ʼs situation, and that the Board pursuant to protocol needed to concur with T.S. going to the Administrator distributed copies of the Curriculum Vitae of to the Board; the Administrator also noted that it is the Vicar for Priestsʼ intent to have T.S. get into a 12-Step Group, as a support group, and not for formal therapy, for Archdiocesan priests with issues involving sexual misconduct with minors, which was just starting up; the Administrator noted as well that he had not directly heard from T.S., in that the Vicar had noted that T.S. intended to contact the Administrator in some form to discuss where he is at with himself at this point and what he would be seeking from the Review Board in conjunction with the Vicar having explained to the Administrator that T.S. would be meeting with the Archdiocesan Office of Ethnic Ministries to discuss doing racial workshops with adults and perhaps eventually be under the direction of that Office; the purpose of the workshop would apparently be to attempt to bridge the gap between racial groups as part of implementation of the Decision goals.

(The Administrator cannot definitely recall if he so informed the Board, but Rev. O'Malley had also noted that persons from the LINK organization had asked if T.S. would run a workshop with LINK adult sponsors along the lines of what was just described).
4.

The Administrator then noted that the above activities would probably need to be justified as a "work component" of T.S.'s in that the policy technically does not allow T.S. back into a "restricted" ministry as a possibility even until at least two years of therapeutic treatment had been completed.

The Board’s basic consensus was to urge that the Vicar and Administrator continue with putting the and group work in place with T.S. and suggested that T.S. directly contact the Board/Administrator in terms of what he is seeking and that T.S. himself should take that initiative and if not then the Administrator should inform the Vicar for Priests, that T.S. should be told to at least put his request for what he is seeking in writing for the Board. Regarding the possibility of an in-person presentation by T.S. to the Board or a sub-committee of it, the Board resolved that it will not yet decide that issue until or if the Board receives such a request from T.S. directly. The Board further gave the "okay" for and that the 12-step group approach was also okay to proceed with but that the Board would like to eventually find out more about who is running that group and how it goes although the Board is concerned about allowing T.S. to help to organize such a group rather than to moreso participate in it.

The Board also suggested that if T.S. directly contacts the Administrator, and if not that the Administrator should inform the Vicar, that T.S. should put a hold on the "work component" in after-care treatment with the Office of Ethnic Ministries aspect in that the Board would need to first review and approve it before any such work activity could be allowed.

Rev. Tom Paprocki and Board member noted that in discussing the matter with the Vicar over lunch that it sounded as if T.S. was preparing something/perhaps some written plan and that it may soon be submitted to the Review Board in terms of what T.S. is seeking.

The Board also concurred that the Administrator might contact at some point with a couple of the questions which the Board/Administrator have following its reading of the Questionnaire answers and Final Report (Board member noted to the Administrator that she would like to examine the documents more closely and would likely contact Steve S. with possible further questions for when Steve S. would contact ).

In the meantime, the Board declined to initiate a Supplementary Review in this matter until further information is received.
The Administrator distributed some articles which had recently appeared in the newspaper on the subject of sexual misconduct with minors and the Board was reminded that its next meeting was set for December 17, 1994. The Board suggested that the Administrator ask Rita Mongan to check with Board members for Jan. 21 and Feb. 18, 1995 as possible meeting dates suggested by Steve S. (Addendum: Upon Rita checking subsequent to the meeting with Board members, it appears that a solid majority of Board members could make/prefer Jan. 21, 1995 and Feb. 18, 1995 as the next Board meetings).

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski -
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board

AOC 005592
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD OF THE 
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO 
(Minutes)

DATE: July 16, 1994

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

[Blank]

OTHERS PRESENT:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski
Update on Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1. The Vicar for Priests, Rev. Pat O'Malley, reported to the
Board that T.S. would be completing his [redacted] soon
in [redacted]. The Vicar stated that he intended to speak with
T.S. about the possibility of serving as a chaplain in a local
hospital upon T.S.'s return and that such an assignment might
benefit T.S. The Vicar only requested the Board to consider that
possibility as well as the possibility that perhaps a two or three
person sub-committee of the Review Board might eventually meet with
T.S. to hear his direct viewpoint on his situation. The
Administrator noted to the Board that a Supplementary Review would
first need to be conducted, pursuant to policy, to consider any
requests by T.S. for him to formally return to any form of
"restricted ministry" - also, the Board would want to review
written information as to T.S.'s [redacted] before it
would make any recommendations.
The Administrator distributed copies of the revised Budget for Fiscal Year 1995 to the Board. Following questions on various subjects pertinent to the Budget, the Board formally approved it and directed the Administrator to submit it formally to the appropriate Archdiocesan officials.
Article 4.7(c) Reports to Board:

Miscellaneous Information and Updates on Various Matters:

* The Board took with them copies of the April, 1994 and May,
1994 Review Board Meetings’ Minutes for possible approval at the Board’s August, 1994 meeting in that today’s meeting had run overtime.

The Board settled on its next three meeting dates as 8-27-94, 9-17-94, and 10-15-94.

Respectfully
Submitted By –
Steve Sidlowski –
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

DATE: March 19, 1994

Board Members Present:

Others Present:
Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

The Board formally approved the Minutes of the Review Board Meeting of 2-19-94.

Matter of
Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1. The Administrator provided copies to the Board of the materials released by T.S. to the Board regarding T.S.'s supervision/risk management plan for T.S. through the and that they have agreed to work in conjunction with our Archdiocesan supervision/general protocol expectations and to implement T.S.'s individual protocol. The Board discussed the and provided general assent to the proposed and supervision program.
The Administrator distributed a copy of a very preliminary budget for the Board to review at this point although it was explained that the Budget process is being reviewed and the numbers may change likely before the final Budget is submitted to the Board. Board Member announced to the Board that he has taken a new position as a parish business manager within the diocese of Joliet and requested input from the Board as to whether they found that acceptable for him to continue in his role on the Board. The Board found no objection to continuing in his role in that he is not an employee of the Archdiocese of Chicago which would have prohibited him from continuing on the Board.

The Board confirmed its next meeting is 4-16-94.

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski - Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously Approved By
Review Board
DATE: September 18, 1993

Board Members Present:

Others Present:

Thomas Paprocki
Steve Sidlowski

Matter of
Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1. T.S. matter before Board because Cardinal Bernardin requested clarification of Board’s recommendations regarding T.S.’s continued involvement with LINK and presence within St. Dorothy Parish from Board’s completion of Second Stage Review on 7-24-93.

2. The Board re-iterates its original recommendation to Cardinal Bernardin and directs Administrator to communicate to Cardinal clarification that such recommendation was meant to communicate unequivocally that T.S. should no longer be allowed to continue in ministry in any way with LINK and should not be present in any way within St. Dorothy Parish.

3. Pursuant to Article 4.7(c) of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry, Administrator additionally reported to the Board a new allegation of sexual misconduct against T.S. by an alleged victim who the Vicar for Priests, Rev. Pat O’Malley, informed Administrator about. Administrator informed Board about phone conversation with alleged victim, that she has not formally confirmed all details of allegation/information Administrator received from Vicar for Priests because she intends to obtain an attorney before further conversations with Administrator, and that T.S. has been informed by Administrator about information received to date regarding new allegation, but no formal response has been requested from T.S. until or if alleged victim provides Administrator with formal details of allegation directly. The Board asserted that alleged victim must desire to proceed with Board procedures voluntarily.
Matter of

Status on Allegation Against Un-identified Archdiocesan Priest:

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski
Administrator

Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
Date: July 24, 1993

Board Members Present:

Others Present:

Steve Sidlowski

Matter of

Matter of

Matter of

Matter of
Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1. The Board completed a Second Stage Review in the PFR-43 matter pursuant to Article 4.11 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

2. Determination: It is not reasonable to return T.S. to ministry in view of all the facts and circumstances, giving appropriate consideration to the safety of children and the rights of the priest. Basis: T.S. continues to minimize his sexual misconduct of minors by refusing recommended therapy and continuing work with L.I.N.K. through daily presence for up to 16 hours a day within St. Dorothy Parish (where much of the abuse occurred) with
no effective monitoring in that his protocol requires no call-in provision, one proposed monitor by T.S. refuses to be a monitor and T.S. is aware of this fact, and other proposed monitor by T.S. is supportive of T.S.'s involvement with L.I.N.K.; thus, T.S. continues to have access to minors on daily basis so that minors are at risk of sexual misconduct in the unsupervised presence of T.S.

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: T.S.'s withdrawal from ministry should continue; T.S. should undergo individual therapy as was suggested. The protocol for T.S. should be restricted to at least allow no access to minors at L.I.N.K. or within St. Dorothy Parish by T.S.
Report on Allegation Against Un-identified Archdiocesan Priest:
* The Board further discussed some business matters, including setting next Board meeting for 8-21-93 and meeting beyond that for 9-18-93, both which appeared good for a Board quorum. The 8-27-93 possible meeting date was cancelled because not enough members could attend.

Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski
Administrator

Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
MEETING OF THE REVIEW BOARD
OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
(Minutes)

Date: February 6, 1993

Board Members Present:

Others Present:

Matter of PFR-43 (T.S.):

1. The Board completed a First Stage Review in the PFR-43 matter pursuant to Article 4.9 of the Review Process For Continuation Of Ministry.

2. Determination: There is reasonable cause to suspect that T.S. engaged in sexual misconduct with a minor. Basis: Based upon the allegations involving four minors at the time and T.S.'s basic acknowledgment regarding allegations, minors would be at risk of sexual misconduct in the unsupervised presence of T.S.

3. Recommendations to the Archbishop: T.S.'s withdrawal from his ministerial assignment was appropriate and should remain in effect; T.S.'s protocol for supervision and restriction should remain in effect; additional inquiry should be conducted, which should include requests from T.S. additional to be released to the Board.

4. The Board directed the Administrator to notify Cardinal Bernardin, T.S. and (through his attorney) by letter about outcome of First Stage Review.

* The Board members also discussed the need to set their terms of service to the Board (one, two, or three years) and each Board member and the Administrator signed a pledge of confidentiality regarding cases of clerical sexual misconduct with minors for the Archdiocese of Chicago.
Respectfully
Submitted By
Steve Sidlowski
Administrator

These Minutes Unanimously
Approved By
Review Board
MINUTES

I. Approval of Minutes – September 7, 2002

II. Case Reviews

First Stage Reviews

A. In the Matter of [Redacted]
Second Stage Reviews

D. In the Matter of Rev. Thomas Swade (Withdrawn) – PFR-43

- The Review Board conducted a Second Stage Review regarding the allegation of
  allegations that Rev. Thomas Swade kissed him, rubbed his body, touched and grabbed his genitals under his clothing.

  In light of the information presented, the Review Board determined that there is reasonable cause to suspect that the alleged misconduct occurred.

  The Board recommends that Rev. Thomas Swade be immediately withdrawn from ministry (or that his withdrawal from ministry continue) and that restrictions and monitoring be imposed in accord with Archdiocesan policies and procedures.

  The Board further recommends: stands by decision determined after First Stage Review – reasonable cause to suspect.

- The Review Board conducted a Second Stage Review regarding the allegation of
  allegations that Rev. Thomas Swade touched him and rubbed his genitals through his clothes.

  In light of the information presented, the Review Board determined that there is reasonable cause to suspect that the alleged misconduct occurred.

  The Board recommends that Rev. Thomas Swade be immediately withdrawn from ministry (or that his withdrawal from ministry continue) and that restrictions and monitoring be imposed in accord with Archdiocesan policies and procedures.

  The Board further recommends: confirms reasonable cause as found/determined in 1992.

Cc: Members of the Review Board
    Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to Review Board
    Rev. Thomas Tivy, Vicar for Priests
    Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Professional Fitness Review Board
Saturday, July 20, 2002

MINUTES

Review Board Members Present:

Non-members present:
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board

Non-members absent:
Kathleen Leggidas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator
On medical leave of absence

I. Approval of Minutes of June 15, 2002

II. Case Reviews

A. In the Matter of [Redacted]
B. In the Matter of Rev. Thomas Swade, PFR-43

The Review Board initiated a Second Stage Review in the allegations against Rev. Thomas Swade. Present for this meeting were Fr. Swade and his attorney, William Harte.

Fr. Swade denied any sexual misconduct with anyone. He described his swimming lessons that he gave to other youths, but denies any genital touching.

Mr. Harte then described his personal familiarity with Fr. Swade. He described Fr. Swade as an alcoholic. Mr. Harte also noted that LINK sent out a letter on June 30, 1992 asking its members to come forward if any of them were ever abused by Fr. Swade. A member of LINK, did not come forward for ten years and in fact never mentioned anything over the sixteen year period.

Fr. Swade then went into a lengthy description of his perceived shortcomings of his seminary education and his involvement with the GENESIS II program, which promoted the use of touch in human development. He also described his involvement with the LINK program and his care for his sick mother.

Mr. Harte noted that Fr. Swade acknowledged that he massaged a chest but denied any genital touching of him.

The Board continued the Second Stage Review to read the additional materials presented by Fr. Swade.

Next regularly scheduled meeting is August 17, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

Cc:  Members of the Review Board  
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal's Delegate to Review Board  
Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests  
Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Professional Fitness Review Board  
Saturday, June 15, 2002  

MINUTES  

Review Board Members Present:  

Non-members present:  

Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board  
Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator

I. Approval of Minutes of May 18, 2002

II. Case Reviews

A. In the Matter of [Redacted]

B. In the Matter of [Redacted]
C. In the Matter of 

D. In the Matter of Rev. Thomas Swade – PFR-43

The Review Board conducted a First Stage Review in the matter of Rev. Thomas Swade concerning allegations of [redacted] and [redacted].

The allegation of [redacted] accused Father Swade of misconduct at a parish where he was never assigned and was alleged to have occurred four years before he was ordained. Thus, the Board determined that there was not reasonable cause to suspect this allegation of sexual misconduct with a minor. (However, the Board instructed Kathleen Leggdas, PFRA, to inquire whether this allegation might involve [redacted] Bob Swade, now resigned from ministry.)

The allegation of [redacted] was alleged to have occurred with Father Swade at St. Dorothy Parish involving a swimming lesson Father Swade gave him at the pool at Loyola Academy. [redacted] alleged that when Father Swade instructed him, Father Swade placed his hand under [redacted] swim trunk on his genitals for about two minutes. [redacted] Father Swade remembered giving a swimming lesson to [redacted] and acknowledged that his hand may have accidentally touched [redacted] genitals, but denied any sexual intent.

Father Swade asked for an opportunity to meet with the Review Board, as is his right before the conclusion of the Second Stage Review per policy §1104.3.6.2.

The Board determined by a vote of 7-2 at this First Stage Review that there was reasonable cause to suspect that sexual misconduct occurred with a minor regarding the allegation of [redacted] Father Swade will be permitted to meet with the Review Board at the Second Stage Review for fifteen minutes.

E. In the Matter of 

AOC 005619
K. In the Matter of

L. In the Matter of

M. In the Matter of

Next regularly scheduled meeting is July 20, 2002 at 10:00 a.m.

Cc: Members of the Review Board
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to Review Board
Rev. Larry McBrady, Vicar for Priests
Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Archdiocese of Chicago
Professional Fitness Review Board

Meeting, Saturday, March 20, 1999
10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

MINUTES

Members Present:

Other's Present:
Rev. T. Paprocki, Chancellor
Kathleen Leggidas, PFRA

I. Approval of Minutes:

February 20, 1999 Minutes approved with one correction in spelling for __________.

II. Review Board Matters:
A. __________
Ralph Bonaccorsi and Fr. Larry McBrady, V.P., met with a focus group from Immaculate Conception Parish on North Park. The group was presented with a hypothetical situation (similar to Tom Swade’s, but without identifying him) in which the priest was requesting a return to ministry. The group did not want a priest with this history returned to ministry in their parish. Tom Swade will be informed of group response.
III. Other Matters:

A. New Secretary hired. Laura A. Neri-Palomino from Family Ministries. 13 years in the Archdiocese.

B. 2000 Budget presented to the Board. Approved as presented.

C. Meeting to be set with Archive representative to review files, set up retention schedule, develop form for archiving materials, etc.

Next regularly scheduled meeting is on Saturday, April 17, 1999 at 10:00 a.m.
MINUTES

Members Present: [Redacted]

Others Present: Rev. Thomas Paprocki Kathleen Leggdoes

I. Approval of Minutes given for:
   A. November 21, 1998
   B. December 19, 1998

II. Review Board Matters
   A. [Redacted]
   B. [Redacted]
   C. [Redacted]
D.

E. **Tom Swade, PFR-43**
   Vicar for Priests, Larry McBrady, called regarding an opportunity for TS to say Sunday Masses at Metropolitan Correctional Facility in downtown Chicago. Fr. McBrady accompanied TS to prison and had a positive reaction to people and program.

Board Recommendation for PFRA to write to VP giving support to the proposal and raising the following points for the sake of charity and to protect TS as well as the Archdiocese:

- Question of degree of disclosure to prison official(s) by LMcB.
- Question of protocol of unsupervised contact with minors tried as adults.

F.

G.

H.

III. **Other Matters:**

A. Telephone coverage, pager information shared along with [redacted] letter of retirement. Replacement options discussed as well as time-line, etc.

B. PFRA job responsibility extended to include allegations of sexual misconduct with minors and/or adults for lay employees of the Archdiocese.

*Next regularly-scheduled meeting is February 20, 1999.*
Minutes

Members Present:

Others Present:
Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki
Bernadette Connolly

I. Approval of Minutes
   A. The Review Board formally approved the May 16, 1998 Minutes.

II. Review Board Matters
   A. Matter of

   B. Matter of

   C. Matter of PFR-43, Thomas Swade
      The Administrator shared a letter on Tom Swade from
      The Administrator also informed the Board that a proposal from the
      Vicars' Office will be forthcoming regarding the possibility of Fr. Swade's return to parish
      ministry.

III. Other Matters

Our next regularly-scheduled meeting is July 18, 1998.
MINUTES

Review Board Members Present:

Members absent:

Non-members present:
Leah McCluskey, Professional Responsibility Administrator [PRA]
Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board

I. Approval of Minutes - June 19, 2004

II. Case Reviews

Initial Review
A. In the Matter of

B. In the Matter of

C. In the Matter of
D. In the Matter of

Review for Cause
A. In the Matter of
B. In the Matter of

PRA provided the Board information on the following:
• Rev. Thomas Swade has refused to complete a Dairy Log and providing PRA with a Vacation/Travel Agreement form each time he does not spend the night at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House. The Cardinal has approved a cut to Fr. Swade's salary as a result of his lack of cooperation with the Individual Specific Protocols.
• PRA updated the Board with Cardinal George's decisions based upon their recommendations from the June 19, 2004 meeting

Next scheduled meeting is August 21, 2004 at 9:00 a.m.

Cc: Review Board Members
Rev. Daniel A. Smilanic, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board
Rev. James T. Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Rev. Edward D. Grace, Vicar for Priests
Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I.
Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review

Review Board
Saturday, March 15, 2008 9:00 am to 1:00 pm

MINUTES

Review Board Members Present:

Review Board Members Not Present:

Non-members Present:
Leah McCluskey, Director, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review
Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
Patricia Zacharias, Assistant Director, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review

I. Approval of Minutes -- February 16, 2008
• Minutes approved

• By 9:30am, there were only five members present and it was determined that discussions of the following cases would proceed with the understanding that there would not be a quorum and therefore, no votes could be taken on any of the matters

• Noted that the next Review Board meeting is scheduled for Saturday, April 26, 2008

• Noted that the May 2008 Review Board meeting is cancelled
II. Case Reviews

Initial Review

A. In the Matter of

B. In the Matter of

C. In the Matter of

- [Redacted] will not be present at the June 14, 2008 or September 13, 2008 scheduled Review Board meetings
In the Matter of
E. In the Matter of
Review for Cause

F. In the Matter of
IV. Other Matters

Fr. Smilanic was asked if he could provide an explanation for Rev. Thomas Swade’s life sentence of prayer and penance; as per Fr. Smilanic, the two choices for Fr. Swade’s sentence were either to be out of ministry [laicized] or a life of prayer and penance; when asked, Fr. Smilanic provided the clarification that the Archdiocese of Chicago would continue to provide Fr. Swade with benefits and car insurance.
At the end of the March 15th meeting, it was suggested that a Conference Call be scheduled for March 27, 2008 at 12p with the proposal to have further discussion of the Initial Reviews and the Review for Causes on the March 15th agenda; a quorum would be necessary for the Conference Call to take place; it was requested that Ms. McCluskey type a summary of the March 15th meeting and have copies sent out in packets to all Review Board members to be read in preparation for the suggested Conference Call.

Next scheduled meeting is Saturday, April 26, 2008 at 9:00 a.m.
MINUTES

I. Approval of Minutes – January 19, 2008
   • Minutes approved

II. Case Reviews
   Initial Review
   A. In the Matter of
B. In the Matter of
E. In the Matter of
Review for Cause
G. In the Matter of
III. Canonical Updates

- Swade, Rev. Thomas – Fr. Smilanic reported to the Review Board that Fr. Swade was found guilty in a [canonical] court of appeals and was sentenced to a life of prayer and penance; if Fr. Swade violates the related decree[s], he will be dismissed from the priesthood

IV. Other Matters
I and ^^^^^|will not be present at the scheduled March 15, 2008 Review Board meeting

• ^^^^^^^^B and ^B^^Hwould not be available for a Review Board meeting if it remains scheduled for April 19, 2008

Next scheduled meeting is Saturday, March 15, 2008 at 9:00 a.m.
Review Board Members Present:

Non-members Present:
Leah McCluskey, Director, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review
Rev. Jeffrey Grob, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board - Designate
Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board

- There will be no meeting on December 12, 2009
- There is a possibility that the tentatively scheduled January 23, 2010 meeting will be rescheduled to take place on January 9, 2010
- Report that [redacted] resigned from his position on the Review Board

I. Approval of Minutes – October 17, 2009 and November 2, 2009
   • Minutes approved

II. Case Reviews
    Initial Review
    A. In the Matter of [redacted]
C. In the Matter of Rev. Thomas Swade (Laicized 2009) - PFR-43
The Review Board conducted a Review for Cause of [redacted] allegation of the sexual abuse of a minor against the former Rev. Thomas Swade (please note that in the November 21, 2009 Review Board Agenda, the accused was incorrectly identified as Robert Swade). A summary of the allegation is as follows: Fr. Swade disrobed, forced [redacted] to disrobe, and then sodomized [redacted] similar incidents happened more than once, but less than 10 times.

Ms. McCluskey provided the Review Board with a verbal overview of and update of the investigation of this matter.

In a 7-0 vote and one member abstaining (one of the Board members needed to leave the meeting early and was not present when this matter was considered) in light of the information presented, the Board determined that this matter warrants additional investigation.

III. Other Matters
• Introduction of new Review Board members: [redacted]
• 10:30 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.: introductions between Revs. John Collins and Vincent Costello, Vicars for Priests, and the Review Board
• 12:15 p.m.: Francis Cardinal George, O.M.I. to swear in [Redacted] as new members of the Review Board

Next tentatively scheduled meeting is Saturday, January 9, 2010 from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUMMARY TIME LINE OF ALLEGATION</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACCUSED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Birth:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current age:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of civil attorney:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Ordination [of accused]:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at ordination:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assignment location of accused:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Status of accused:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of canonical advocate:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date allegation received:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date allegation formalized:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of initial incident of alleged abuse:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brief summary of alleged abuse: [Redacted] sought out Fr. Swade when his parents [Redacted] and Fr. Swade [Redacted] swam, and took showers together; mutual administration of lotion on backs, buttocks, and thighs; [Redacted] called diocese and presented allegation; diocesan investigation

Brief summary and date of response from accused:

Stage of disposition by Review Board: not presented to the Review Board; substantiated by an Administrative Review

Additional allegations made by accuser: None
ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED

Name of accuser: [Redacted]
Date of Birth: [Redacted]
Current age: 43

Name of civil attorney: Jeff Anderson

Date allegation received: 7/6/92
Date allegation formalized: 6/25/02
Date of initial incident of alleged abuse: 1978
Date of last incident of alleged abuse:

Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse: more than one

Brief summary of alleged abuse: touching and rubbing genitals through clothes; diocesan investigation

Brief summary and date of response from accused:

Stage of disposition by Review Board: 10/02—Concluded, reasonable cause to suspect the alleged misconduct occurred

Additional allegations made by accuser: None
**ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of accuser:</th>
<th>[Redacted]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date of Birth:</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age:</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of civil attorney:</td>
<td>[Redacted]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date allegation received:</td>
<td>5/10/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date allegation formalized:</td>
<td>6/13/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of initial incident of alleged abuse:</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of last incident of alleged abuse:</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse:</td>
<td>more than one</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief summary of alleged abuse:** kissing, rubbing body, touching, grabbing genitals under clothing; diocesan investigation

**Brief summary and date of response from accused:** 6/14/02; Fr. Swade denied the allegation

**Stage of disposition by Review Board:** 10/02—Concluded, reasonable cause to suspect the alleged misconduct occurred

**Additional allegations made by accuser:** None
ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED

Name of accuser: [redacted]

Date of Birth:

Current age:

Name of civil attorney:

Date allegation received: 7/1/92

Date allegation formalized: 7/31/92

Date of initial incident of alleged abuse: 1982

Date of last incident of alleged abuse: 1988

Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse: Two

Brief summary of alleged abuse: Fr. Swade worked his hands across stomach of [redacted] into the pants to feel minor's private parts; Fr. Swade grabbed [redacted] penis while exchanging swimming suits and both were naked

Brief summary and date of response from accused:

Stage of disposition by Review Board:

Additional allegations made by accuser: None

AOC 005656
ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED

Name of accuser: [Redacted]

Date of Birth: [Redacted]

Current age: 57

Name of civil attorney: Jeff Anderson

Date allegation received: 6/1/02

Date allegation formalized: 6/7/02

Date of initial incident of alleged abuse: 1956

Date of last incident of alleged abuse: 

Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse: 

Brief summary of alleged abuse: Fr. Swade urged [Redacted] to close her eyes and put her hands on his penis and ejaculating; masturbation in front of her.

Brief summary and date of response from accused: 6/14/02; Fr. Swade denied the allegation

Stage of disposition by Review Board: allegation unsubstantiated

Additional allegations made by accuser: None
ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED

Name of accuser: [Redacted]

Date of Birth: [Redacted]

Current age: [Redacted]

Name of civil attorney: N/A

Date allegation received: 7/6/92

Date allegation formalized: 7/6/92

Date of initial incident of alleged abuse: 1977

Date of last incident of alleged abuse: [Redacted]

Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse: [Redacted]

Brief summary of alleged abuse: third party allegation reported by mother on behalf of her daughter; daughter visiting Fr. Swade in rectory; waiting in Fr. Swade's room for him and cleric came out of bathroom without any clothes on

Brief summary and date of response from accused: no investigation by archdiocese; therefore not presented to Fr. Swade

Stage of disposition by Review Board: see above

Additional allegations made by accuser: None
ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED

Name of accuser: [Redacted]

Date of Birth: 

Current age: 

Name of civil attorney: N/A

Date allegation received: 9/1/93

Date allegation formalized: 9/3/93

Date of initial incident of alleged abuse: 1983

Date of last incident of alleged abuse: 1984

Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse: more than one

Brief summary of alleged abuse: stroking and penetration of vagina with finger under swimming bathing suit.

Brief summary and date of response from accused: no investigation by archdiocese; therefore not presented to Fr. Swade

Stage of disposition by Review Board: matter investigated prior to existence of Review Board; diocesan investigation—Fr. Swade not to be present within parish in any way

Additional allegations made by accuser: None

AOC 005659
ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS AGAINST ACCUSED

Name of accuser: [redacted]

Date of Birth: 

Current age: 

Name of civil attorney: N/A

Date allegation received: 6/30/06

Date allegation formalized: 7/5/06; Ralph Bonaccorsi from Assistance Ministry spoke with [redacted] who indicated he would contact PRA to schedule a time to formalize his allegation; no contact from [redacted] received to date

Date of initial incident of alleged abuse: 1980s

Date of last incident of alleged abuse: 1980s

Approximate number of incidents of alleged abuse: unknown

Brief summary of alleged abuse: third party allegation reported by priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago to Assistance Ministry;

Brief summary and date of response from accused: no allegation to present to Fr. Swade

Stage of disposition by Review Board: see above

Additional allegations made by accuser: None

Signature of Director: [signature] Date: 4/12/07
MEMORANDUM

To: File

From: Leah McCluskey, Office for Child Abuse Investigation and Review

Re: Swade, Rev. Thomas [Retired/Withdrawn]

Date: February 23, 2007

Rev. Thomas Swade faxed the attached Travel/Vacation Notification to this office on February 22, 2007, which was the same start date of his proposed travel.

I called the phone number listed on the Travel/Vacation Notification form in attempts to speak with [redacted], the chaperone listed by Fr. Swade. When I called the number [redacted], an adult male answered the phone. I asked to speak with [redacted] and received the immediate gruff response, "Who's calling?" I identified myself and stated that I worked for the Archdiocese of Chicago and that I needed to speak with her. The male then stated, "This is Fr. Swade." He appeared irritated as he continued by asking me, "Why are you calling this number?" I pointed out to Fr. Swade that I had just received his travel form that same day, even though he has been directed to turn in such a form up to three weeks prior to his planned travel. Fr. Swade took much time to adamantly express that he had to stay overnight at his family home in Cicero, as the next day was a priest prayer day and he needed to pick up another priest the next morning at 8:45 am. He stated that as a result, he had to stay in Cicero, as it would not be convenient for him to stay overnight in Mundelein and then be able to pick up the other priest early in the morning the next day. I reminded Fr. Swade that regardless of where he needed to be the next day, the travel forms are to be in my office three weeks prior to the planned departure. Fr. Swade forcefully responded that he did not know until 9:00 am that day that he had to pick up the other priest early the next morning. It was clear to me that Fr. Swade did not understand my issue with him faxing a travel form the same day that he had planned to be away from the retreat house overnight.
Fr. Swade continued by addressing his issues with me calling the phone number [which evidently is to his family's home in Cicero], which I again informed him that it was the only phone number that he had listed on the travel form and that I needed to speak with [name]. Seemingly missing the point, Fr. Swade expressed his certainty that it was my fault that I had given him an incorrect travel form [one that did not require the contact number for the chaperone]. I did not engage in a debate about the travel form with Fr. Swade and told him that I needed to speak with [name] to ensure that she knew that he was there and that he had listed her as the chaperone. Fr. Swade responded by saying, “Well you have her phone number, don’t you?” I again reminded Fr. Swade that the only phone number that he provided on his travel form was the number that I had called and reached him at his home. I then asked Fr. Swade for [name]’s phone number, to which he sighed and sounded irritated when he remarked, “I’ll have to look it up.” Fr. Swade then gave me [name]’s phone number [number].

After hanging up with Fr. Swade, I called and reached [name]. I asked her if she knew that Fr. Swade was staying overnight at the home in Cicero that evening, to which she replied that she did not. When asked, [name] stated that she would be home that evening and understood her responsibilities as Fr. Swade’s chaperone and his restrictions. [name] then remarked, “I’m sure he’ll [Fr. Swade] call me shortly.” I took this to mean that [name] seemed to think that she would get a phone call from Fr. Swade informing her that he would be staying there that evening.

After speaking with [name], I called and spoke with Rev. Vincent Costello, Vicar for Priests to advise him of the aforementioned information. Fr. Costello asked that I type up the series of phone calls concerning Fr. Swade for all respective files.

I told Fr. Swade that I had wanted to talk to him anyway, as I had just received his travel form the same day and pointed out that he obviously had already traveled. I added that as he knows, he is to turn in a travel form to my office three weeks prior to his scheduled departure.

Cc: Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
    Rev. Edward D. Grace, Vicar for Priests
    Jimmy Lago, Chancellor
    Deacon Richard Hudzik, Cardinal Stritch Retreat House
IN THE NAME OF THE MOST HOLY TRINITY. AMEN.

Considering that beginning in 1992, the Professional Responsibility Board, earlier-titled the Professional Fitness Review Board, of the Archdiocese of Chicago found on several occasions that multiple allegations of sexual misconduct with minors against the Rev. Thomas Swade were credible and that he was removed from public ministry;

Given that when a Preliminary Investigation found that the allegations did have the required semblance of truth the matter was commended to the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith as required by US Norm 6 and Article 13 of the Procedural Norms of Sacramentorum Sanctitatis Tutela, that on July 26, 2003 the aforementioned Congregation directed that a formal canonical process be initiated with the Rev. Thomas Swade as the reus, that on February 2, 2006 a Tribunal in First Instance found him guilty of several grave violations of the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue with minors, and that he appealed against the decision to the aforementioned Congregation;

Troubled by the credible reports that the Archdiocese has received concerning the daily, solitary, prolonged absence of the Rev. Thomas Swade from his designated supervised residence, the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House in Mundelein, Illinois and more troubled by the credible information that when he is away overnight he is not realistically present to his travel chaperone;

Gravely concerned about the safety of children, about the scandal caused to the faithful of the Archdiocese of Chicago in recent years by the sexual abuse of minors by clerics, and about the diminishment of the credibility of the Church before the general population of this metropolitan area by the skepticism concerning the supervision of those who have been removed from public ministry because of violations of the Sixth Commandment of the Decalogue with minors,

Heedful that the Rev. Thomas Swade had been admonished about his questionable compliance with the Individual Specific Protocols and thus he has been cited, that the Promoter of Justice in this matter, the Rev. Daniel A. Smilanic JCD, has been consulted, that it is of a pressing necessity to prevent scandal and for his own security that he comply with the specifications of his residence, and that in accord with Canons 281 and 1350 his canonical maintenance and sustenance is provided at the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House in Mundelein, Illinois;

Having reviewed the norm of Canon 1722 which empowers the Ordinary to exclude the accused from the sacred ministry, from ecclesiastical office and function, to impose or forbid residence in some place or territory, and to prohibit public participation in the Most Holy Eucharist in order to prevent scandals, to protect the freedom of witnesses and to guard the course of justice, I, the Very Reverend John Canary, Vicar General of the Archdiocese of Chicago, invoking Canon 1722 do hereby require that when the Rev. Thomas Swade is away overnight from the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House, he is to be at the same physical location during the night as his designated chaperone. Understanding that the Rev. Thomas Swade may not be immediately physically present to his chaperone, he is to be morally present to him. That is to say, overnight the Rev. Thomas Swade must be at the same geographic site as his chaperone; they must be at the same real estate location. Overnight, if the Rev. Thomas Swade and his chaperone are at two different US Post Office addresses or at two unrelated places with distinct accesses, then he is violation of this decree. Moreover, he is to be reminded that he must be in complete compliance with his Individual Specific Protocol and the Travel/Vacation Notification. If the Rev. Thomas Swade is found to have violated the specifications of this decree, then a reduction in his salary will be considered.

This decree is effective immediately. I direct that this decree be communicated without delay to the Rev. Thomas Swade, to his Canonical Advocate and to his Civil Legal Counsel. I further direct that as a binding notification, this decree be appended to his Individual Specific Protocol.

Very Reverend John Canary,
Vicar General, Archdiocese of Chicago

December 19, 2006
From: Leah McCluskey
To: Costello, Vincent; Grace, Edward; Hudzik, Richard
Date: 12/15/2006 3:33:42 PM
Subject: Re: Swade logs

Dick,

Ah yes--does the fun ever end?!

The Vicars, Fr. Smilanic, and hopefully Carol Fowler to discuss Fr. Swade's Daily Log issues...and to look at updating forms and such for all. I will let you know the outcome--or at least keep you up to date!

Leah

Folks:

FYI:

Tom Swade turned in another two logs which omitted reference to being away overnight. I gave him a note asking him to have the logs reflect an overnight stay. He initially said I had previously told him he didn't have to do that. That is not truthful. He and I have had conversations about his absence away without benefit of a signed travel report. On such occasions, I have acknowledged to him the obvious--I can't make him not go anywhere but that the absence would be reported (as it has).

Moreover, when Tom tells me he is going to be away other than as reported previously to Leah, I always thank him for letting me know and remind him that it is not I who gives him "permission" or signs the travel forms. That is Leah's office. He persists in not understanding my conversations with him on this score. In any event, he did return the forms indicating "overnight" on November 30 and December 2, which previously were not so completed.

I also noted to him that I do not have any reports for his time away in November. I was informed that he has never provided reports when he is away from Stritch but at his home. I responded that I was not aware there was any distinction to be made between being out of town and being at one's home--both required completion of the logs. I do not expect I will be receiving logs for the November time away.

This email is not to suggest that there is any hostility in these exchanges with Tom. It is all politely accomplished-- but perhaps polite with gritted teeth.

Advent greetings to all (yes, I am being ironic).

Dick

Deacon Richard F. Hudzik
Director
Cardinal Stritch Retreat House
P.O. Box 455
Mundelein, IL 60060-0455
www.stritchretreat.org
tel 847.566.8060
fax 847.566.8082

CC: Smilanic, Daniel
December 15, 2004

Rev. Thomas J. Swade
P.O. Box 455
Mundelein, IL 60060

Dear Father Swade,

As the Advent season draws to a close, we do hope this time of waiting on the promise of God has been a fruitful experience for you. We want you to know that you are in our prayers during this time as we remember God's saving love. May your Christmas be blessed with God's special presence.

We regret that we need to address an unpleasant issue regarding your monitoring protocol. We are aware that the following conditions of the protocol have not been fulfilled, namely,

- Neglecting to submit a daily log to the Professional Responsibility Administrator
- Completion of travel/vacation agreement forms when you are not present at your residence overnight

Efforts have been made to bring the above items to your attention, with the intent that you comply to these portions of the protocol, but to no avail. For that reason, we are informing you that your salary of $22,023 will be reduced by 10%, effective January 1, 2005. Should you wish clarification, please do not hesitate to contact us.

May the God of the New Year be with you.

Sincerely, in Christ's peace,

[Signature]
Rev. James T. Kaczorowski
Vicar for Priests

[Signature]
Leah McCluskey
Professional Responsibility

Cc: Francis Cardinal George, O M I
Rev. George Rassas, Vicar General
Dr. Carol Fowler, Director of Personnel Services
Sr. Francine Quillan, PBVM, JCL, Canonical Advocate
Rev. Daniel Smilac, Adjutant Judicial Vicar
MEMORANDUM

To: File - PFR-43
From: Leah McCluskey, Professional Responsibility Administrator
Re: Swade, Rev. Thomas [Withdrawn]
Date: November 30, 2004

PRA and Rev. James T. Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests traveled to the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House on November 29, 2004 to meet with Rev. Thomas Swade. Fr. Kaczorowski arranged the meeting with Fr. Swade to discuss his lack of compliance with the current Monitoring Protocols. Specifically, Fr. Swade has chosen not to complete a daily log, provide PRA with a Travel/Vacation Agreement form, or to sign his Individual Specific Monitoring Protocol.

Fr. Swade was extremely vocal and at times seemingly agitated during the November 29th meeting.

Fr. Kaczorowski began by informing Fr. Swade that he would be receiving a letter from Cardinal George in the near future informing him that his current salary will be cut 10% as a result of his non-compliance with the aforementioned monitoring protocols. Fr. Swade verbally and visually expressed his disagreement with the monitoring protocols, specifically the Daily Log and the Travel/Vacation Agreement forms.

As the discussion continued, PRA clarified for Fr. Swade that as stated in the current Individual Specific Monitoring Protocols that he has in his possession, he is asked to complete a Daily Log as well as a Travel/Vacation Agreement form each time he spends the night anywhere outside of the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House. Fr. Swade expressed his negative feelings toward the Daily Log forms and their insignificance. As for the Travel/Vacation Agreement forms, Fr. Swade stated that he has "permission from the Review Board" to stay at his family home in Cicero, Illinois every Sunday night. In response to his statement, PRA referred Fr. Swade to the last meeting that took place of all present in January 2004. PRA again informed Fr. Swade that despite what arrangements were made between him, the past Professional Fitness Review Administrator Kathleen Leggdas, and/or the Review Board concerning his
overnights in Cicero, such arrangements have not been valid since June 2002 [United
Conference of Catholic Bishops in Dallas, Texas]

Further, PRA reminded Fr Swade that as discussed in January 2004, he had been asked
to cooperate with the current Individual Specific Monitoring Protocols and complete a
Travel/Vacation Agreement form for each occasion when he would not spend the night at
the Cardinal Stritch Retreat House. PRA also explained to Fr Swade that completing the
Travel/Vacation Agreement form included identifying the name and contact information
of his acting monitor when he was overnight somewhere other than the retreat house. Fr
Swade was then provided with the example that an identified acting monitor would be
able to be contacted by PRA to ensure his/her understanding of the role of monitor

At the end of the meeting where Fr Kaczorowski advised Fr Swade as his Vicar to
comply with the Individual Specific Monitoring Protocols, Fr Swade stated that he
would discuss the matter with his canonical advocate, Sr Francine Quillin, PBVM, JCL

Cc  Rev Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
     Rev James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Memorandum

To: File – PFR-43
From: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator
Re: Rev. Thomas Swade Response to Allegation of
Date: June 14, 2002

Present at Meeting:

Rev. Thomas Swade, Accused
Mr. William Harte, Attorney
Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
Kathleen Leggdas, Professional Fitness Review Administrator [PFRA]

Allegation by [redacted] was presented in detail. TS acknowledged knowing [redacted] through LINK and acknowledged that his style was to hug everybody. There was no kissing.

TS took top LINK students to four colleges for orientation and connection to good schools. [redacted] was accepted to [redacted] but reneged on his commitment to attend. TS was very angry because this jeopardized other program members.

Annually, the teen club went to Loyola for a swim party. TS often taught the teens to swim. They would go to shallow end of the pool and he would place his hand under back and on abdomen to support swimmers on their backs. They would then kick and eventually incorporate arm movements into swim efforts. There may have been contact when swimmer was kicking but there was no touching or fondling genitals under swim trunks.

Genesis II group in which TS participated was a program about spiritual growth through human growth. Growth was the product of affirmation, affirmation was best communicated by touch, intimacy (hugging). This was the rationale for his style of ministry.

In 1992 letters were sent to all St. Dorothy Parishioners and LINK students. No one came forward.

Cc: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Cardinal’s Delegate to the Review Board
    Rev. James Kaczorowski, Vicar for Priests
    Victim Assistance Ministry
    John O’Malley, Legal Services
Memorandum

To: File -PFR-43
From: Laura A. Neri-Palomino, Administrative Assistant
Re: Rev. Thomas Swade
Review Board Meeting – Second Stage Review
Date: July 30, 2002

A summary of the discussion from the Professional Fitness Review Board Meeting on July 20, 2002:

The Review Board initiated a Second Stage Review in the allegations of sexual misconduct against Rev. Thomas Swade. Present for this meeting were Fr. Swade and his attorney, William Harte.

Fr. Swade denied any sexual misconduct with unspecified victims. He described his swimming lessons that he gave unspecified youths, but denies any genital touching.

Mr. Harte then described his personal familiarity with unspecified victims. He described unspecified victims as an alcoholic. Mr. Harte also noted that LINK sent out a letter on June 30, 1992 asking its members to come forward if any of them were ever abused by Fr. Swade. Unspecified victims did not come forward for ten years and in fact never mentioned anything over the sixteen year period that unspecified victims

Fr. Swade then went into a lengthy description of his perceived shortcomings of his seminary education and his involvement with the GENESIS II program, which promoted the use of touch in human development. He also described his involvement with the LINK program and his care for his sick mother.

Mr. Harte noted that unspecified victims

Fr. Swade acknowledged that he massaged unspecified victims chest but denied any genital touching of him.

The Board continued the Second Stage Review to read the additional materials presented by Fr. Swade.
Memorandum

To: File -PFR-43

From: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator

Re: Rev. Thomas Swade

Date: July 9, 2002

Summary of the discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board Meeting on June 15, 2002:

The Review Board conducted a First Stage Review in the matter of Rev. Thomas Swade concerning allegations of

The allegation of accused Father Swade of misconduct at a parish where he was never assigned and was alleged to have occurred four years before he was ordained. Thus, the Board determined that there was not reasonable cause to suspect this allegation of sexual misconduct with a minor. (However, the Board instructed Kathleen Leggdas, PFRA, to inquire whether this allegation might involve , now resigned from ministry.)

The allegation of was alleged to have occurred with Father Swade at St. Dorothy Parish involving a swimming lesson Father Swade gave him at the pool at Loyola Academy. alleged that when Father Swade instructed him, Father Swade placed his hand under swim trunk on his genitals for about two minutes. remembered giving a swimming lesson to and acknowledged that his hand may have accidentally touched genitals, but denied any sexual intent.

Father Swade asked for an opportunity to meet with the Review Board, as is his right before the conclusion of the Second Stage Review per policy §1104.3.6.2.

The Board determined by a vote of 7-2 at this First Stage Review that there was reasonable cause to suspect that sexual misconduct occurred with a minor regarding the allegation of Father Swade will be permitted to meet with the Review Board at the Second Stage Review for fifteen minutes.
Dear Sir/Madam:

The person identified below has applied for federal employment, and has given your name as a personal reference or as a present or former supervisor or employer.

We must rely on persons such as yourself to help us determine whether applicants meet the requirements for good character and unquestionable loyalty to the United States Government. Therefore, we ask that you complete the form on the back side of this letter. Please be entirely frank, and answer all questions as fully and specifically as you can. All information given will be kept strictly confidential.

If possible, please return the letter and form within seven days. If you should have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (312) 322-0567. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

NAME OF APPLICANT: Rev. Thomas Smith
SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER: [Redacted]
DATE OF BIRTH: [Redacted]
DATES OF EMPLOYMENT CLAIMED: [Redacted]
TITLE OF JOB APPLYING FOR: [Redacted]

(See attached)
**INQUIRY CONCERNING APPLICANT FOR EMPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON CONTACTED (NAME)</th>
<th>TFER. LAWRENCE P. McBRAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. **How has your knowledge of this applicant been obtained?** (Circle) EMPLOYER SUPERVISOR CO-WORKER FRIEND

2. **How long have you known the applicant?** 20 yrs

3. **Title of applicant's last position with you:** DIRECTOR: RACIAL/Ethnic Sensitivity

4. **Title of applicant's duties in position identified in item #3:** Directing Programs to Racial/Ethnic Awareness

5. **Number of employees supervised:** Two

6. **Brief description of applicant's duties in position identified in item #3:**

7. **Evaluation of applicant's performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please check the appropriate column</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Satisfactory</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Dependability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Ability to work harmoniously with others</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ability to supervise others</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Amount of acceptable work produced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Overall skill in his/her work</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Attendance (see item B)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **If item 7F is rated "Below Average", is the rating attributable to:**

   a. Tardiness
   b. Unexcused absences
   c. Excessive leave requests

9. **If circumstances permitted would you:**

   a. Employ or re-employ him/her without hesitation
   b. Prefer him/her over most
   c. Prefer not to hire him/her

10. **Reason applicant gave for leaving:**

11A. **To your knowledge has he/she ever been terminated/resigned in lieu of termination from a job because of misconduct or unsatisfactory performance?** (If yes, please complete 11B.-11D.) No

11B. **Name and address of employer:**

   CATHOLIC BISHOP OF CHICAGO, PO BOX 1979, CHICAGO 60680

11C. **Reason for termination or resignation:** DNA

11D. **To your knowledge was the applicant notified as to the reason?** DNA

12. **Do you have any reason to question this person's loyalty to the United States?** Yes

13. **Do you have any reason to believe this person belongs or has belonged to any communist or fascist organization, or to any organization which advocates overthrowing or altering our constitutional form of government by force or other illegal means?** Yes

14. **To your knowledge does this person associate, or has associated with any person, whose loyalty to the United States is questionable or belongs to any type of organization described in #13?** Yes

15. **Do you have any knowledge of any behavior, activities or association which tend to show that this person is not reliable, honest, trustworthy, and of good conduct and character?** Yes

16. **Do you have any information indicating this person's employment would be against the interest of national security?** Yes

17. **Do you have any knowledge that applicant's performance on the job is adversely affected by the use of alcoholic beverages, narcotics, marijuana, or other drugs?** Yes

18. **Do you recommend this individual for employment in the Federal Government in a sensitive position?** Yes

19. **Use this space and additional space if necessary, to supply any other pertinent information or explanation you may have in connection with the above answered questions.**

**Form completed by (signature/date):**

---

**AOC 005675**
MEMORANDUM

TO  Fr Ray Baumhart

FR  Fr Larry McBrady

DT  November 30, 1999

RE  Fr Tom Swade

I am writing to ask that you give consideration to the possibility of placing Tom Swade on the payroll of the Office for Ethnic Ministries beginning in the new fiscal year. Since Tom is now working full time in that area, I believe such a change will serve as a further indication that he has re-entered full-time ministry. It would also be very helpful for the budget of the Professional Fitness Review administrator!

Ray, I would be very happy to discuss this matter with you in person if it would be helpful. Thank you for giving this matter your consideration.

Larry, I have no difficulty with this. There will be no real increase in the money spent by the Archdiocese; the money will come out of a different pocket. I’d include it in the budget of Social and Ethnic Services.

Ray
On Sunday, March 7, 1999, Ralph Bonaccorsi and I conducted a focus session with a number of parishioners at Immaculate Conception Parish (North Park Avenue). In a two hour conversation the parishioners grappled quite seriously with the issues, but in the end, they felt there was too great a risk and recommended that Tom not be given an assignment in any parish.

It should be noted here that Tom's case was presented anonymously and the details of the past incidences were discussed in detail. Pat Lee and I saw our parish as a good site for Tom's limited re-entry because the church area is so compact and there would be adequate monitoring. This is not to indicate that I see Tom as a risk because I most certainly do not. Rather, Pat and I saw this as Tom's best chance to engage in some form of parish ministry. The people, however, just were not open to the idea and there was a good deal of emotion and fear at the mere thought of someone like Tom coming to the parish. I was surprised by the intensity of the feelings in view of the fact that it was made clear to the participants that Tom had never engaged in any kind of overtly sexual act.

Perhaps one of the most interesting moments in the meeting came when a medical doctor pushed the issue as to why such a priest would want to return to ministry after having violated a major trust. Why would he want to come to the parish with so many limitations attached? How would he have any credibility as a preacher? The doctor also pointed to the fact that Tom has a viable ministry. Why is that not enough?

A total of fifteen people participated in this focus group. Six were men and nine were women. They ranged in age from being in their 30’s through the 70’s. The group was composed of blacks, whites and Asians. The overall education level was college graduate.

On March 16th I met with the Cardinal to report on this meeting and to indicate to him that, in light of this discussion, I saw very little hope that any priest who has been previously been removed from parish ministry can be returned even on a very limited basis. These findings are consistent with what I have learned at the last two summer gatherings of Vicars for Priests from...
around the country. There just is no indication that people want these priests in any situation where young people are present. They seem to support the priest’s right to continue in ministry, but in a ministry that does not include parish.

On March 15th Ralph and I shared these conclusions with Tom Swade. It was painful for Tom to listen to the feedback and it is my belief that Tom will continue to pursue various ways of seeking re-entry into parish.
If you think you know the person — please don’t mention name.

This is an open-ended discussion. No decision anticipated.

All information will be forwarded to Archdiocese.

Priest: ordained in the 1960s
highly respected by peers
all incidents took place in 70s & early 80s

allegation: June 5, 1992 -- removed from ministry.
25 year-old when he was 13-19.
Denied any sexual intent

Parish was notified. In time, six others came forward:
close physical contact, hugging, lying on each other face-to-face
in one case, during tracing of circulatory system, penis was
exposed. Touching of genitals during swimming lessons. He
denies this and denies any sexual intent. In sixth case: claims to
have seen him naked coming from the shower.

DCFS & State’s Attorney’s Office both notified -- no action
taken.

Protocol:
- not alone with anyone under 18
- no work with youth groups
- reugular spiritual direction
- monitored living situation

Why a protocol, if he is not a threat?
His Insistence? What does that mean?
Major Trust Broken
why welcome with limitations
how to recover credibility? - especially in family
Consequences - he has a ministry
how to compartmentalize his ministry
Taking Comm. is an intimate encounter?
Does he have self-knowledge enough?
my family exp. & parish exp. are the same - what can I use
what would it cost or to to do this?
one AA & one abuse

was been long process
30's - 70's
black, white & asian
Over the last months Tom has continued to push for a return to public ministry. In the light of Tom's loss of the Anawim Center (after negative publicity spawned by Tom Economos) it seems more unlikely that Tom will be returned to a parish any time soon.

Recently, a new possibility emerged. The full-time chaplain at the Metropolitan Correctional Center, Rev. Ron Walker, is looking for a Catholic priest for Sunday services. They need a priest available each Sunday to celebrate three Masses between the hours of 8 - 11 a.m. (There is a Mass for men, a Mass for women and a Mass for those in protective custody, witness protection program etc.).

Tom and I visited the facility on Wednesday, December 23 and met with Chaplain Walker. There is no one in the facility under the age of 18. All movement by visitors is monitored by cameras. Chaplain Walker oversees all those attending Mass to make sure there are no problems. In other words, Tom would be in a highly monitored situation.

Tom is definitely interested in this position. As part of the application process he will be photographed, finger printed and there will be a criminal background check. (This will not be a problem for Tom because he was never arrested and there was no contact with the State's Attorney's Office). Tom shared with Chaplain Walker his removal from parish ministry after a boundary violation with another male. Tom also gave a brief description of the programs in which he has participated and the self knowledge he has come to in an attempt to move beyond the problems of the past.

Chaplain Walker said he appreciated Tom's candor and trust. I stated, that as a representative of the Archdiocese, I could attest to Tom's efforts and assured the chaplain that Tom is permitted to function as a priest. We asked the chaplain if he had any questions. He did not. He said that he felt no need to share this information with his superiors and, since he will be Tom's supervisor, this notification seemed both adequate and appropriate. Before leaving the facility, I gave the chaplain my card and urged him to contact me if he had any further questions. In this way I was attempting to give him an opportunity to speak to me privately if, upon further reflection, he had some concerns or wants additional information.

On Monday, December 28, Dan Coughlin and I met with Cardinal George. I reported on Tom’s opportunity to serve at the MCC. I explained the content of the interview with Chaplain Walker stressing that I had not shared any information about the media attention that has plagued Tom. The Cardinal wanted some
assurance that we had been candid with the chaplain and, in the end, seemed satisfied and then responded by saying the officials at the MCC should know what’s on tv news. I told the Cardinal that I saw this offer to serve at MCC as Tom’s only opportunity for Sunday ministry and I felt certain that if I were to raise the media issue, the matter would be sent on to the warden where it could possibly be rejected. I also said I was prepared to take the heat for this if the matter were to draw media attention. (The Cardinal was dismissive on this latter point).

The Cardinal feels we should move ahead with the plan in the hope that media coverage will not become an issue. He wants to see Tom in some form of ministry and knows the parish (any parish) is unlikely. The Cardinal approved Tom’s ministry at MCC saying he favors taking the risk of possible media exposure.

After the meeting with the Cardinal concluded, Dan Coughlin and I discussed the matter further. We reasoned that because PCAC is an advisory body to the Vicars for Priests and the Cardinal, there was no need to bring this to their attention. The Cardinal and the two of us have ascertained this is worth doing. I will discuss this with Kathleen Leggadas — in the same way the Anawim Center was brought to Bernadette Connolly’s attention. Tom and I will meet with Jim Vodak to surface questions that might be asked by the media if they were to find out about Tom’s service at MCC. Jim Vodak’s goal is to have an “offensive” plan in effect describing the good reports Tom has received from people like

Rev. Ron Walker:
MEMO

TO: File
FROM: Larry McBrady
DATE: August 24, 1998
RE: Rev Tom Swade

Last Friday I met with Cardinal George to discuss Tom Swade’s situation. The Cardinal and I determined that his situation would be reviewed this summer. I informed the Cardinal about discussions that have been taking place at recent PCAC meetings relative to giving Tom an opportunity to serve in a parish as week-end Mass help. In light of the failure of our attempt to get Tom into Faith, Hope and Charity, we are now thinking along the lines of introducing him in the limited capacity of week-end help. The cardinal was open to this idea. I told the Cardinal that my specific recommendation is that Tom be allowed to begin helping with Masses at Immaculate Conception Parish (North Park). As Vicar for Priests, I feel I would be in an excellent position to handle the supervision requirements when Tom came over for Mass. Also, this proposal has the complete endorsement of Patrick Lee, the pastor of Immaculate Conception. The church area (including the sacristy) is quite public and Tom would always be in a situation where adults were present.

The Cardinal indicated he would “sign off” on this proposal and he liked the idea that Tom would be helping with Mass but would still be living at the Jesuit residence. I reiterated that this is a first step in trying to gain Tom some aspect of public ministry.

I assured the Cardinal that Tom has made an excellent recovery and continues to be faithful to his protocol. He is not seen as being a possible risk in this situation. The Cardinal was totally supportive of the way we propose handling this and said he felt it was just for Tom to be permitted to celebrate Mass publicly.
In preparation for our meeting on April 1, 1997, you asked me for a summary of the allegations against Father Swade. Enclosed is a copy of my remarks to the principal, school board and religious education board at Saints Faith, Hope and Charity parish on January 7, 1997. It contains a general summary of the allegations.

The following is a more specific account of these allegations:

1. **alleged misconduct with him at the age of 12-13 starting in 1979, which he said went on for a year and a half to two years:**
   a) **Taking showers together.**
   b) **Mutual administration of lotions all over the body, including genitals.**
   c) **Swimming lessons, grabbing and others by the mid-section, including the genitals. (Fr. Swade denies touching genitals.)**
   d) **being scantily clad (just underwear) in Fr. Swade's room when entered the room.**
   e) **seeing Fr. Swade lay down on top of a girl fully clothed during a retreat.**
   f) **and Swade lying on top of each other fully clothed; says Swade admitted having ejaculated on one of these occasions. (Swade denies ejaculation.)**
2. **Confidential Memo to Bishop Goedert**
   Re Father Swade
   March 29, 1997 - Page 2

2. Anonymous reported that said that one time when she returned from college she saw Fr. Swade naked coming out of his shower while she was sitting and waiting in his room at the rectory.

3. Anonymous said that one time when she returned from college she went up to see him; he gave her a blessing and a prolonged hug.

4. Alleged that when he was in 8th grade in the late 70's, he went to Swade's room at St. Dorothy's for a counseling session; Swade turned down the lights and had lay across his lap, facing away while Swade rubbed his chest. While in this position, says he felt Swade getting an erection.

5. Alleged two incidents:
   a) The first was when he was a junior or senior in high school around 1982. said that Swade then bent down and worked his hands across his stomach into the pants and felt his private parts. Swade denies that he ran his hand down to the penis. This incident happened at St. Dorothy's in the office of Swade's second floor suite.
   b) The second was after graduated from college in 1988. They went swimming one evening at Loyola Academy. While they were in the process of changing, says that Swade grabbed penis while they were standing there naked. Swade denies touching penis.

6. called the State's Attorney's Office in 1993 after seeing Fr. Swade read from Scripture at the liturgy of. She alleged three incidents:
   a) While she was a freshman in high school, says Swade was teaching her how to swim. on one
occasion stroking her vagina and on another occasion he penetrated her vagina with his finger and also had her cup his penis. Swade admits giving swimming lessons by holding students under their midsection, but denies intentionally touching their genital area.

b) At a Mass for LINK students at St. Dorothy's in 1986, she went to the rectory. She went up to his room and he was there in his bikini-type briefs. He grabbed her and hugged her with a big bear hug.

c) In 1987, after graduation from high school, she was at the parish and Swade asked her. She says that he lifted her blouse, lifted her bra, and then ran his finger against the scarred area.

The State's Attorney (per Mark Cavens) said those who interviewed her found her credible, but the statute of limitations had run on any kind of criminal offense.

On December 9, 1996, in preparation for our meetings at Ss. Faith, Hope and Charity Parish, Fr. Swade met with Fr. McBrady, Ralph Bonaccorsi, Bernadette Connolly and me at the Pastoral Center. Swade denied ever touching her during He also denied that he had told that he had ejaculated during his hugging sessions with. Swade did say that most of the rest is true. He admitted to the application of lotion to his genitals on one occasion. Swade said that it is true that he taught how to swim, holding her by her abdomen, but denies touching her vagina. He denied lifting her blouse or touching her breast. Swade also denied holding by the genitals, but said that he could have touched him there during these swimming lessons.

I don't know how much of this information you want to share with the priests at the meeting, but certainly the names of the parties who made allegations should remain confidential. Since Father Swade plans to be at the meeting, perhaps you could ask him to describe the allegations against him. The above summary could be helpful in making sure he hasn't left anything out.

If you need anything else, please do not hesitate to ask.
12/9/96

MEETING WITH PFR-43, THOMAS SWADE.
Also present: Rev. Thomas Paprocki, Rev. Larry McBrady, Ralph Bonaccorsi and Bernadette Connolly.

1. TJP started the meeting by reviewing the number of victims that reported sexual abuse by T.S. According to the information in T.S.'s file, there are six (6) victims who reported sexual misconduct against T.S. We reviewed each case with T.S. (1) genital touching; (2) inappropriate touching; (3) genital touching/inappropriate touching; (4) Two children - inappropriate touching; and (5) genital touching. One of the victims did not report inappropriate touching, but rather "seeing T.S. naked as he was coming out of the shower." T.S. denied one of the allegations - that being the allegation from one victim. T.S. claims he never stuck his finger in her vagina. "Never." T.S. also denies it was he who was doing it to her. The PCAC meeting later this afternoon (12/9/96), Larry McBrady said he would speak with POM regarding the disclosure of the allegations.

2. I asked T.S. if he ever formally met with Steve Sidlowski in terms of SS reading the allegations to him. T.S. informed me this never occurred - it was always done by telephone and on some occasions his lawyer was present. T.S. reports he was unaware of the allegations and again denied the content of the allegations even though the State Attorney's office found her to be credible in her report.

3. We then discussed with T.S. his approach in conveying his behavior to the School Board and Religious Education Board at Faith, Hope & Charity. I advised T.S. to begin his statement with something like "I engaged in sexual misconduct with minors, etc..." and then proceed in describing where he was psychologically at the time, and what has happened since and where he is now. I also told T.S. I would be willing to read his statement if he so desired.

4. The group and T.S. felt my approach was the best way to proceed and we informed T.S. we are here to assist him in any manner.
OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL FITNESS REVIEW
CLIENT INFORMATION SHEET

FILE:
Opened - 2/6/93
Closed

1. NAME: Thomas Swade
   S.S.#

   BIRTHDAY:

   ORDAINED: 1961

2. RESIDENCE:

   Msgr. Koenig Hall

   ADDRESS:

   P.O. Box 455 Mundelein, IL. 60060

   DATES:

   9/94 - Present

3. MINISTRY:

   Associate Pastor, St. Dorothy
   (Founder of LINK)

   STATUS:

   Withdrawn

   DATES:

   6/92

4. ALLEGATION(S):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Date of Offense(s)</th>
<th>Sex/Age</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>approx. 1979</td>
<td>M/12-13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>approx. 1972-1977</td>
<td>F/teenager, college</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NK</td>
<td>approx. 1982</td>
<td>M/16</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. GENERAL NATURE OF ALLEGATION(S): Nudity, fondling of body and genital area, hugging, mutual administration of applying lotion to body and genitals. Females complained of T.S.'s exposure of naked body out of shower and excessive hugs.

6. OTHER PROBLEMS/CONCERNS DURING MINISTRY: None

7. REVIEW STATUS:

   1st Stage - 2/6/93
   2nd Stage - 7/24/93
   Supp. Rev. - 1/21/95, 2/18/95

AOC 005688
EDUCATION:

MINISTERIAL ASSIGNMENTS:
- St. Bernadine’s, Associate Pastor - 1961-1966
- Holy Angels, Associate Pastor - 1966-1972
- St. Dorothy’s, Associate Pastor - 1972 - 1992

FAMILY COMPOSITION:
Parents: Deceased
Siblings: Two married brothers

MONITORS:

ADDRESS:

PHONE:

EMERGENCY CONTACTS:
1st
Relationship
Home #
Work #
2nd
Relationship
Home #
Work #
I think the Board may be waiting to hear from you on the issue. He is getting spiritual direction, and a support group as well as his own personal support group. Perhaps the next PFR Board meeting could see this topic handled.

2. Tom has been diligent in following up on his attempt to do the race relations workshop. He has made a number of contacts with various vicariates and pastors. He has a good lead or two but knows that nothing is really going to happen on this until late September when parishes start to function on all cylinders again. Meanwhile, he has a lot of time on his hands and a lot of energy.

May I make a suggestion? Tom informed me that a group of adults, lectors and lay ministers at St. Dorothy's, have approached him to conduct a Genesis II program during this summer. They would meet one evening a week for about two hours over a period of about three or four months. I am sending a copy of the gist of the program which Tom submitted to me. The meetings need not take place at St. Dorothy's and could be set up somewhere else.

I would recommend that you give Tom permission to have these meetings for the following reasons:

1) They would be with adults who have asked Tom's help and who are involved in adult ministry at St. Dorothy's.

2) It is all about spiritual development and it is something that Tom himself can grow from.
3) Tom absolutely needs something to do and this would be a great boost for his spirit.

4) Tom knows about the situation with [redacted] and the effort to get him back in the parish. He, of course, supports that. We were concerned about how others would react to that situation.

5) I know this would probably have to be run past the PFR Board. I would hope that they could see it as a help to Tom in his recovery and in his need to start working with adults and forming adult relationships. He would not be ministering. He would merely be a facilitator at meetings in which people explore their own spiritual journeys.

It will soon be over three years since Tom was removed from ministry. Overall I think this program would benefit the people, would benefit Tom, and would help prepare him for an ultimate return to some kind of ministry.

If you have any questions, and I know you will, please give me a call.
Memo to File
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 5/1/95
Re: Rev. Thomas Swade

At the Professional Fitness Review Board meeting on 4/29, we discussed the Cardinal's response to the Swade recommendations from the Board. The Cardinal accepted the recommendations and wanted to ask one exception, namely, that Swade be allowed to run the very first encounter in the racial integration workshop. He would need to do that in order to train those who would be running these workshops in the future. He will work with Sheila Adams of the Ethnic Ministries Office.
MEMORANDUM

To: Ms. Bernadette Connolly, Acting Professional Fitness Review Administrator
   and members of the Professional Fitness Review Board

cc: Reverend Patrick J. O'Malley, Vicar for Priests
    Mr. Ralph Bonaccorsi, Victim Assistance Minister

From: Reverend Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor
       and Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board

Date: April 28, 1995

Re: Reverend Thomas Swade

Bernadette,

As the Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board, I am writing on behalf of Cardinal Bernardin regarding the determinations and recommendations of the Review Board in the matter of Reverend Thomas Swade, described in Steve Sidlowski’s letter to His Eminence dated February 23, 1995, following completion of the Supplementary Review at the Review Board’s meeting on February 18, 1995.

Cardinal Bernardin accepted the Board’s determination that it is reasonable that Father Swade’s withdrawal from ministry should continue. The Cardinal also accepted the recommendation that Father Swade should be allowed to work in training adult trainers and/or presenters of the workshop addressing racial harmony which Father Swade conducted in the past and which Father Swade has described to the Review Board. As such, the Cardinal agreed with the recommendation that Father Swade work in assisting the staff of the Archdiocesan Office of Ethnic Ministries in developing such a workshop training program as part of the DECISIONS goal for implementation of programs in the area of racial/ethnic harmony. The Cardinal concurs with the view that such training would constitute a work component of Father Swade’s consistent with Article 5.3(b)1 of the policies.

Concerning the recommendation that Father Swade not actually conduct the workshops himself, however, the Cardinal has decided that Father Swade would be allowed to conduct the first workshop himself. This is seen as necessary in order to properly train and show others how the workshops are to be conducted. With the Cardinal’s permission, Father Swade has begun working with Bishop Conway, Father Thomas Cima, and Sheila Adams of the Office of Ethnic Ministries in preparation for such a workshop.
In addition, the Cardinal accepted the Board's recommendation that Father Swade not provide any such training to or in conjunction with the LINK organization, consistent with the Board's previous recommendation to His Eminence and accepted by him that Father Swade not have further involvement with LINK.

Please inform Father Swade and the Review Board of the Cardinal's decisions as indicated above.

As always, the work of the Review Board and yourself in this matter is very much appreciated.
 Memo to File  
From: Rev. Andrew McDonagh  
Date: 3/16/95  
Re: Tom Swade  

I met Tom Swade outside the Retreat House Chapel early Tuesday morning. He was on his way to a lower level chapel to say Mass. We exchanged greetings and I wished him well. Later he came to my room and asked me if I remembered much about his case. I briefly touched on the points I remembered --

1) My telephone calls with [REDACTED] (former friend of [REDACTED]). She was concerned that we were not doing something about Tom for the things he had done to [REDACTED] possibly hinting that Tom was responsible for this breakup. She was talking about going to the media, etc.

2) Experience at St. Dorothy Church on the Sunday the people were informed -- how traumatic is was for everyone.

3) How angry Tom was at the Retreat House meeting that Pat, John and I had with the priests who had been removed.

4) How abandoned Tom felt.

5) How angry some of the LINK supporters were.

6) How angry Tom was and how he attacked the [REDACTED]

7) How he was told not to go back to St. Dorothy’s.

8) How concerned Sr. M. Patrick (president of Longwood Academy) was about Tom’s inappropriate familiarity some LINK girls at Longwood.

9) How upset Tom was about going to [REDACTED] and his experience there.

10) How I did not remember too much about his connection with [REDACTED] and the people who came forward.

11) How he had had a good experience at [REDACTED] etc.
Then Tom proceeded to tell me about his life before this happened, his relationship with his mother, with St. Dorothy's, and LINK, and the many students and families he was close to. Tom dwelt on the kind of experience he had at Quigley, Mundelein, no drinking, no drugs, on his life after that.

In his relationships with students at LINK and St. Dorothy he taught from Genesis II, Tech, etc., and certainly never had any "bad" thoughts or intentions. At he found out that some of his actions were inappropriate but for him never wrong. He reviewed his relationship with and explained his actions, but saw them as anything but not wrong. (I must say to myself at this point I wonder if Tom ever experienced any guilt or any feeling that he had done something wrong. It certainly seems not at the exact time these events occurred.) Tom explained how he has 9 months to go before he comes back into ministry. He wonders if he can ever go back to St. Dorothy's. I told him that he most likely has the most fruitful part of his life in front of him.

Regarding Mike Nallen, he feels that Mike would like to be at St. Dorothy's but is afraid he might interfere. I ventured that Fred Fisher is strong enough to deal adequately with that possibility. Tom would like to see Mike back there as a senior priest feeling all the support of the people.

In final remarks to Tom I mentioned that a priest, living in the scene of former great experiences, after a few years of retirement from involvement can easily be forgotten.

Tom talked about Ventura, Reuter (?), Keusel as examples of support. He mentioned racial seminars the he is about to start. He seems as forceful, dramatic, sincere as ever. He admits his
experience in [REDACTED] has been good. He is intent on getting back into the game.

I suggested that Jesus might have a new game for him and that he should be good at it. He has to listen.
3/11/95
Proposal for Fr. Thomas Swade

1. PFRBD does not want T.S. working with LINK in any capacity.

2. They have given him permission to work on racial harmony workshops. Specifically, they do not want him doing the whole show by himself, but want him to work with "training the trainers".

3. Proposal: For an effective program to work T.S. will have to be totally involved in the first presentation.
   - go to one of the vicariates and see if they are interested in setting up such a workshop.
   - interested parishes would send top people to experience the workshop. Initially T>S> would be the team leader and set-up man.
   - these people would experience the workshop
   - they would be encouraged to run such workshops on their own
   - T.S. would then train them to do such workshops
   - he would help future with his expertise and training
   - People from the Ethnic Ministries could attend the first workshop to see if such a thing might work for them (mutatis mutandis)
   - T. role then would be getting the whole thing off the ground and then making sure that workshop will take place in the future and that they will be done well.

T.S.'s contacts with Blacks and Whites may serve him in good stead when he is helping people put these workshop together.
December 9, 1993

Dear [Name],

Thank you very much for your letter of December 2, 1993. As you indicate in your letter, the program being drawn up for Father Swade will have as its goal a future healthy return to ministry for Father Swade.

As to what the specific nature of that ministry will be in the future, I cannot say at this time. I know that Father Swade has done a remarkable job for LINK Unlimited and is trusted in both the African-American and the white community. His record in being able to bridge the gap between the different racial groups as well as the age gap between youngsters and adults is remarkable. Nevertheless, I am not in a position at this time to make absolute guarantees about anything in the future. I will consider your letter and the thoughts of the Link Board as to what we will do when that time comes.

I am concerned about the future of LINK and I want to see it continue. I have asked Father Ken Velo, my secretary, to work with LINK and the Archdiocese to make provision for some priestly help in your work. I cannot guarantee a full-time priest as LINK has enjoyed in the past, and certainly no one with the qualifications of Father Swade. Nevertheless, we will do what we can.

Again, thank you very much for your understanding in this very difficult matter. Please inform Mr. Robert Anderson, who I understand is the director of LINK at this time, and the Board, of my great admiration for the program and my hope to be able to help in whatever way I can to see that it continues.

With cordial good wishes, I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,

Archbishop of Chicago

bc: Father Pat O’Malley
October 14, 1993

His Eminence Joseph Cardinal Bernardin
Archbishop of Chicago
155 E. Superior St.
Chicago, Ill. 60611

Dear Cardinal Bernardin:

Thank you for agreeing to see me on October 21. It is my fondest hope that our discussions might resolve the limbo in which I have lived for the past 16 months and allow me, in one form or another, to continue in the mission which has been my life's work, Link Unlimited.

As you are well aware, the Board of Directors of Link, after an investigation of the "Summer's incident" voted unanimously in November, 1992 to reinstate me as President of Link. At your request, I have not returned and remain on voluntary leave of absence because I want to return with your blessing and as a priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago. It is with respect to the terms on which I can return to Link as a priest that I wish to meet with you on the 21st.

I know, the Board of Directors of Link believe, and I sincerely hope you believe that I am not in any way a sexual deviant. I have no personality disorders and no psychological disorders, including paraphilias. I am entirely normal. In addition, the publicity and communication which surrounded my administrative leave from St. Dorothy's Parish has resulted in no substantive "red flags" I have worked with thousands of young people over the past 39 years. Does anyone honestly believe that these people would remain silent if they had felt impropriety in my actions over those years?
Then why am I in the position I am in today? As I see it, the answer involves two factors. One is the unfortunate rash of reporting of priestly sexual misconduct across the country, which has created an environment of suspicion and mistrust. The other involves my own honest acknowledgement of a situation which occurred fourteen years ago. That situation did not involve sex or sexual intent. It resulted from my sincere interest in the well being of a very disturbed teenager and was grounded in my work at the time with Genesis II, self image and affirmation, the pathology of the black family, the teaching of maturity and sexuality, and my own personal growth and demythologizing of the priesthood. Would the situation have occurred today in our current litigious and suspicious society? No. Do I regret that one individual, out of thousands, claims he was harmed by my mission? Yes. But the grounding remains valid. It has enabled me, with the grace of God, to help thousands of minority young people become viable citizens and mature, caring and loving human beings.

I attach a photocopy of a letter recently received from a Link graduate, which perhaps expresses better than I my mission in the African American community.

So this is the situation in which I find myself. Link wants me to return. The St. Dorothy's parishioners want me to return. You, your Eminence, have kindly allowed me to work in the background at Link and to spend my days at St. Dorothy's. The Review Board has read my file and, without ever interviewing me, as I have repeatedly requested, has informed me of their recommendation to you.

Their recommendation is highly perplexing, especially in light of the written comments provided the Review Board by

Where do we go from here? I want to return to full ministry in the shortest time frame possible. On what terms do you believe that can be done?

While I feel I am fully competent to return immediately to ministry, I am prepared to make concessions for the good of all. I would, therefore, suggest the following:

1. I participate in whatever counseling you suggest is necessary for a period to be agreed by us.

2. Until successful completion of that counseling, I not deal with individual Link students on a private, non-public basis.
3. I return to Link as President responsible for:

a. Spiritual affairs, namely
   (1) Young adult masses
   (2) Genesis II
   (3) Tic-Cor-Tec retreats
   (4) Meditation Prayer Groups

b. Workshops on racism

c. The alumni association

d. Fund raising

e. Link expansion

Hopefully these concessions will meet with your approval.

I have prayed and reflected long and hard over this matter these past 16 months. I know I am and have been a good and zealous priest for over 32 years. I have been a healthy and happy person, dedicated to serving this local church. A characteristic that has been present all throughout my priesthood and has never changed is my willingness and desire to address problems and to be a part of the solution.

I look forward to meeting with you on October 21.

Your Brother in Christ,

Father Thomas J. Swade
Memo
To: Mr. Steve Sidlowski
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley
Date: 9/1/93
Re: Rev. Thomas Swade

At 4 PM on 9/1/93, we received a call from Carey Huff who was in contact with Mark Kavens at the State's Attorney's Office. Kavens told us that a young woman named [redacted] came to see the State's Attorney on April 7, 1993. [redacted] presently lives at [redacted]. Her phone number is [redacted].

It seems that on April 3, 1993, Fr. Swade read at the liturgy of [redacted]. He read a reading and was wearing his Roman collar.

When [redacted] went to the State's Attorney's Office, she was told that the statutes of limitations had run on any kind of criminal offense. Fr. Swade had officiated at [redacted] and [redacted]. She was hearing word that he was going to be returned to LINX.

On the first occasion that [redacted] alleges to have been abused by Swade, he was teaching her how to swim. He was under the impression that she was a young swimmer. While he was showing her how to swim, he slipped his finger underneath her swimming suit and was stroking her vagina. On the second or third time he penetrated her vagina with his finger and also had her cup his penis. During these times he was isolating her from the others and no one could see [redacted].
exactly what he was doing. She says this penetration by his finger occurred on about 10 occasions.

A second instance as related by the State's Attorney's Office occurred in 1986 at a Mass which was held for LINK students at St. Dorothy's. She went over to the rectory. She went up to his room, knocked on the door, and Swade apparently was there in his bikini-type briefs and he grabbed her and hugged her with a big bear hug.

In 1987, after her graduation from high school, she and Swade asked her to the party. He lifted her blouse, lifted her bra, and then ran his finger.

In 1991, in a celebration at the St. Dorothy gym, he once again gave her a big bear hug and kissed her on the mouth. Those who interviewed from the State's Attorney's Office found her credible and believable and said that she had no ax to grind. Steve will follow up with a call to
August 7, 1992

INDIVIDUAL SPECIFIC PROTOCOL
FOR REVEREND THOMAS J. SWADE

I have reviewed, understood, understood and agree to the following requirements of this protocol:

1) Unaccompanied out-of-house activities include the following:

   Mercy Hospital - meals - every day
   Link Unlimited Offices - Mon.-7.00pm - 11.00pm
   St. Dorothy Church - Thu.-7.00am - 11.00pm
   Fri.-7.00am - 11.00pm
   Sat.-7.00am - 11.00pm
   Sun.-7.00am - 5.00pm

   Mother's house -
   Sun.-5.00pm - midnight
   Mon.-12.00am - 5.00pm
   Wed.-5.00pm - midnight
   Thu.-12.00am - 5.00pm

   If for some reason women who take care of Rev. T.S.'s mother are not able to
   keep their appointment time slot and Rev. T.S. is not able to find a suitable
   replacement, he may take over that time period.

   Social events, visits with family, classmates, friends, going to restaurants,
   movies, theatres, etc., - every day

2) Attendance at all activities and the specific names, addresses, time and
   telephone numbers regarding resident's whereabouts must be entered on the
   individual itinerary. If for some reason(s) itemized requirements cannot be
   met, the resident is obliged to call in to update a staff member on-duty.

3) Resident is accountable for his own time and is required to support his
   attendance at social events with physical proof i.e., movie ticket, receipt
   from restaurant. If such proof cannot be provided, resident is required to
   call the resident staff member from the place of destination. The telephone
   number from where the call has been made may be verified by a staff member.
   Unlisted, unpublished telephone numbers will not suffice unless previously
   approved by the Executive Director. Using mobile phone is not permitted.

4) In order to leave boundaries of Archdiocese/Lake County, Cook County/
   resident must receive permission from the Vicar for Priests.

5) Visitation by previously approved visitors can only occur at resident's
   apartment. All visitors must sign in and out at the Community Room.

6) No one under the age of 18 is permitted to be at the residence unless
   prior approval has been obtained from the Executive Director, the Vicar for
   Priests or designate. Meetings with minors, in and out of the residence, can
   take place only in the presence of an approved companion.
Any contraband materials i.e., alcohol, pornography can be confiscated.

8) Any deviation and/or non-compliance with requirements of the Individual Specific Protocol will be addressed by the residence Executive Director and/or designate and may be grounds for modification of currently existing protocol. Such modification will be collectively determined by the Archdiocese Vicar for Priests and/or designate in conjunction with the residence Executive Director. In case of emergency, any staff member can modify the protocol until an administrative decision can be made by the Executive Director and/or designate.

9) In order to change the protocol prior approval must be received from the Archdiocese Vicar for Priests, staff in conjunction with the residence Executive Director. This is a working document which can be changed, altered, or superceded where there is an indicated need to do so.

SIGNED: [Signature]

PRINTED NAME: Rev. Thomas J. Swade

DATE: 8/23/92

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR: [Signature]

A copy of this protocol will be kept on file and a copy will be sent to the Archdiocese Vicar for Priests.
Memo to File
From: Rev. Patrick O'Malley  
Date: 7/28/93  
Re: Thomas Swade

The Fitness Review Board reviewed the Swade situation on 7/24/93. They agreed that there should be continued withdrawal from ministry and that there should be no unsupervised access to minors. They did express concern regarding his professional relationship with LINK. They feel that his present protocol is too liberal and should be made tighter. They also feel he should be in some kind of therapy at this time.

Sidlowski will talk to Swade but we do not know how that will work. This is one where the Cardinal would have to be involved in it from the outset.
REVIEW DATE: July 24, 1993

1. NAME: Rev. Thomas Swade AGE/D.O.B.

2. ORDAINED: 1961

3. PRESENT ASSIGNMENT OR RESIDENCE:
   Stritch Retreat House
   Mundelein, Ill. (Residing with several other priests withdrawn from ministry - Stritch is temporary residence in nature)

4. ALLEGATIONS/INFORMATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Offense</th>
<th>Sex/Age of Child</th>
<th>Credibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>approx. 1979</td>
<td>M/12-13</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx. 1972-77</td>
<td>F/teenager &amp; college age</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approx. 1982</td>
<td>M/approx. 16 ('88 as 22 yr. old)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   5. GENERAL NATURE OF OFFENSE(S) One minor states Tom Swade fondled and placed his fingers around the 12-13 yr. old’s genitals and penis specifically (Swade called it _______); same boy stated Tom Swade once was lying on top of him and Tom Swade admitted to the boy that he had ejaculated; on different occasions same boy stated he and Swade took showers together and Swade would direct boy to wash Swade’s naked body including Swade’s genitals; many times T.S. directed 12 yr. old to rub lotion over T.S.’s naked body including T.S.’s genitals and buttocks and this was mutual administration; 12 yr. old says T.S. rubbed him and others in genitals in swimming pool; females complained of T.S.’s exposure of naked body out of shower and excessive hugs; third person as teen-age boy stated T.S. held his private parts ______ and asked minor to do same to Swade.

6. OTHER PROBLEMS DURING MINISTRY: None.
6. SPECIAL CONCERNS OR PROBLEMS (If any): T.S. had to be reprimanded by Cardinal to obey his protocol (already rather liberal in terms of freedoms); T.S., former director of Link; T.S.' refusal to modify his protocol schedule; law suit/demand being made by one of the victims; no therapy to date.

9. DATE OF FIRST STAGE REVIEW COMPLETION: 2-6-93

10. REVIEW BOARD’S DETERMINATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO ARCHBISHOP/ARCHBISHOP’S DECISION: There is reasonable cause; withdrawal from his ministerial assignment was appropriate and should continue; protocol/restrictions should remain in place; Cardinal fully accepted Board’s recommendations.

SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS

Tom Swade continues to be withdrawn formally from his ministerial assignment, although he continues to spend a great deal of time at St. Dorothy Parish which is right across the street from LINK, T.S.’s former full-time ministry. Typically T.S.’s protocol allows him to maintain a low profile existence with Link while working at St. Dorothy Church from 7:00 a.m. to as late as 11:00 p.m. five nights a week. Even then, he is actually allowed into LINK Offices from 7:00 to 11:00 p.m. on Mondays. (Steve S. would like to discuss T.S.’s protocol further later).

Due to this tremendous leeway, Tom Swade was rarely in the former residence at ______ or currently at Stritch. Rather, he practically spends his entire day and night working for LINK. This seems rather odd in that the Review Board has determined reasonable
cause in his matter and determined he should be withdrawn from a ministerial assignment with access to minors. Moreover, per Paul Dudek, former housing director at [redacted] and Bernadette Connolly current director, they are not sure if Tom Swade's always in the "presence of an approved adult companion," as his protocol requires in quote "meetings with minors both in and out of the residence." This is another area of great concern. When this was suggested to Tom Swade, and he was asked to provide names of persons who the housing director, Pat O'Malley, and I could count on to serve as his approved adult companion, he provided the St. Dorothy's pastor's name who POM said has made it clear he is uncomfortable being in that position, and [redacted] of LINK who has been named in the potential lawsuit along with Tom Swade, was mentioned by a victim as having said nothing and was in his underwear in Swade's room.

I note the above because I do intend to recommend that Tom Swade continue to be withdrawn from his ministerial assignment and that I believe that recommendation is reasonable in view of the current facts and circumstances in giving proper consideration to the safety of the children as well as his own rights. And so, I recommend strongly that his protocol be changed and strengthened and he not be allowed nearly as much time at St. Dorothy Church as has been the case.

Recommendation is also based upon the fact that Tom Swade continues to minimize the information brought forward against him about the verities of sexual misconduct he engaged in. Primarily, T.S. has never attended any therapy whatsoever since this information has come forward.
Moreover, T.S. admits that he would not hesitate to have kids see him naked and did indeed ask [redacted] to put lotion "all over my body," which included his genitals he admitted.

Tom Swade's contention that there is no sexual intent in any of these types of behavior is not acceptable in my view. At the very least, it was extraordinarily inappropriate and indeed appears to be grievous sexual misconduct on his part with minors. (Also note how he has described another college student male who he asked to take his penis out of his pants, touched the young man's penis and apparently did not think it was wrong. His arrogant response to that incident is that "...it never occurred to me before. I knew what I was doing. Who gives a shit what others think." It is this type of attitude which Tom Swade has displayed which makes clear to me that he ought to be in intensive therapy addressing these issues.

All in all, it is my view that Rev. Swade continue to be withdrawn from ministry with no access to minors and that his current protocol be modified with further restrictions, including a longer list of approved adult companions who POM, myself and Bernadette Connolly find acceptable.

Perhaps if T.S. [redacted] long term and was successful, a supplementary review of his situation could be re-considered.
REV. THOMAS SWADE

Present Address:
P.O. Box 166233
2520 S, King Drive
Chicago, IL 60616-6233

Phone: Mother's House:
At (common room at #104)
Message can be left at:

Ordained: 1961 from St. Mary of Lake Seminary.

Assignments:
St. Bernadine's - Forest Park 1961-66
Holy Angels - 66-72(?)
St. Dorothy's - 1972 (?) - to 6/92 when he was removed and took up residence at

Founder of LINK back in 1966. Became full time with LINK in 1984 with residence at St. Dorothy's former convent.

Before these allegations came forth, there was never any other claim made against Swade to our knowledge.

Circumstances: Fr. Swade has two brothers, both married. His Mother is still alive but bed-ridden in her own home for 18 years. Fr. Swade has been her principal care-taker, spending at least two overnights a week with her. He also pays women to come and take care of her the rest of the week.

Over the years, more than 900 young men and women have been helped to obtain good educations through his efforts. Many people came forward in support of Swade when this all happened. They want him to be exonerated and return to LINK/ST. D. A much lesser - but still articulate - number are against his returning to LINK and St. Dorothy's.

Factors to be weighed in any recommendation to return to ministry: pressure of allegations/civil suit pending, public expectations about this case since TS is a very public figure.
Fr. Swade has been given permission by the Cardinal to maintain a low profile presence at LINK. He is not to be in the presence of those under 21 without another adult being present. He has complied with the Cardinal's advice.

Swade has not undergone any counselling to this point.

The Cardinal awaits the Fitness Review Board input.

At present the FRA office will pick up his entire salary and car transportation responsibility. What will that salary be for the 7/1/93 - 6/30/94 fiscal year?

What has happened to the one making the allegations?
The young man who brought forward the allegation has been receiving financial help from the Archdiocese from quite early on. That continues and is to be placed under the VAM's jurisdiction.

Counselling has also been offered to the three other parties who brought allegations forward. See files for details.

A civil suit has been threatened by the attorneys of young man who made the first allegation. Mr. Serritella can provide details. We have reason to think that others may come forward once the first civil suit is satisfied.
Re: Fr. Thomas Swade/St. Dorothy Parish

Your Eminence:

The attached letter that I have forwarded to St. Dorothy's anonymous "leadership" is my attempt at providing additional perspective to an issue that is under study by you and your staff—a troubling issue that I'm sure is testing the Solomon in you.

Because this issue is so sensitive; because it impacts on the children of our church family, many in our congregation and school have been hesitant to talk openly of related issues or events that have come to their attention—directly or indirectly. And because much information has been second hand or third hand, parishioners have judiciously been reluctant to openly address the long time "rumors" about Fr. Swade and have chosen simply to maintain a watchful eye and keep their children at a distance from any private or close encounters with Fr. Swade.

I, like other parents, made sure that my teen daughter was never alone with Fr. Swade during her years as a member of the teen club; other parents made sure their sons were never left alone in his room or in his exclusive company. This summer's "open" allegation regarding Fr. Swade's sexual misconduct and the "parish leaders'" deliberations about this problem has compelled me to end my silence. Even though my information may not, in its present format, be admissible in a court of civil law, I must share with you what recurring events and concerns that have been discussed about Fr. Swade for at least the last 8 or 9 years.

- MORE -
Cardinal Bernardine

November 1, 1992

- -

The following are only some of the events that have been discussed regarding Thomas Swade's behavior over the last eight (8) years or so:

1) At teen club outings, ... his swimming lessons ... revealed to you and touched you in your personal parts ... , confided to a parish adult by two female teenagers who were reluctant to ride with Fr. Swade to a teen swim event.

2) I don't know why another male teen spends so much time up in Fr. Swade's room ... , comment made to a parish adult by male teen. The adult sensed that the teen was subtly trying to tell this adult about the teen's insights and suspicions.

3) The shock and consternation experienced by a female teen after being called up to Fr. Swade's room to find him attired in only underwear bottoms.

4) An adult walking in on Fr. Swade and a teen male and observing Fr. Swade tickling the teen male who was seated in a chair: the adult described the position of Fr. Swade to be ... so close and intimate that I was acutely uncomfortable watching him hover over this young man: I made my presence known and he abruptly stopped the tickling and gave me some space.

5) A confidence shared by a parishioner with a former parishioner that her niece was ... grabbed in the crotch by Fr. Swade while swimming in the pool at Loyola during a LINK gym night.

6) A complaint regarding Fr. Swade's questionable advances toward a male LINK member that was initially brought to Fr. Nallen's attention but never fully investigated by Fr. Nallen or other church officials; since this particular incident occurred - approximately seven years ago - parishioners had 'speculated' that this incident was either covered up or that the parents (perhaps spelled) chose not to pursue it further because of concern by the parent that the incident might become public and cause the son undue emotional strain and embarrassment.

This last noted incident was formerly brought to the attention of archdiocesan representative, Fr. Tony Vada (perhaps spelled Veda) by the parent of the male teen about seven (7) years ago. There apparently was no further investigation by the diocese or notification to our pastor, Fr. Nallen. I can only conjecture and wonder because it was stated at the parish town meeting that the recent allegations were the first and only made against Thomas Swade. Our pastor has said that no parent of any alleged victim brought charges directly to him - with the implication that no official of the diocese had made him aware of any charges against Thomas Swade through the diocese or Vicar of Priests.

The incidents that I have described have come to my attention at one time or another over the past seven years. None had been so clear cut or sufficiently compelling to cause me to go to church authorities, civil authorities, or the media: but the
allegations of this summer - have caused me great concern for the physical, emotional and spiritual safety of the children and young adults of our parish.

Other members of the parish, former members of our parish and I are further concerned by information that strongly suggests:

1) Thomas Swade has personally and directly or indirectly, manufactured his support amongst our parishioners and the anonymous parish leadership. Swade has gone so far as to present his case, defense to the nameless parish leadership at the time that he was, if we were to believe the pastoral letter, been removed from St. Dorothy and LINK. Thomas Swade even advised our parish leadership how his spontaneous support campaign should be organized, administered and executed. Swade’s recommendations to his support group went into detail and suggested specifically that ...five articulate members... should personally and directly plead for his reinstatement with you. It was noted by an attendee of these meetings that Swade emphasized ...articulate members.

2) Thomas Swade still directs the operation and administration of LINK and is routinely consulted by staff regarding day-to-day operations, administration of LINK programs and activities, the involvement of LINK students and former students. In fact it appears that Thomas Swade - except possibly during his recent vacation - has directed the LINK operation from the “dugout tunnel” - much like the baseball manager who has been ejected from the baseball game or perhaps more like the American Caesar, Gen. Douglas McArthur - biding time until his triumphant return from temporary exile.

Many parishioners, rightly or wrongly, were content to let sleeping dogs lie when they were told that Thomas Swade was being removed from our parish and excluded from interaction with our community’s teen male and females. Most thought was that this clear and present danger (pedophilia) was being removed from our community and that Thomas Swade was going to get the help and counseling that he needed. Many of us probably felt absolved from any need for further action; with Thomas Swade gone, we no longer had to live with the nagging feeling that it was not enough just to protect our immediate family and advise our friends to “be careful with your children around Fr. Swade.

What are parishioners like me, who either know directly or indirectly of Thomas Swade’s conduct, to do? Now that we are aware that Thomas Swade was never removed from our parish but had merely removed himself to the “dugout tunnel” (St. Dorothy convent) during daylight hours where he conjured up and directed his support team - what are we to do? Now that we are aware that Thomas Swade still directs LINK from the “dugout tunnel and that legally, within the LINK Foundation’s corporate charter, is beyond our Cardinal’s jurisdiction - what are we to do? Now that we are aware that Thomas Swade has...two high powered lawyers to defend him...one Black, one white... - what are we to do? (It is not clear to us whether Thomas Swade’s “high powered” consuls have been more...
Cardinal Bernardine, November 1, 199;
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retained by Swade to defend him on civil and/or public charges. Now that we are aware that Thomas Swade may be brought back to our community, are we being asked to stand up, speak out, and publicly or privately identify victims and name time, dates, incidents?

We feel strongly that there is a substantial number of parishioners and former LIN students who are now willing to talk openly since they now feel that Thomas Swade may be returned to our community. If a reasonably discreet mechanism to hear allegations about Fr. Swade had been in place back in June, you and your staff might be in a better position to judge their validity. What I have addressed in this letter. We felt that parish meeting on June 28 with the distinct impression that there would be follow-up correspondence or communication to advise parishioners whom to call or write should they have further information about Fr. Swade's misconduct. Instead, for the entire summer at each mass, the parish received weekly messages of heartfelt thanks from Fr. Swade for the outpouring of support and instructions on where to send additional letters of support for Fr. Swade.

I must note at this point that the September communication you recently received from the parish leader who signed the letter requesting Thomas Swade's reinstatement left out at least one key statistic - more than half of the parish did not respond at all to the September 21, 1992 survey.

Your healing service at St. Dorothy parish in Berrien indicates that you are sensitive to this very complicated issue of pedophile priests and its effect on the parish community. Although I can appreciate your genuine concern and responsibility for your brothers of the cloth, please be sensitive to the very real concerns of the silent members of our parish who have, up to this point, remained silent or left our parish. Allowing Thomas Swade to return to St. Dorothy and LINK would only provide unnecessary cannon fodder to your VOCAL critics and give credence to charges that your newly promulgated policy is mere rhetoric.

I have admired your sensitivity, wisdom, judgement and your calm approach to the problems of our diocese. You were the breath of fresh air that Cardinal Cody was not. I am trusting that you will continue to be the voice of reason and sound judgement we have come to expect.

Your lay brother,

cc: Fr. Thomas O'Mally

Attachment
have been an active member of St. Dorothy Parish since 1953 and witnessed the good times and the bad times. I have seen our parish apart by the Fr. Clements/ Cardinal Cody Wars. Back in the early '70's a decision to bring back Thomas Swade as a minister at St. Dorothy or head of the CDeep Program would be more divisive, more polarizing than anything in St. Dorothy's history.

St. Dorothy/ survived integration/white flight/ community and rather quietly evolved into a viable congregation survived the Fr. Clements/Cardinal Cody Wars and slowly recovered it spirit.

The perception that a group of unnamed Parish leaders met and made a decision to support Thomas Swade's return was the first consulting with parish members in some, democratic open forum will do more to erode faith and confidence in the St. Dorothy pastor than cumulative controversies of the past 40 years. It says to many members of our Parish family that consistency in supporting what many parishioners believe to be a pedophile priest (even before his recent removal), is more important than the parish family - including the parish family's silent members. Perhaps more silent because of the initial passionate first meeting that served to intimidate both young and older parishioners from stepping forth with their experiences and observations. Intimidated by the fact that weekly petitions were only offered for Thomas Swade's comfort and one for the victim. Intimidated by the fact that the promised procedures or forum, for bringing potential victim's experiences to the proper authorities, was never implemented or publicized.

It is a strong belief of many St. Dorothy parishioners that incidents regarding Thomas Swade have been - hushed or ignored. There is strong evidence that some parents have opted to cover their complaints rather than subject their child and family to the tortures of such an investigation. (The 'kill-the-messenger' atmosphere during the parish meeting on the Thomas Swade removal is an indication of how they would have been viewed; it is not a great leap of logic for some parent or child to understand that a climate of strong, vociferous support for Thomas Swade would also mean strong, vociferous denunciation of any child or parent bringing allegations against Thomas Swade.) The "strong rumors" that Thomas Swade has been hiding in St. Dorothy's convent over the summer further erodes any confidence in the present system and process that has anonymous Parish leaders meeting without Parishioner input or a forum, mechanism for input.

It is no secret - in fact it is a parish in joke - that a significant number of long time members of St. Dorothy have quietly left St. Dorothy for St. Sabina and other parishes. Bringing Thomas Swade back would not only exacerbate this exodus but cause great wounds and cause great conflict among our parishioners who remain. I feel strongly enough about this parish dilemma to sign my name and weather the potential personal criticism than become just anonymous opposition to the apparent course that has been set

hope and pray that legitimate dissent is honored respected and openly addressed in a legitimate parish forum.

Trusting in God's wisdom and direction.
Aug. 18, 1992

Rev. Michael Nallen
St. Dorothy Church
450 E. 78th St.
Chicago, Ill. 60619

Dear Mike,

I received your letter of August 5th and also spoke to Dr. Craddock about her impressions of your meeting. Thank you for sharing your feelings and impressions with me. I agree that every one of these situations is a learning experience. After our Sunday meeting with your congregation, we reviewed our mode of presentation as to how we might learn from that experience and better conduct such a meeting in the future. We do want to learn.

As for your other observations, let me take them one by one. You felt the original presentation to the leadership group was too abrupt, too unfeeling with regards to Fr. Swade's reputation, that I might have "softened the blow in some other way".

Mike, I shared with your people how devastated I was when I first learned about the allegations. I have known Tom Swade and his family for almost 50 years. When I told you, Mike, by your own admission, you too were stunned. When I told your leadership people, they were stunned. Then the scene in Church! Is there any way to hear such news without being stunned, hurt, discouraged and disappointed? If I moved into detailing the allegations so quickly, it was because I have found that people deal with difficult problems much better when they know the facts up front. Again, perhaps that is not accurate in all cases, but we have found over and over again that it does not help to "sugar-coat" bad news.

As to the observation that Fr. Swade may have been "offered up on the altar of expediency", I must say again that the Archdiocese acted only after prolonged and serious consultation. The Cardinal and his advisers in these matters sought for a way to understand the allegations against Tom in a way that was fair to Tom and sensitive to the young man's concerns.
As we informed you, the allegations were first brought forward at my rectory when Fr. Swade accompanied the young man, then later when the young man came on his own to my office with additional information. Quite simply, the young man believes he was sexually abused. Fr. Swade denies any sexual intent in whatever actions may have occurred. The stories seem to be at odds, but they may also be true at the same time. That remains our dilemma.

When I spoke to your leadership group, I did say Fr. Swade would not be returning. I spoke a little prematurely, but I did so knowing the full weight of the dilemma we faced. The accusations were made, and they were serious. Several people, friends of the victim, knew of the allegations and supported them. We could not simply ignore allegations of this kind and it was going to be very difficult to get to the truth. Given Fr. Swade's position with youth, we have to be very careful in considering his possible return to ministry.

When I spoke on Sunday to your people, I softened that statement about Swade not returning, and said we would wait until the investigation was completed before we made the final decision. We will wait until the investigation is completed, but even now we do not know how we are going to resolve the dilemma that won't go away.

As for the Church's protection of its finances, we have to remember that the Archdiocese is steward of funds given to it by the people in the pews. It does not exist separately from its people. If there is a civil suit, it could result in an adverse judgment requiring the Archdiocese to pay large sums of money. That money ultimately comes from the donations of the many lay people of the archdiocese. We would be very remiss if we did not act prudently to protect the reputation and the resources of the Church.

How then do we balance the needs of the people of the Archdiocese as over against the personal good of Fr. Swade? It is difficult but we must do it. Some say we have thrown Fr. Swade to the wolves on the altar of financial expediency. That is simply not true. The allegations of the young man must be judged on their own merit. We are inquiring into them further and are going to have to make judgments about them.

To your question as to whether or not we have made a mistake
and would we admit that mistake if it is thus proved, I can only say that I do not believe a mistake was made. The only way things might be different would be if the young man fully recanted his allegations. Then the Archdiocese might reconsider, not because of a mistake however, but because the original allegations were withdrawn. Even if the allegations are withdrawn, we must still evaluate the entire situation.

The inquiry is proceeding as quickly as possible and we hope to have some conclusions in the next few weeks. We cannot give an exact date at this time.

The final decision will be made by the Cardinal in consultation with his advisors. Normally those advisors are the group which he has been working with over the past year on the matters of sexual abuse of minors by clergy. The recommendations for new procedures and a new review board suggested by the Cardinal's Commission are not yet implemented though work is proceeding on them at a rapid pace. Where they might possibly come into play in this case, we cannot say at this time.

I have tried to deal with your concerns openly and honestly. I hope that my answers may provide some clarification for you and your people, Mike. We want to help all of you in coming to grips with this most difficult and sad matter. We have said before and I repeat it now that we will be available in any way we can to help.

Fraternally yours,

Vicar for priests
Memo to File (POM)  
Re:  
7/31/92

is 26 years old. At that time he brought up the incidents, and there were two, with Fr. Swade. 

There were two main time periods. One when was in high school as a junior or senior, about 1982. Two, after he had just graduated from college about 1988 when he was around 22 years old.

used to come in and talk to Tom Swade. He considered himself a friend of Swade's. This happened at St. Dorothy's in the office of Swade's second floor suite. 

remembers himself being fully clothed. Then Swade bent down and either at that time or shortly after, worked his hands across his stomach into the pants and felt his private parts. 

feels that it might have happened more than once, but he could not come up with any further description of the number of times. From that point on didn't go around
had a second incident with Swade around 1988. It was August or September after he had graduated. Swade had said to him, "Let's get together," and they got together to go swimming at Loyola Academy. It was an evening during the week and they were alone.

While they were in the process of changing, Swade grabbed his penis while they were standing there naked.

I asked why he had waited to bring this forward.
Memo to File (POM)
Re: Thomas Swade
7/6/92

On June 29, I met with

He called me and said he had several matters he wished to discuss.

1. 

2. [REDACTED] claimed that William Harte, the lawyer for Tom Swade, went to see [REDACTED] and tried to persuade him not to bring forth charges against Fr. Swade. This happened after the allegations were initially made. He thought that this was very unprofessional. I reminded him that we had also told both Swade and Harte not to confront [REDACTED] in this manner. Then [REDACTED] went on to say that Fr. Swade had asked [REDACTED] to sign off on a release. Apparently, while they were talking, Swade is supposed to have said to [REDACTED] that it would be nice if he would sign off on a release that there was no sexual or criminal intent in his mind when actions were performed. [REDACTED] felt that this, if true, was inappropriate.

3. He felt that Swade had tried to approach [REDACTED] and insinuate that there may have been abuse back in the past.

4. 

AOC 005725
claimed that what happened to was not an isolated event but that it had happened over a period of time and was a pattern. He felt that Tom Swade should not have access to children.

As for the next step, he felt that:

1. privacy and confidentiality must be respected.

2. should no longer have contact with Swade nor Swade with

I told that I would be in contact with him.

In the meantime, will there be other calls of a similar nature? In fact, there have been. They are recorded on another memo.
Memo

To: [REDACTED]
From: [REDACTED]
Re: Thomas Swade
6/29/92

I am sending over the key interviews of the Swade/ [REDACTED] case.

Here is an outline of the main moments:

1. Phone call from [REDACTED] in early June re: young man was abused by Swade; she confronted Swade in March; he denied and, to her mind, minimalized matters. She demanded Swade get help; he said he and [REDACTED] would get help after the LINK banquet of 6/11/92 was over.


3. Swade calls and comes to my rectory with [REDACTED] on evening of 6/6/92. They come as mutual friends. Interviewed both separately. Tom, in an hour interview, admits the actions, but denies any sexual intent. Afterwards, we spoke together (all 3 of us) about the possible consequences of this matter.

5.

6. June 17, 1992, [REDACTED] calls and asks to see me. In the second interview he brings up more matters that occurred both early on and also when he was 19.

7. 6/19/92 I inform [REDACTED] of his rights.

8. 6/22/92 Meeting with leadership of St. Dorothy
9. Letter sent to members of parish announcing a meeting.
10. Meeting with parish after 10:00 Mass on 6/27/92
11. LINK meeting on Sunday, 6/27/92 - we were not present for this meeting, but according to the leadership, it went well.

12. On 6/30/92 Andy McDonagh got a call from [REDACTED] wondering about what is happening. We usually refer her back to [REDACTED] This day she said that she knows 3 other young men who experienced similar situations with Tom. Andy assured her they could come forward. She says that Swade admitted to her he had done things like that, but that he had stopped doing them in light of the kind of accusations that were coming forward in the most recent past. As of this moment, we don't know what will happen.
Memo to File (POM)
Re: Tom Swade
6/29/92

At this point, he is thinking of asking Tom to accompany him to see the Cardinal on Wednesday. I encouraged him in that since I know that Tom is a very good listener and is also very balanced in whatever approach he would take.

On 6/28/92 I went out to St. Dorothy's along with Andy McDonagh, Dr. Carol Craddock, Joyce Gilly of the Office of Religious Education and Sr. Ann Catherine of the Office of Catholic Education. After the 10:00 Mass at St. Dorothy's we met with the parishioners. The church was packed. The meeting was very difficult. I read a short statement that I had prepared and at no time did I ever say that Tom admitted to the actions.
The crowd, of course, was very vociferous in support of Tom. They were hurt and angry and expressed the usual very deep emotional reactions to news such as this. Carol Craddock got up towards the end of the meeting and helped them to put their own feelings into perspective. The LINK organization had its own meeting at 2:00 in afternoon. I will call Bob Berner today to see how that came out.
6/26/92
 Report to St. Dorothy

My task today is not an easy one. I would like to explain why it is that the archdiocese has recently placed Fr. Thomas Swade on a temporary administrative leave of absence.

A short time ago, a 25 year old young man brought forth allegations of sexual misconduct against Fr. The incidents occurred over 12 years ago, when the young man was 12 or 13 years old. When the young man came forward, he said he was seeking help for himself and help for Fr. Swade.

For reasons of confidentiality for both the young man and Fr. Swade, we cannot go into details of the allegations, but, after initial investigation, we found the allegations to be serious. Fr. Swade himself has denied any sexual intent in any of his actions. As a result of the accusation, the Archdiocese proceeded to remove Fr. Swade from his residency here at St. Dorothy and to limit his work with young people.

The Archdiocese has extended an offer of help to the young man. And we are presently working with Fr. Swade.

Fr. Swade is under archdiocesan supervision at this time. No further action will be taken until the investigation is completed.
Memo to File (POM)
Re: St. Dorothy Parish
6/24/92

On Monday evening, June 22, Ralph Bonaccorsi and Sr. Ann Catherine of the School Office and I met with the heads of organizations of St. Dorothy's parish and also with Fr. Nallen and, later in the meeting, Fr. Dussman. Also present were [redacted], Executive Secretary of LINK, and [redacted], and a man named [redacted], also associated with LINK.

I presented to the group the fact that Fr. Swade has been put on administrative leave because of allegations of sexual misconduct with a minor. I told them that the Archdiocese felt that the allegations were not frivolous and we needed to give serious attention to them. I did not explain any more than that. I also told them that Fr. Swade denied any sexual intent with any of his actions.

A long discussion ensued concerning what kind of an announcement the parish ought to make. After the initial amazement and dismay, the parish people began to get very practical. They eventually arrived at a letter that would go out on Tuesday to all parishioners stating the simple fact that Fr. Swade has been placed on administrative leave and that there will be a meeting after the 10:00 Mass on Sunday, June 28, to discuss the ramifications of that move.

The group would explain nothing as to the reasons, but merely that the reasons would be given at that meeting. At the meeting on the 28th, I will be present along with Ralph Bonaccorsi, Carol Craddock, Carla Leoni and members of the school religious board. We also recommended that all of the leadership be present as well.

The people there from LINK said they were meeting on Thursday evening and that they would also send out letters to their people announcing a meeting on Sunday at 2:00 for LINK people and parents and whoever else they would invite. The same group that would address the issues at the 10:00 Mass will address them again at the 2:00 meeting at St. Dorothy's Church.
Memo to File (POM)
Re: Tom Swade
6/18/92

On Wednesday, June 17, I contacted Tom Swade at his mother's house, phone #. I told Tom the bad news that he would have to leave St. Dorothy's that day. I told him that he would be able to stay with his mother for a while, and after that we would have to place him in a supervised situation. I asked Tom to call his pastor, Mike Nallen, to whom I had spoken a few minutes before. Mike was stunned. Tom did call Mike later and explained to him what the allegations are. Tom said he would also tell his brothers ▲ and ▲.

Tom would also talk to his lawyer, Bill Harte. We talked a bit about the latest phone call from ▲ and Tom explained what had happened from his point of view, how he was trying to help ▲ work through his ▲ at that time, how the whole philosophy of LINK is an embracing and hugging philosophy rather than an "at a distance" philosophy. He has by his own admission received many accolades from people based on the fact that LINK is a real caring and loving organization.

LINK has helped over 900 kids in 25 years, and it has been extremely successful. I told Tom that we wanted to handle this as judiciously as possible without destroying his reputation or the fine work that has been done by LINK. I told him that I would be meeting with leadership people of St. Dorothy's and the pastor in order to figure out where we go next. I also suggested that we meet with the leadership people of LINK as soon as possible. He will be telling them himself as he indeed told Mike Nallen what had happened.

Tom defends himself. He says that none of these incidents were sexually motivated but rather a style of dealing with young people with problems that was supportive and helpful. I alerted Bernadette Connolly at ▲ that he would be coming in there although his entrance into ▲ will be delayed for a while.
Later in the morning, Tom's lawyer, Bill Harte called me to express his disappointment. He said that he would like to talk to about what his allegations are causing. I reflected back to Bill that I did not think that would be helpful for Tom in the long run. I felt that any approaching of the person who brought forth the allegations could be seen later on in a negative way.

I encouraged Bill to talk to lawyers who had dealt with child abuse situations before. He intimated that he had called Steve Komie and also Serritella.
Memo to File (POM)
Re: Thomas Swade
6/18/92

I received a phone call from [redacted] is the young man who brought forth the allegation against Tom Swade a week or so back. We met on Wednesday, June 17th. He remembers certain other incidents that he mentioned:

1. At times when Tom would bring young people to swimming expeditions, he would try to teach swimming to those who could not swim. [redacted] says he remembers Tom grabbing him and others by the mid-section. I asked if that was around the genitals and he said yes. The action apparently was supposed to help float him in the water to help him to learn how to swim.

2. The second instance [redacted] reported was that one time he was on the second floor of the rectory with Tom. He does not remember why, but for some reason he was scantily clad, with just his underwear on in Tom's room when [redacted] came in. [redacted] was about 12 at the time. [redacted] came into the room and talked to Swade about some LINK business. [redacted] said nothing. [redacted] wondered if even noticed, although he said nothing.

3. The third example that [redacted] described was during the retreat at [redacted]. Tom Swade was there with the LINK people and one girl [redacted]. Tom had her lie down. Then he lay down on her fully clothed.

4. When [redacted] was 19 and in college, during that time he was very close to Tom.
ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO
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says that they would lie or sit very close on the bed in Tom's room, but they would be dressed and there would be no touching. Apparently during that time they would be "in position". A term which said meant they would lie on top of each other fully clothed of course and with no sexual intent.

says that at one time he was talking to Tom and Tom admitted that he had ejaculated. No indication of whether it was in relationship to what was happening at that moment.

That same day, I attempted to contact again to let him know that he has the right to take his information to civil authorities if he so desires. I was to give him that little packet that we have and ask him to sign to attest to the fact that indeed we did advise him of his rights in this matter. I was not able to contact on June 17, although he called my office and then called me at home. The numbers I have for him did not give me successful contact. I shall do so as soon as possible. Arrangements have been made to meet on 6/19 at 1:30 PM here in my office.

Meanwhile, had called asking what had been happening. He was to get back to her. He would not give her any details, but tell her that we would be working with
A young woman called earlier this week. Her name was [redacted]. Her work phone is [redacted]. Her home phone is [redacted].

Andy McDonagh spoke to her first and got her story. She is a friend of a young man named [redacted]. After speaking to [redacted] myself, I called [redacted] and set up an appointment to see him on Saturday morning, June 6, 1992. I was at my rectory at 4:30 PM when I received a call from Tom Swade who said he was with [redacted] at that time and wanted to come to see me right then. I told them to come and they arrived at 5:30 PM.

and Tom came together. They sat in the parlor and Tom asked [redacted] to go ahead and tell his story. I asked Tom to wait in the other parlor so that [redacted] would not feel inhibited in telling his story. [redacted] did not mind if Tom were present during the telling. Nevertheless Tom did move to the other room.

is a 25 year old man, graduated from college a couple of years ago, and he is associated with the LINK Program. This Program was founded by Tom Swade to match up sponsors with young black people to help them get through high school, college and into careers. It has been very successful in the past.

She confronted Tom with this material. [redacted] said he and Tom had talked about the experiences at length in a friendly sharing way.

as a 12 or 13 year old at St. Dorothy's School back in about 1979. In the course of working with Fr. Swade, [redacted] says that he and Swade engaged in what he called [redacted]. He says that at times, on different occasions after
activities such as swimming, they had showers together. Often others were present. No indication of any activity during those common showers.

He also said at times there was mutual administration of lotions on the back, buttocks and thighs, but never on the genitals. According to Fr. Swade, he would put the lotions on Fr. Swade. This went on for about a year and a half and then stopped and it has never happened since.

I then interviewed Fr. Thomas Swade for about an hour at St. Mary of the Lake while stepped out of the room. I told him what had said. Tom said that there was absolutely no sexual intent on his part in any of his actions. It was in the context of his way of helping the young man come to grips with his own problems and his own sexuality. Tom said that he never had any sexual intent and he has never had any sexual interplay with male or female.
Tom was very cooperative and I advised him to speak to his lawyer and he said he would be in touch with William Harte, a lawyer whom we both know here in the city of Chicago. I advised Tom that he should not be in the presence of minors under 21 without another adult being present. As difficult as this is for him, it is a necessary step to protect him and to protect anyone else.

I said I did not know what the future held but that I would work with him and if we deal with this properly in a correct manner we may be able to do it in such a way that both he and get the necessary help. Much will depend on the

On Saturday, June 6, I will speak to Tom Sunday night and tell him of this arrangement. I spoke to James Serritella on Friday evening.
7 August 2002

Ms. Lea McCloskey
Acting Administrator, Fitness Review Board
676 North St. Clair, Suite 1910
Chicago IL 60611

Dear Ms. McCloskey:

I have been mandated by Rev. Thomas Swade to serve as his canonical advocate for proceedings surrounding allegations regarding misconduct, and for any ramifications of those proceedings. My mandate is on file in the office of the Cardinal. Yesterday I spoke with Mr. Ralph Bonacorsi [because I was referred to him by Father Kaczorowski's office], and in that conversation I asked that he add my name to the list of recipients of any correspondence sent to Father Swade from your office. I will be most grateful for that accommodation.

The purpose of this letter is, on the advice of Father Propocki, to bring to the attention of the Fitness Review Board some information regarding the recent allegations from [redacted] and [redacted], which allegations are now in the Second Stage of the Review.

1. Concerning [redacted] [redacted] made an allegation in 1992, and it was among those considered when Father Swade was removed from ministry and asked to go to treatment. Two factors are of concern:

   A] When the recent allegation was made by [redacted] it was Mr. Harte's clear impression that the Board did not realize, and thus did not reference, the fact that [redacted] had made an earlier allegation that had, in fact, been dealt with. In conversation this morning with Father Propocki, I discovered that he was indeed unaware of an earlier allegation made by [redacted]. This information is in the file of the Office of Vicar for Priests. I suspect it may never have been transferred to your office, since, if I am correct, the office of the Review Board was just coming into existence at about that time.

   B] When [redacted] recently called, Ms. Leggdas asked him why he was calling at this time, and he said that it was because he had made a complaint ten years ago and nothing had been done about it. When Ms. Leggdas relayed this to Father Swade, Father asked her if she had told [redacted] that in fact something had been done, viz., that Father had been removed from ministry and had subsequently gone for treatment, Ms. Leggdas responded that she had not given [redacted] that information.
Given these circumstances, there seems to be no reason for the Board to be considering the allegation at this time, and I respectfully request, on behalf of Father Swade, that you dismiss it. As noted above, it has, in fact, already been dealt with, and it is a fair presumption that, had Father Swade been so informed, he would have been perfectly satisfied. In the 1992 file, he asserted that the actions “never altered his life,” and that he was not vindictive. It seems clear from his statement to Ms. Leggedas that he sincerely simply wanted to be sure that Father Swade had dealt with this allegation.

You have the information which Father Swade provided regarding the reasons for which there were alleged inappropriate behaviors, particularly his admittedly unwise use of the GENESIS II program. He has consistently denied that there was sexual gratification involved [a key factor in the recent definition of sexual abuse by the Conference of Bishops]. One could assert that he is in denial, but that seems unlikely. Further, he is reputed to be an honest man.

All of that aside, the fact remains that the allegation of [Redacted] has already been dealt with, and thus it should not be considered as a new allegation. We ask that you remove it as such.

2. Concerning [Redacted]. Again, two elements are of concern.

A] We respectfully submit that [Redacted] is not a credible witness, and that he approaches the Archdiocese with ulterior motives. Mr. Harte did present to the Review Board the statements of [Redacted] peers, as well as his own experience with [Redacted]. As recently as this past Saturday, [Redacted] again approached Mr. Harte to seek money. He seems to have no viable income.

B] [Redacted]

Only after a long time did [Redacted] begin to sense he might have something to report. In other words, he had not been plagued by anything until he saw some opportunity. While it is true that any effect on him is not germane to the fact of whether or not misconduct took place, it is also indicative of the spurious nature of this allegation that he only later “wondered.” When true abuse occurs, the abused is always aware, either immediately or in time, of the deleterious effects of this abuse. That does not seem to be the case with [Redacted].

Further, [Redacted] is not even sure of the question, which gives rise to the very clear possibility that nothing at all happened, and that Father Swade was simply teaching him to float. Nowhere in the record of other allegations regarding swimming lessons is there record.
of Father Swade ever asking a question of the nature and with the implication that suggests. Thus it does not “fit” the other similar allegations. could most easily have discovered the basis for the allegations made by others, and adopted them as his own. This becomes all the more plausible, given character. If you wish written statements relative to his character, we can provide those from reputable persons who know him well.

Again, given the unreliable basis for this allegation, we respectfully request that you consider it to be non-credible. It is difficult to see how the Board can come to any certitude about this allegation. It is important to note that Father Swade denied this allegation when it was first raised. He denies it today as well. On the contrary, where there were incidents of inappropriate behavior, Father Swade has acknowledged that something occurred.

At the Hearing which Father Swade and Mr. Harte attended, Father Swade referenced the third allegation, made by which the Board determined was unfounded because Father Swade was not in the stated parish at the time, but was in seminary. His reference made the point that, had he been at the parish at that time, he would have, almost automatically, based on earlier allegations, been found guilty, whether he was in fact guilty or not.

This statement is not a condemnation of this Board or its work. It is simply an appraisal of the human condition itself, that is, that any one of us can easily fall into a line of thinking that if A is true, and B is true, and D, E, and F are true, then G must also be true. But I urge you to give full consideration to the possibility that there is no credibility to allegations, regardless of what is alleged to have occurred with other persons.

Further, given the unique nature of these allegations as described above, we respectfully request that you give them consideration as early as possible, so that Father Swade can be assured that there are not new allegations proposed against him. This request is particularly important in light of the fact that Father is appealing to Rome, thus bound by some time frame, and his current status needs to be made clear as that process goes forward.

We all recognize that these are very difficult times for everyone, and the work of this Board is extremely taxing and difficult. I am most grateful to you, as is Father Swade, that you will give time and consideration to this matter which is, needless to say, of utmost importance to Father Swade, both for his reputation and for his sense of himself.

Please contact me if you have further questions or need clarification. Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Francine Quillin, PBVM, JCL
Advocate

Copy: Rev. Thomas J. Swade
Mr. William Harte
September 23, 1992

Cardinal Joseph Bernadin  
c/o Archdiocese of Chicago  
155 East Superior Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60610

Dear Cardinal Bernadin:

I am currently a member of St. Dorothy Parish. It has come to my attention that some of the members of this parish are beginning a campaign to have Father Thomas J. Swade reinstated as an Associate Pastor.

I am writing to express my concern and to inform you that I strongly oppose Father Swade's return to St. Dorothy Parish. I feel that such a move would not only go against the basic teachings of the Catholic Church, but would also be a blatant insult to the parishioners of St. Dorothy. Further, I feel that such a move would jeopardize the level of trust required for a strong parish.

I grew up in St. Dorothy's Parish. During these years, I came to admire and respect Father Swade for his talent and generosity which was particularly generated toward the young people of the parish. However, when I first learned of the allegations made against Father Swade, I did not doubt one bit that they were true. Then began to wonder how this news would affect the young parishioners, particularly the Link high school students who turned to Father Swade for guidance and trust. Now I wonder what type of message would be sent to these same young men and women by allowing Father Swade to return to the parish. The first message it would send is that a wrong can be committed against them, but the offender will go unpunished. Further, such a move would lessen the seriousness surrounding an issue as important as sexual assault.

The Catholic Church takes a strong position against actions such as abortion, adultery, pre-marital sex, and homosexuality. Sexual assault and abuse are no less serious and can not be overlooked or condoned, particularly when it is committed by a member of the clergy. Allowing Father Swade to return to St. Dorothy would not only condone his actions, but it would also condone sexual assault and abuse. Although we as a Christian people are taught to be forgiving and understanding and not to judge one another, we can not overlook the severity of what Father Swade has done. Father Swade has committed a
serious offense against a young black male who put a great deal of trust in him and this cannot be overlooked. While it is a well known fact that Father Swade is a giving and talented person, he is still human and, therefore, subject to human frailties. We can pray for Father Swade but we can not accept him back into the parish as if his actions did not amount to anything.

Father Swade has insulted his parishioners and colleagues who trusted him very much. Allowing him to return to St. Dorothy's would be an even bigger insult. For these reasons, I strongly urge that the best interests of the parish, parishioners, young and old, be considered and Father Swade not be allowed to return to St. Dorothy's Parish.

A concerned parishioner

cc: Father Michael Nallen
From: Leah McCluskey
To: Costello, Vincent
Date: 9/4/2007 4:02:54 PM
Subject: Re: Dear Leah,

Fr. Costello,

Thank you so much for following up. I will print this up for our files here.

Leah

>>> Vincent Costello 9/4/2007 4:00 PM >>>

Dear Leah,

After exchanging voicemails and messages Fr. Tom Swade and I finally made contact on the phone today. When I asked him if he worked at PADS in Oak Park during the lenten season last year he answered in the affirmative. He said that he did so at the suggestion of his spiritual director. During our conversation I mentioned that the folks who supervise that PADS site might not be willing to accept him back this season Father Swade seemed to be at peace with it.

Fr. Vince Costello
From: Leah McCluskey  
To: Costello, Vincent  
Date: 8/30/2007 1:49:12 PM  
Subject: Fr. Swade

Fr. Costello,

I did get your message yesterday about Fr. Swade. Please inform Fr. Swade that we have received information that he had been active in PADS and ask what information he could provide us on such involvement.

Dependent upon what he says, I'm wondering if we tell him that he is not to volunteer at PADS or that the discussion was that we will provide PADS with information on his status as a priest in this diocese [I'm thinking the latter is what was discussed].

Thanks.

Leah
From: Leah McCluskey
To: Hudzik, Richard
Date: 8/27/2007 1:29:13 PM
Subject: Re: Swade Inquiry

Dick,

Thank you very much for the information and your recollections. I am sorry for not sharing this information with you sooner. I will keep you up to date as we continue to go forward with this--I have asked one of the Vicars to either call Fr. Swade to ask of his involvement with PADS or to make the call with me to Swade.

Leah

Leah McCluskey, MSW, LSW
Director, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review
737 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 900
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Office: [312] 751-5205
Fax: [312] 751-5279
lmccluskey@archchicago.org

>>> Richard Hudzik 8/27/2007 11:46 AM >>>
Good morning, Leah. In review of your memo regarding Tom Swade and PADS, I can only offer the following:

As Tom Swade has very little interaction here with any of us (only one or two meals during the entire time I have lived here, for example), what he does during the day is not disclosed in conversation around the table. As Tom returns typically around midnight each night, it would be feasible for him to work the shift ending at 10:30PM and return here by midnight. As for his only overnight away--generally Sunday nights--his reports state that he is at what he calls "the family home." In any event, there has never been any mention to me about working at PADS.

The only suggestion ever about PADS was mentioned to me by one of the other residents here when I inquired about Swade's animated conversation with the Cardinal when the Cardinal was here a few weeks ago to visit with the men. I was not in the room at the time the conversation occurred--I was in the kitchen working with the kitchen crew and I could see through the window in the door that Swade was holding the floor as the men sat in a circle with the Cardinal. It is my recollection that when I asked one of residents later what Swade was going on about, I was told that he was stating the need for the residents to have "some kind of ministry, such as, for example, PADS." Of course, as reported to me, Swade's comment about PADS was prospective and not a disclosure of something that he was doing presently. Swade's comment does not become remarkable except in light of your memo and the fact that he is apparently already working at PADS. Might it be that, if the report to me about the conversation with the Cardinal was accurate, the mention of PADS by Swade is his effort to assert that "Well, I mentioned it to the Cardinal and he didn't say anything"?

Thank you for keeping me up to date. Let me know if there is anything else you need.

Dick

Deacon Richard F. Hudzik
Director
Cardinal Stritch Retreat House
P.O. Box 455
Mundelein, IL 60060-0455
www.stritchretreat.org

AOC 005746
Hello Dick,

I have attached a memorandum that I typed up concerning Fr. Swade and his reported involvement with PADS in the Oak Park area.

I did look through all of his Daily Logs during this past Lenten season—where Swade never specifically indicated that he was volunteering at PADS every Tuesday of Lent.

I suggested that I check with you to determine if any of this sounds familiar to you...

Thanks.

Leah
As you may recall, on December 22nd Ed Grace and I met with Tom Swade. He came with his spiritual director. Neither Ed nor I knew that anyone was going to accompany Swade to our meeting until showed up. In many ways it was a typical Swade meeting, and I suspect you know what I mean by that. Our agenda was to discuss our concern about Swade’s lack of an onsite chaperon when he spends overnights away from Stritch Retreat House. (Before the meeting we all agreed that having his brother serve as his chaperon was insufficient since he lives in the next town.) Ed and I shared the canonical decree with Tom. Of course this made him very agitated to say the least.

By the conclusion of the meeting we agreed that it was possible for the woman who lives downstairs to act as his chaperon. She and her adult son rent from Swade. Swade told us that she is retired and spends most of the time at home. Her name is Swade said he would speak with her over Christmas about serving as his chaperon. Our original plan was for us to inform you of the plan and for you to speak with Swade about the matter at his family home on Wednesday, December 27th. When we spoke about this with you on the 22nd you informed us that you would be on vacation until January 3rd (?). I spoke with Swade on the 27th. He informed me that was willing to serve as his chaperon. I followed up with a call to her (I can’t remember if it was on the 27th or the 29th) and told her a few basic things about her role. I informed her that Swade had some problems in the past and that he was removed from ministry because of those problems. I told her Swade was never to be alone with young people, he was not to present himself as a priest or wear clerical garb. I advised her if she ever had reason to believe Swade violated these conditions that she should contact me as soon as possible and I provided her with my name and number. I also said that you might call her during this week to say a bit more about her responsibilities.

Name:  

Telephone Number:  

Address:  

On December 22nd I mailed a copy of the decree to Swade’s canonical advocate, Sr. Francine Quillin, and after Christmas I sent a copy to his civil lawyer, William Harte.
I was born on the feast of St. Joseph. I was ordained on May 1, 1961, the feast of St. Joseph the worker. Throughout my life St. Joseph has been a father figure and a symbol of one who is dedicated to his family and his work; a man committed to the service of others. In my ministry I have tried desperately to be like St. Joseph and to make a difference. A characteristic that has been present all throughout my priesthood and that has never changed in my willingness and desire to address problems and to be part of the solution. People who believe in doing things, err. They just do. In order to grow you must take RISKS. And a certain number of risks are bound to fail. That is OK, if we learn from our mistakes. I like to think that all of my mistakes are original ones. In other words, I try not to make the same mistakes twice.

In the quotes and readings that are part of this report, I have culled from many sources, the psychological, sociological, theological and moral grounding which have nourished, informed, challenged and guided me during much of my priesthood. I was trained in a pre Vatican educational and seminary system which was designed to supply the Archdiocese of Chicago a stable supply of obedient and docile clergy. I have lived most of my priesthood in a post Vatican era of rapid change where many so-called absolutes that guided past generation have crumbled, where new information and options face us continually. I believe that part of maturity today is inner security and self-confidence so that when the guideposts of the past shift and fade, we don’t become frightened and panic, but can pick and choose our best way through the time of uncertainty and ambiguity. One of the directions that my human and spiritual growth has taken since Vatican II has been away from the need for certainty and toward the tolerance of ambiguity.

In chapter one of this report I stress the fact that to isolate an incident in a series of events is to cut off the real meaning of that incident. I am convinced that this is being done in the situation. To isolate an incident from what was going on in our relationship from what I was zealously and faithfully trying to accomplish in my religion classed on Maturity, Spirituality, Sexuality and Moral education, from the goals and objectives in my complex and challenging ministry in the African-American community through LINK, from what I was experiencing and how I was growing in my own personal and spiritual life at that time is to lose most of the meaning of the event.

Chapter two enumerates some personal characteristics and values which have guided me through my life thus far.

Next in Chapter three I state first through columnist Richard Roeper the distorted disfigured view many, many Catholics and non Catholics had of priests. “We didn’t know priests were human. They didn’t seem any more three-dimensional than the
saints we read about in religion class. Then Denny Geaney and John Ring in their book, *What a Modern Catholic Believes about Priesthood* reveal:

"Openness and honesty, warmth and compassion—all very human qualities. A man endowed with such qualities would be very human indeed. The priest who attempts to develop these virtues soon finds that his personal life becomes very complicated and risky. He finds himself more and more involved in other's lives. Many have experienced deep pain and acute confusion in allowing themselves to enter into deep personal relationships. It was not only that they were inexperienced in such relationships, they were also suspicious of them. They were caught between the desire to be fully human and the fear that their celibate state made this impossible.

A priest can do one of two things in the face of this dilemma. He can easily turn away from every threatening human relationship. This may seem the safer thing to do. In the process, however, he becomes just a little bit less human with every rejected opportunity. If he decides not to run away then he must know that he is in for deep pain and considerable anxiety. His life will never have that easy security again. Many priests have had the courage to love deeply. The signs of their struggle are there for everyone to see. Because of this some have left the priesthood; others have stayed but have become embittered by a difficult situation.

However, there are those who have become exceptionally fine human beings and powerful priests because of the pain they have experienced. These are hard times for those who refuse to take refuge in clerical culture.

Chapter four is the critical chapter in this report. It examines and summarizes the Genesis II Program which was developed in 1975 by Father Vincent Dwyer, O.C.S.O. founder of the Center for Human Development. I was first exposed to Genesis II in 1978 when the priests in our Southside cluster embarked on this lengthy program for 16 consecutive Mondays. At the time, I found this experience of Genesis II to be earthshaking. The beginning of a personal human and spiritual reawakening. It became for me a process of reviewing and evaluating my formation and opening myself to the challenge of growth. In other words, it changed my life. It gave me new energy and a new sense of purpose and direction as a priest at St. Dorothy and in my work as executive director of LINK.

In summary:

UNIT 1 The Spiritual Journey Session 1

Purpose: To help the participants discover that human growth and spiritual growth are closely interwoven and that both involve risk.

Session 2
Purpose: To help the participants understanding of the principles of the spiritual life which are presented in the films, the Spiritual Journey, and to begin to make them part of their lives.

Session 3
Purpose: To help the participants explore the stages of spiritual growth. To determine whether they made decisions on values received from without or on principles interiorized and made their own.

UNIT 2 Spiritual Growth and Self Concept
Session 1
Purpose: To help participants begin to become aware that a POSITIVE SELF IMAGE is the basis of loving acceptance of other and a necessary condition for becoming open to one's self, to others and to God.

Session 2
Purpose: To help the participants realize that spiritual growth depends on an integral love which includes SELF, every bit as much as God and neighbor.

"Love of self is communicated NOT self converted. It comes from without. TOUCH is a powerful force to communicate AFFIRMATION, to communicate the feeling of value and worth.

Love of self is communicated therefore we would have to recognize the fact that we are DEPENDENT because we need one another. If love of self is so critical and we communicate it, then the greatest power we have is the power to UNCONDITIONALLY AFFIRM one another. We possess the tremendous POWER TO AFFIRM.

This is really scary!
This power is like unto God's power!
Do you use your power
to communicate to your children the UNCONDITIONAL AFFIRMATION of them
to stand by them
to stand by and with one another
to show how much we need one another
husbands-wives
priests-religious

Do you affirm one another?
The greatest power we have is the power to AFFIRM!!! The greatest evil, the most horrible, greatest sin we are capable of committing is the non exercise of that power!!! because it is a sin against the Spirit and is rooted in pride because we won't take the RISK to communicate the Good News, the beauty and lovableness of other people.

AFFIRMATION I must be able to give and receive
AFFIRMATION. I must develop the type of asceticism that allows me to give and receive. How did God create us? Self concept is so crucial.
The spiritual life is a supportive way of getting tuned in to the way that
God created us and working with him. God doesn't make JUNK.

Session 3
Purpose: To put participants in touch with their self-image and their self-ideal and help them see areas in which they would like to grow spiritually.

"Fr. Dwyer says that because our self concept is so critical to our growth and well-being we all need to be affirmed to have the experience of being loved. When we are loved and affirmed we grow. When we are not affirmed, when we are put down, serious damage can be done to us."

UNIT III The Risk of Being Myself  Session 1
Purpose: To explore with the group the contacts they have with people and to consider their meaning and importance. To bring about a realization of the importance of relationships for spiritual growth.

"...basically it is the quality of our ordinary relationships with the people with whom we live and work that determines the quality and tone of our spiritual life.

The number of times we do 'acts of charity' each day is NOT nearly as important for spiritual growth as the openness and trust we show to people, as the tolerance we have for the frustrations they cause us, as the willingness to forgive and try again when they have hurt us.

If you are friendly and pleasant, if you pay attention to people, they may want to know you better, may want to become more deeply involved with you, if you show by your attitude that you are an OPEN person you invite people into your life.

You need to be aware of ordinary daily human contacts to realize how important they are.

You have to work at them. You have to keep reminding yourself of how these LITTLE things convey an ATTITUDE. You have to work on having and keeping that attitude, that you think people, all people are worthwhile and worth your attention.

Think of what that can do for you!"

Session 2
Purpose: To explore the healing and sanctifying process of listening and being present and to examine some of the blocks to this process.

"FUNDAMENTAL OPTION - Man has the ability to make an EITHER/OR choice. This choice sets us in a direction or way of life. If I choose to move in the direction of the UNRELATED existence I will move toward the MONOLOGICAL WORLD. In that world everything becomes an OBJECT to be MANIPULATED and whose fruits are LONELINESS, CYNICISM AND BITTERNESS. If I choose to move in the direction of the related existence I will move toward the dialogue world whose fruits are solitude, friendship and intimacy. St. Thomas says that SIN is a BROKEN RELATIONSHIP. What are the things that tend to promote relationships?
What are the things that tend to break down relationships? The UNRELATED, MONOLOGICAL WORLD is the experience and result of SIN. Once in this world I cannot get out of it by myself. I need to experience TRUST, WARMTH, FRIENDSHIP AND LOVE which come from OUTSIDE me to help bring me out of the world of SIN.

God uses you and me to create that environment of TRUST, LOVE, WARMTH AND FRIENDSHIP to get people out of the world of SIN.

When people can reach out and say I need you, they will begin to move out of the world of NON-RELATIONSHIP AND SIN back into the world of RELATIONSHIP.

This is a POWERFUL CONCEPT!
I HAVE THE POWER OF JESUS CHRIST
I HAVE THE POWER TO COMMUNICATE HIS LOVE
I HAVE THE POWER TO INVITE PEOPLE OUT OF THE WORLD OF SIN INTO A WORLD OF GRACE AND LOVE. IT IS TOO GOOD TO BE TRUE!

Session 3
Purpose: To help the participants examine the blocks to dialogue with others and to see real ways they might try to overcome them.

UNIT IV THE ADVENTURE OF SELF-DISCOVERY Session 1
Purpose: To help the participants realize that in order to grow Jesus needed deep human relationships just as we do.

A) How difficult is it for you to visualize Jesus touch women, not in a ritual greeting, but in affection?
B) Why do you think Jesus was more drawn to certain women than to others?
C) How important do you think the love of women like these was for Jesus own growth?

To be an open person, to be willing to share something of ourselves, demands that we know other people care about us. And, we don't know about this caring unless it is expressed in some way.

Choose a partner, Sit close to one another, within arm's reach. Look at each other. One of you tell your partner about something that touched you deeply lately. TOUCH in whatever way feels comfortable to the two of you. Can you look at your partner and experience caring in his/her eyes?

Upon completion of this conversation, discuss with your partner how important these expressions (looking, hearing, TOUCHING WITH CARE) are in your life.

A) Discuss the importance for our growth of having other people who care about us, and who express that care.
B) Consider what this need says about some of their other relationships.
C) Consider what this care and concern would be doing for their own growth and the growth of the other people.

I think one of the saddest things not only in the lives of religious—priests, nuns,
brothers, but in the lives of married people, very sad to think that you have never fallen in love. Very sad to think that because you have fallen in love with another human being and by that I mean not this emotional thing, but the intimacy of friendship, the ability to share and care— is not going to take place in your life. Tragic! It is tragic. Eugene Boylan wrote a book called This Tremendous Lover. "We are called to become tremendous lovers. We really are. It is tragic for married people to think you will never love another human being. You will never have deep feelings for another human being. For if marriage is really rich they will integrate deep loving relationships and it will be a base for other relationships, not an elimination of other relationships. And so it was really tragic for me to see people really feeling that because they had experienced a really loving relationship, that it meant that therefore, they should get married. And I’m afraid that many religious have left the religious life because they have failed to understand that that is a normal experience of any religious who is following Jesus Christ.

Jesus Christ is a tremendous lover. He loves men. He had intimacy with the apostles and he had intimacy with women in his life. He was very close to them.

How would you define or describe a deep relationship?

Do deep relationships require deep expressions of affection?

Session 2
Purpose: To help the participants realize that deep human relationships are necessary for spiritual growth.

Deep relationships are really mysterious. You can't manipulate people into these relationships. The best you can do is practice the discipline of being yourself. It takes effort to be open and available to another person. It takes effort and discipline to be sensitive to the needs of others. If we are pushing, probing, if we are not willing to respect the freedom of the other person, it becomes threatening and loses its fun and attractiveness. Patience is needed. Deep relationships usually develop gradually. Relationships continually change. Deep relationships sometimes die, or grow weaker. When interests change, when there is nothing further to discover and share, when there is no warmth or freshness, a relationship dies. There must be a continual revelation of thoughts and feelings, of facets of the personality for deep relationships to flourish.

If you enter a deep relationship which is genuine and giving, at the same time, you enter a deeper relationship with God.

INTIMACY You have a close, loving relationship with another in which there is openness, freedom, dialogue. Intimacy is not synonymous with sex. The greatest and most important affirmation comes from intimacy.

Session 3
Purpose: To help the participants look into their lives to see how much discipline they practice and to discover guidelines for deep relationships.

Chapter five deals with the crucial factors of self image and affirmation in the
“Human beings thrive on physical contact. All of us need physical affection, as reassurance that we are lovable and loved. Especially in times of personal crisis—when physical or emotional suffering makes us doubt our own and others’ goodness—sometimes the only thing that really helps to melt away our pain is a warm embrace. However, our culture shuns display of affection; our fear of being misunderstood—or letting down our guard—holds us back. Many people, however, have difficulty expressing affection without seeming to signal an interest in sex.

Popular psychology insists that we all need hugs—everyday, several times a day, and if we are going through a difficult time in our lives, all the more reason to seek and to give hugs. The emotional lift that we get from hugging and being hugged has surely to do with how we are made, some reflection of our Creator’s plans for us. We are, after all, the children of God who loved us into being, a God who took humanity into divine arms:

Sister Joyce Rupp, OSM writes in her book Praying Our Goodbyes:

We cannot pray the ache out of one another but we can bless it with the touch of our hands, the gift of our hug and our embrace. When we do this, we give the ache in the other permission to go on its way. Touch fills a person’s being with the energy of bonding and love. Without ever saying a word, the message is given: “I care. I am here for you. Here is some strength of mine to go on. Here is some love to energize you now when you need it so much.” Touch connects one to another in care, makes contact with heartache, centers love, concentrates spiritual energies, warms the cold or exhausted spirit. Touch can penetrate barriers of despair, anguish, hardness of bitterness. A kiss on the cheek, a quiet embrace, arms linked or hands held are powerful movements in our ritualization of goodbyes. Let us not be afraid to risk this valuable aspect of praying our goodbyes.

Closely related to the issues of self image and affirmation are the shocking and discouraging facts and realities concerning African Americans and poor self esteem which are discussed by black authors Vernon Jarrett and Shelby Steele in Chapter six. This is the context in which I have carried out my complex and challenging ministry in the black community since 1966 at Holy Angels, St. Dorothys and LINK.

Chapter seven examines the issue of Fatherhood especially as it relates to the African-American community and my deep desire to be a strong positive male role model for young black males especially those in the LINK program. As I have grown older, a primary concern of mine has been the guiding and passing on to the next generation those Gospel values and family traditions that have been so meaningful and worthwhile in my life.

Finally chapter eight speaks to my role, efforts and methodology in teaching
In conclusion, Fr. Vincent Dwyer in his Genesis II program says, "Today spirituality is seen as man's response to God revealing himself from moment to moment. It is obvious that spiritual growth doesn't consist in doing more practices, more religious acts. Spiritual growth is a process of taking possession of our values — making them our own — of being guided in our decisions by an interior, integrating principle. In other words — it isn't so much WHAT you do as WHY you do it.

The real task that each of us faces is to remain open to the Holy Spirit, and the need to be willing to let go and remain ever faithful to the unfolding richness and understanding of the message of Christ, as that Light speaks to us in and through the Church, but also through the knowledge that we are given in other ways — through the events of our lives and primarily in and through the people He sends into our lives.

When we do look back we should be able to say that we tried to follow the light that was given to us — that's all that is needed and all that you're capable of doing."

As I look back I can say that I tried to follow the light that was given to me as best I could.

It is my conviction that after reading and studying this report which I am now submitting, you will arrive at the correct explanation and motivation of my actions and the conclusion that as I was growing, learning, understanding and trying to be an effective priest in a complex and difficult ministry I incorporated my variety of reasons into a complex motive — to be like Jesus! To be like Jesus is to think and act as Jesus did — as an adult, mature loving, inner directed Christian.
MEMORANDUM

To: PFR - 43
From: Leah McCluskey, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review
Re: Swade, Rev. Thomas [Withdrawn]
Date: August 24, 2007

I returned a phone call to [Redacted] on August 3, 2007. Mr. [Redacted] is the Director of the Social Work Department at West Suburban Hospital in Oak Park. I met Mr. [Redacted] when I was a graduate school intern in his department at West Suburban.

Mr. [Redacted] explained that the reason for his call was to inquire about “a retired priest” who had volunteered in the PADS program in the Oak Park area, beginning in February 2007. As per Mr. [Redacted], he and his wife [Redacted] have worked with the PADS program in Oak Park for the past 15 years. Mr. [Redacted] explained that many individuals volunteer for PADS, including some religious order priests from the area. However, there is one in particular priest that Mr. [Redacted] was calling to ask me about who had just begun to volunteer in February 2007. As per Mr. [Redacted], this priest had begun to volunteer at the beginning of Lent and had provided the explanation that his Spiritual Director suggested that volunteering would be his “...penance during Lent.” Mr. [Redacted] stated that he recognized this priest from his time that he attended St. Mary of the Lake Seminary in Mundelein, Illinois.

Mr. [Redacted] said that his brother looked up this priest “on your website [the Archdiocesan website where the list of priests withdrawn from ministry as the result of substantiated allegations of the sexual abuse of minors].” When asked, Mr. [Redacted] identified the priest as Rev. Thomas Swade. Mr. [Redacted] continued by stating that when his brother found Fr. Swade’s name on the aforementioned website, they looked him up and did not find his name on the Illinois Sex Offender Registry. I explained to Mr. [Redacted] that Fr. Swade’s name is on the aforementioned list on the archdiocesan website, all clerics named on the site have at least one substantiated allegation of the sexual abuse of a minor against them. As for Fr. Swade, I explained that he is not a
registered sex offender, as he has never been convicted of abusing a minor in the State of Illinois as per the Statute of Limitations.

I informed Mr. [REDACTED] that Fr. Swade is a withdrawn priest from ministry as per our policies and informed him that his restrictions include: not being able to identify himself as a priest, not to be alone with anyone under the age of 18 without a responsible adult present, that he is not able to reside in parish setting, and that he has no faculties as a priest in the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Mr. [REDACTED] provided the information that the PADS program runs from October 1st through the end of April each year. He added that those who take advantage of the PADS program include adults and “young people.” When asked for clarification, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that children under the age of 18 are also “...at the [PADS] site...” Mr. [REDACTED] stated that PADS does not permit registered sex offenders to participate, however added that background checks are not completed on participants.

When asked, Mr. [REDACTED] provided the information that there are three different shifts at PADS, one beginning at 5:00 pm, one beginning at 6:00 pm and ending at 10:30 pm, and the last shift beginning at 10:30 pm and ending in the morning with breakfast and clean up. Mr. [REDACTED] stated that his wife runs “the food teams” and that he works the initial shift that sets up the mattresses and such at the site. When asked, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that to his knowledge, Fr. Swade volunteered on the “First Shift,” from 6:00 pm through 10:30 pm. Mr. [REDACTED] added that he was not certain if Fr. Swade worked any other shifts, including the overnight shift. After listening to my description of Fr. Swade’s restrictions as per the archdiocese, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that there is no way for one individual to “supervise” another individual with all of the participants [50 +] at PADS on a given night.

I asked Mr. [REDACTED] if he was calling to report a concern about Fr. Swade’s behavior at PADS from February 2007 through the end of April 2007 or if he was calling due to the fact that October 1st is approaching and out of his recollection of the cleric from the seminary and finding his name on the aforementioned list on the archdiocesan website. Mr. [REDACTED] indicated that his reason for calling was the latter.

When asked, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that he is not 100% certain if Fr. Swade identified himself as a priest. Also when asked, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that Fr. Swade first became involved when he called the rectory to state his wish to volunteer. As per Mr. [REDACTED], all calls from volunteers are given his home phone number and speak with his wife to schedule their participation. When asked, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that his wife does not have any contact information for Fr. Swade. However, Mr. [REDACTED] added that his wife thought that she did have Fr. Swade’s information, but could not find it. When asked, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that when the PADS season begins, “...there are regulars [volunteers] who show up...or they [volunteers] call [his wife] to schedule [shifts to work]...”
I informed Mr. that I have concerns with Fr. Swade's participation with the PADS program and that there were other individuals at the archdiocese with whom I needed to discuss this situation. I suggested to Mr. that he follow whatever procedures PADS has concerning Fr. Swade and his now known restrictions as per the Archdiocese of Chicago. Mr. stated that he intended to do so. It was clear to me that if Fr. Swade appeared to volunteer at PADS at any time in the future, that he would not be welcome.

Mr. stated that he was fairly certain that the person he was calling about is in fact Fr. Swade. When asked, Mr. accepted my offer to fax him a picture of Fr. Swade so that he could be certain.

I thanked Mr. for calling and for the information he provided. Mr. provided the following contact information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>page</th>
<th>day</th>
<th>work</th>
<th>fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

After speaking with Mr. on August 3rd, I called and spoke with Rev. Vincent Costello, Vicar for Priests. I verbally provided Fr. Costello with the aforementioned information and asked if he could call Fr. Swade to ask if he has had any involvement with PADS. Fr. Costello stated that he would be leaving for vacation and was not certain if he would have time to call Fr. Swade. I asked Fr. Costello to call or e-mail me if he did not have the opportunity to contact Fr. Swade prior to leaving for his vacation. I informed Fr. Costello that if I received such an e-mail or phone call from him, I would ask Rev. Edward Grace, Vicar for Priests, to call Fr. Swade with me to ask him about any involvement he has had with PADS.

Cc  Rev. John Canary, Vicar General
Rev. Vincent Costello, Vicar for Priests
Rev. Edward Grace, Vicar for Priests
Jimmy Lago, Chancellor
John O'Malley, Legal Services
Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board
### OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL FITNESS REVIEW

**CLIENT INFORMATION SHEET**

---

**FILE #:** PFR-43  
**REVIEW STATUS:**

- **Opened Date:** 2-6-93  
- **Closed Date:**  
- **1st Stage:** 3-19-93  
- **2nd Stage:** 7-24-93  
- **Supplementary:** 1-21-95  
- **3-19-95**  
- **2-18-95**  
- **4-29-95**  
- **10-21-95**  
- **11-16-96**

---

1. **Name:** Thomas J. Swade  
   **Date Ordained:** May 1, 1961

2. **Current Residence:** Jesuit Residence  
   **Address:** 2058 N. Clark St., Chicago, IL 60614  
   **Telephone:**  
   - **Home:**  
   - **Office:**  
   - **Pager:**

3. **Ministry:** Director, Worshops on Racism and Ethnic Sensitivity  
   **Status (Check one):**  
   - **Active:** ✓  
   - **Deceased:**  
   - **Resigned:**  
   - **Withdrawn:**  
   - **Other:**

4. **Allegation(s):**  
   - **Date:** 1992  
   - **Date of the Offense(s):** 1979  
   - **Sex/Age:** M/12-13  
   - **Credibility:** Yes
   - **Date:** 1992  
   - **Date of the Offense(s):** 1972-77  
   - **Sex/Age:** F/teen-college  
   - **Credibility:** Yes
   - **Date:** 1993  
   - **Date of the Offense(s):** 1982  
   - **Sex/Age:** M/16  
   - **Credibility:** Yes

5. **General Nature of Allegation(s):**
   Genital fondling; inappropriate physical contact, kissing and hugging; partial nudity in presence of teenage female.

6. **Protocol:** on file  
   **Original Date:** 1993

- **Review Dates:**
  - 11/96
  - 1/31/00

---

AOC 005760
9. **Education:**
   BA Philosophy – St. Mary of the Lake Inner City Studies, Northeastern University, Chicago
   MA Theology – St. Mary of the Lake
   PHD Humane Letters – Hamilton College, New York

10. **Ministerial Assignments:**
   St. Bernardine, Forest Park
   Holy Angels
   St. Dorothy
   LINK Unlimited

11. **Family Composition:**
    Parents: 
    Siblings: 

12. **Monitors:**
    Rev. Edward Schmidt
    Address: 2050 N. Clark St., Chicago, IL 60614
    Phone: 

13. **Emergency Contacts:**
    1st 
    Relationship: Brother
    Home #: 
    Work #: 
    2nd 
    Relationship: Brother
    Home #: 
    Work #: 

14. **Other Concerns:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Appointed</th>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Date Left</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-5-61</td>
<td>St. Bernardine, Forest Park</td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td>5-10-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10-66</td>
<td>Holy Angels</td>
<td>Asst.</td>
<td>6/14/72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/14/72</td>
<td>Saint Dorothy</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1977

Administrative Leave

Office of Evangelization and Christian Life

Workshop on Racism and Ethnic Sensitivity

Admin Leave
MEMO TO FILE: PFR-43
FROM: Kathleen Leggdas, Administrator
RE: Thomas Swade
DATE: January 16, 1999

Summary of discussion from Professional Fitness Review Board, January 16, 1999:

Vicar for Priests, Larry McBrady called regarding an opportunity for Father Swade to say Sunday Masses at Metropolitan Correctional Facility in downtown Chicago. Father McBrady accompanied Father Swade to prison and had a positive reaction to people and program.

Board Recommendation for Professional Fitness Review Administrator to write to Vicar for Priest giving support to the proposal and raising the following points for the sake of clarity and to protect Father Swade as well as the Archdiocese.

- Question of degree of disclosure to prison official(s) by Larry McBrady.
- Question of protocol of unsupervised contact with minors tried as adults.
I met with Tom Swade this morning to discuss with him the Board's recommendation for his supplementary review. I reviewed with TS that, according to our current policies, TS would be reviewed in accordance with Article 5. I explained to Tom that he has not yet completed: TS seemed to understand my point. I informed TS that according to Article 5.3(a) a priest shall never return to parish ministry or a ministry that includes access to minors. Therefore, TS would be able to be involved in a non-parochial ministry and his living quarters could not be at a rectory. TS was very upset. He stated that his intentions were only for parish ministry and nothing else. "I belong in parish ministry. It's been three years and that is what I want. This is bullshit." I also informed TS that the Board requested he receive an assessment for group therapy. TS did not respond to this remark. I advised TS that the Board has to follow our current P&P and, therefore, Article 5 kicks in. He stated: has now made it very difficult for any priest to ever return to ministry. I am upset because I have done everything that they told me to do. This is just not fair." I advised TS that he should speak with Pat O'Malley about his anger and what direction he should take. I informed TS that the Cardinal's Commission has reconvened and is in the process of reviewing our current P&P. I informed TS that the Commission "might" change our policy regarding return to parish ministry but that this was not a guarantee. TS requested that I let POM know about our meeting since POM could not attend due to feeling ill. and wait until the Commission has reviewed our P&P. I informed TS that he should also speak with POM about our meeting.
MEMO
TO: File (PFR-43)
FROM: Steve Sidlowski
DATE: November 5, 1993
RE: Discussion with Rev. Tom Paprocki following Cardinal Bernardin’s meeting with Rev. Tom Swade communicating Second Stage Review decision.

Tom Paprocki called me to inform me about the outcome of Cardinal Bernardin’s meeting with Rev. Tom Swade on 11-4-93. The purpose of the Cardinal’s meeting with Tom was to communicate to him the Cardinal’s decision following the Second Stage Review of Tom’s case with the Review Board. Most recently, the Board unequivocally communicated to both Cardinal Bernardin and Tom Swade that their recommendation was that Tom Swade could no longer be allowed to continue in ministry in any way with LINK and not be present in any way within St. Dorothy’s Parish. The Cardinal has accepted that clarified recommendation and yesterday, Tom Paprocki told me he communicated his decision unequivocally to Tom Swade.

Tom Paprocki said that Tom Swade heard what Cardinal Bernardin told him but still seems to be having a problem with seeing the severity of his problems.

Tom P. said that the Cardinal made clear that Tom Swade would have to leave St. Dorothy’s Parish and LINK. Unfortunately, Tom Paprocki said that Tom Swade is still somewhat combative about defending his position at LINK. Tom Paprocki said that among Tom Swade’s complaints at this point is that this has been a conspiracy against him (apparently by LINK-related persons), and that he did not get to meet personally with the Review Board.

The Cardinal explained to Tom Swade that no priest has been given the opportunity to directly meet with the Review Board, per the Review Board’s own choice, to date. The Cardinal provided Tom Swade, per Tom Paprocki with a practical example about how others have followed the Review Board process and new procedures without appearing before the Board and their cases have been handled fairly.

Tom Paprocki said that the most recent information that has come forward through the Vicar for Priests Office regarding [redacted] was also brought up by Cardinal Bernardin to Tom Swade. Tom Paprocki said that Tom Swade is denying that particular allegation and in reference to it said “that’s bull shit. You know what she wants” (and then he proceeded to rub his fingers in the motion that a person uses when they are saying that someone wants money).

However, in reference to [redacted] Tom Swade once again acknowledged certain behaviors in reference to [redacted] but tried to
justify or defend those behaviors by making what has become his common argument apparently that there is a difference between the "ethic of behavior" and the "ethic of relationship." Indeed, he gave the Cardinal a set of papers he would like the Review Board to have and what he considers is the importance of "context" of one’s behavior. The Cardinal promised that the Board would receive the papers.

Also, Tom Swade argued that the time period in which the abuse occurred also has to be considered and Tom contended that at that time he thought that what he did to [redacted] was the right thing to do.

Tom Paprocki told me that at that point the others in the meeting including himself firmly disagreed with Tom Swade in that he should have known even at that time having such physical/sexual contact with a minor was anything but the right thing to do. (Also present at the meeting were the Vicar for Priests, Rev. Patrick O’Malley and former Vicar, Rev. Tom Ventura, and Rev. Tom Paprocki).

In summary, Tom Paprocki said that Tom Swade is going to go along with not being at St. Dorothy’s and working with LINK. He did not argue that point with Cardinal Bernardin.

The Cardinal assured Tom Swade that he does not want LINK to fall apart and is thinking about getting a part time priest to help LINK out as Tom will be leaving.

Tom Paprocki said that Pat O’Malley and Tom Ventura intend to sit
down with Tom Swade about the counseling further and Pat O’Malley will be in touch with me to discuss the as well.

In short, Tom Swade appears to at least be cooperating according to Tom Paprocki although he still needs to address the severity of his problem. Tom Swade did say that he wants to remain as a priest and would first resign his position with LINK rather than leave the priesthood.

I told Tom that I will be in touch with Pat O’Malley about the and I also pointed out that there will need to be a change in Tom Swade’s Protocol in that the current one obviously allows for free and regular access to both St. Dorothy’s and LINK. I reminded Tom Paprocki that I had already proposed a new Individual Specific Protocol for Tom Swade and that perhaps that one could be functional unless Tom were to leave very soon for an out of state facility in which case I and Pat O’Malley could work up a Protocol for Tom either before he departs, or that the interim protocol might suggest that he follow all the rules of and then he would follow his new Individual Specific Protocol upon his return from that residential program.

Tom Paprocki also informed me that Cardinal Bernardin will be meeting with some of the LINK leaders to inform them that he has decided that Tom Swade will no longer be allowed to minister in LINK or in St. Dorothy’s Parish this coming Monday November 8, 1993.
July 30, 2009

Dear [Name],

I hope that this letter finds you doing well.

Enclosed you will find a final report of your allegation of sexual abuse against Rev. Thomas Swade. Thank you so much for your additions and corrections.

In the interest of continuing to expedite this process, I ask that you please return the enclosed report with your signature to me by August 13, 2009. Once all parties sign the report, I will return a final copy to you through Mr. Phillip Aaron. In the event that I do not receive any response from you by August 13th, I will present the enclosed document as the final report to the Review Board in order to continue to proceed forward with this matter.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (312) 534-5205 or lmcluskey@archchicago.org.

Sincerely,

Leah Mccluskey
Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review

Enclosure
Victim Statement Abstract

This abstract replaces the summary prepared by Leah McCluskey, Director of the Archdiocese of Chicago's Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review, of Victim EQ's statement, given to Ms. McCluskey on May 26, 2009, formalizing his allegation of abuse against Rev. Thomas Swade. The alleged abuse consisted of several incidents of hugging, caressing and anal penetration. The alleged abuse took place at the St. Dorothy's parish rectory when Victim EQ was in ninth and tenth grade. Victim EQ estimates that there were less than ten instances of abuse.
MEMORANDUM

To: Rev. John Collins, Vicar for Priests
    Rev. Jeffrey S. Grob, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board
    Matt Hunnicutt, Assistance Ministry
    Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Cardinal's Delegate to the Review Board

From: Santa Garcia, Secretary
      Office of Child Abuse Investigations and Review

Re: [PFR - 43] ALLEGATIONS OF THE SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR AGAINST REV. THOMAS SWADE (WITHDRAWN) MADE BY

Date: August 14, 2009

Enclosed is a copy of the [PFR - 43] ALLEGATIONS OF THE SEXUAL ABUSE OF A MINOR AGAINST REV. THOMAS SWADE (WITHDRAWN) MADE BY with all of the necessary signatures for your file.

Please call Leah McCluskey at (312) 534-5205 with any questions you have regarding this matter. Thank you.

Attachment

Cc: John C. O'Malley
    Office of Legal Services
MEMORANDUM

To: Very Rev. John Canary, Vicar General
    Rev. Vincent Costello, Vicar for Priests
    Carol Fowler, Personnel Services
    Rev. Edward D. Grace, Vicar for Priests
    Matt Hunnicutt, Assistance Ministry
    Jimmy Lago, Chancellor
    Rev. Daniel Smilanic, Archbishop’s Delegate to the Review Board

From: Santa Garcia, Secretary
       Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review

Date: Nov. 26, 2008

Re: [PFR - 43] SWADE, REV. THOMAS (WITHDRAWN)/

Attached is a copy of a new allegation received by this office on Nov. 24, 2008.

Please advise this office of any information you may have in your files regarding
[PFR - 43] SWADE, REV. THOMAS (WITHDRAWN)/

It is extremely important that your forward copies of any and all documentation
pertinent to this case to this office within 5 business days of receipt of this memo
to ensure that the investigation of this matter be properly handled.

Please call Leah McCluskey with any questions you may have at 312-751-5205.
Thank you.

Attachment

Cc: John O’Malley, Attorney

BCC: James Seritella
From: Leah McCluskey
To: Garcia, Santa
Date: 11/24/2008 5:13 PM
Subject: New Allegation
Attachments: Leah McCluskey.vcf

Santa,

I received information from Burke Warren today [November 24th] that has notified us that he is representing [his claim of alleged sexual abuse by Rev. Thomas Swade [PFR - 43].

Please open a file in our office and circulate a PCAC memo. I can enter this new case into RADAR upon my return to the office next week.

Thank you.

Leah

Leah McCluskey, MSW, LSW
Director, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review
Archdiocese of Chicago
737 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 900
Chicago, Illinois 60611
Office: [312] 751-5205
Fax: [312] 751-5279
lmccluskey@archchicago.org
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MEMORANDUM

To: File - PFR - 43
From: Leah McCluskey, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review
Re: Swade, Rev. Thomas [Withdrawn]
Date: December 5, 2008

On December 3, 2008, I called and spoke with [redacted] in civil attorney [redacted]'s office with regard to [redacted]'s client [redacted]. I informed Ms. [redacted] that I had received a copy of [redacted]'s notification letter that he was representing [redacted] in his claim of the sexual abuse of a minor against Rev. Thomas Swade.

I explained that the reason for my call was to ask if [redacted] was interested in scheduling at time to meet so that he could formalize his allegation. Ms. [redacted] said that she knows that [redacted] does want to schedule such a meeting. When asked, Ms. [redacted] confirmed that [redacted] is the same [redacted] listed on [redacted] but licensed only in Illinois.

Ms. [redacted] and I suggested December 11th or December 18th as possible meeting dates before the Christmas holiday. It was agreed that Ms. [redacted] would speak with [redacted] about the dates and get back to me.

I received a voice mail message on December 4th from Ms. [redacted] with regard to scheduling a meeting time with [redacted]. Ms. [redacted] asked that I keep December 11th open and that she would get back to me with a definite time after [redacted] is able to readjust his schedule for that day.

Ms. [redacted] may be reached at [redacted].
March 10, 2010

Dear [Name]

I am writing to inform you that the independent Review Board met on February 20, 2010 and was to conduct a Review for Cause of your allegation of sexual abuse against the former Rev. Thomas Swade pursuant to Article §1104.10 of the Review Process for Continuation of Ministry. As you may know, Mr. Swade is a laicized priest of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

At the Review for Cause, after considering all information presented to it, the Review Board determines whether there is reason to suspect that the accused cleric has engaged in the sexual abuse of a minor.

The Board recommended that the Review for Cause be postponed because your allegation is in litigation. Cardinal George has accepted this recommendation.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at any time. I may be reached at (312) 534-5205 or lmccluskey@archchicago.org. Also, please know that Matt Hunnicutt of the Office of Assistance Ministry continues to be available to you and may be reached at (312) 534-8267 or mhunnicutt@archchicago.org.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dean McCluskey
Director, Office for Child Abuse Investigations and Review

Cc Matt Hunnicutt, Office of Assistance Ministry

Bcc: John O'Malley, Legal Services
MEMO
TO: File PFR-43
FROM: Steve Sidlowski, PFRA
DATE: December 28, 1994
RE: Impromptu Meeting With Tom Swade

I met with Tom Swade today for over one hour following the dedication of the new priests' residence (for those with sexual misconduct with minors' issues) and lunch at Monsignor Koenig Hall in Mundelein with Cardinal Bernardin. Tom wanted to give me a copy of the type of workshop he would want to be conducting in the future and he also elaborated about it somewhat as well. Tom also wanted to specifically request an in-person meeting with either the entire Board or a Committee of it to explain where he has been, is at now, and would like to do in the future.

I conveyed to Tom that I would directly pass along his request to the Board at its next meeting. I explained that the Board had not yet resolved the issue as to whether to either meet with him directly or allow a Committee of the Board to meet with him about his situation but that the Board would likely now resolve that issue at its next meeting.

In the interim, whether the Board assents to his request or not, I explained to Tom that it would be helpful to the Board in any event, as the Board has noted in the past, if he'd put his thoughts into writing, particularly if the Board or a Committee of the Board did not meet with him in person. In that way, I noted that the Board might be able to conduct a more complete Supplementary Review in his situation, particularly regarding his desire to conduct the type of workshop he was describing.

Regarding the workshop suggestion, Tom Swade explained that he and three other priests had formulated the workshop back in the early 1980's. Tom conducted it many times over the last several years directly with the adult sponsors of LINK, parents of student recipients of scholarships through LINK, and alumni of LINK itself. Tom explained that in general there might be 50 student recipients of scholarships every year. As such, the workshops are broken down usually into one in late February or early March and the other later in the year. Tom Swade noted that he has not conducted the workshops for LINK in the past year and a half since he has not been involved with LINK following the Board's recommendation and Cardinal’s decision. He explained that the participants in the overnight workshops are about one-third sponsors of students, one-third parents of students, and one-third LINK now-adult alumni.
Tom Swade also confirmed that he had met with the Office of Ethnic Ministry Staff for the Archdiocese of Chicago about the possibility of perhaps conducting such workshops down the road. Tom noted that the Vicar for Priests Pat O'Malley thought the meeting would be a good idea, so he did attend. However, he noted that in speaking later with Pat O'Malley about the situation, Pat passed along to him that once the Review Board had learned about it, that the Board wanted the matter to first go through it and that the Board should first have to recommend or not recommend that any such involvement with such workshops would or would not be appropriate at this time, and if so, to what extent. Further, I noted to Tom that the policy, per se, does state that he would need to be in a prognosis, etc. before he could technically apply to the Board to return to a "restricted" ministry; as such, we discussed how Tom running any such workshops would have to be justified somehow as a work-type component of his which he has been engaged in for about one year now (in that he began work with in January, 1994). We also discussed how his involvement with the workshops might be interpreted/perceived by some people as a form of an actual "ministry" of sorts, albeit "restricted," but how under the policy in any event the matter should first go through the Review Board’s process. Tom acknowledged this reality.

Further, we discussed how the Board/Cardinal had stated in the past that Tom should no longer be involved with the LINK organization in any way and that this could be a complication in his request. However, I noted that Tom can request whatever he would like in a Supplementary Review and there is always the possibility he could also request conducting such workshops as a component of his with other groups and not through LINK per se; Tom stated he would still very much want to conduct the workshop with the LINK adults (i.e. alumnae, parents, and sponsors) although he will consider the other possibility.

Indeed, as noted, Tom met with the Office of Ethnic Ministries’ staff and discussed how there was the possibility that such workshops might be conducted down the road in some form as part of the implementation of one of the Archdiocesan "Decisions" recommendations recently made. Tom noted to me, however, that he told the Ethnic Ministries’ Staff, per their own suggestion apparently, that the best way for that staff to know how such workshops would work would be for them to actually participate in such a workshop which Tom would conduct. As such, Tom was thinking he could perhaps conduct the early-March, 1995 LINK workshop as an example for Ethnic Ministry’s Staff. I explained to Tom again the complications involved with that possibility but that the Board would consider all suggestions, as well as this idea that perhaps Tom might conduct such workshops in settings other than to LINK groups.
The discussion was very frank and Tom said helpful to him. Tom wanted to know again some of the reasons that the Board did not want him involved with LINK in any way and we went over some reasons. Further, he contended that poses no risk of sexual misconduct in un-supervised or un-monitored settings to minors, per direct verbal comments made to him as well as the answers contained in the Board's Questionnaire. I told Tom frankly that the Board did have some concerns about the Questionnaire results and that it carefully examines all such situations and that it will do the best it can to make a fair determination and recommendation in his situation at this point.

Yet, I noted that we had taken note that, as opposed to previously, Tom was now fully cooperating, e.g. with recommendations, protocol, etc. and that such cooperation is a positive.

Tom complained somewhat of the restrictions he has but said that the new residence is better than the old one. He did want to make clear that he does realize that he does not control his own future and that the Board must first review his situation before anything significant occurs. Tom did want to know if he could still go ahead and begin to make contacts and preparations for the workshop even though the Board had not yet reviewed his request for him to conduct such workshops. I told him that he can request whatever he would like and that that could be one of his requests before or when the Board would make a recommendation to the Cardinal but that is up to him. In the meantime, I suggested he hold-off on the plans in that the Board should review any such requests.

Tom also noted that he did meet with Cardinal Bernardin in early to mid December and they discussed his desires apparently; Tom said that Pat O'Malley had suggested the meeting but that he wanted the Board to know that he had already met with Cardinal Bernardin about this matter. I told Tom that to my knowledge the Cardinal does want to respect the Board process and its recommendations before the Cardinal will make a decision on this situation. Tom understood that reality.

At one point in our discussion, Tom did note how a significant moment for him by the institution (i.e. the Church) which prepared him to become a celibate priest by not allowing him to date and consider his own sexuality in a serious way while he was in the seminary preparing for the priesthood. I asked Tom, however, if he also now realized, as one result of his sense that the victims in his case were also abused and if he had a sense of the painful effects such abuse would have on them. Tom responded candidly "Yes," and spoke particularly about although Tom stated that the details in the legal complaint filed against him by were somewhat exaggerated. He also re-iterated, however, that the allegations brought forward by to the Cook County
State's Attorney are "bull shit."

In any event, Tom did say that he does intend to continue to cooperate and that as a result of our meeting, he does now intend to put his thoughts in terms of what he is seeking in writing to the Board, particularly if it or a Committee of the Board does not end-up meeting with him directly.

I assured Tom that I would make copies of the workshop as described in the packet of materials he gave me for the Board and would await receipt of any accompanying written letter/explanation from him for the Board as part of a possible Supplementary Review consideration by the Board to perhaps be initiated or conducted at its Jan. 21, 1995 meeting.
MEMO

To: File
From: Rev. Thomas J. Paprocki, Chancellor and Archbishop's Delegate to the Professional Fitness Review Board
Date: January 21, 1995
Re: Br. Thomas Szczerba - Supplementary Review

Br. Szczerba requested a supplementary review, requesting that he be permitted to meet with the Board to explain his request to do workshops on racism through the Office of Ethnic Ministry and UNI.

The Board felt unanimously that Br. Szczerba should not be involved with UNI. They further determined that he should not be the one conducting the workshops himself, but could be the one who trains others to do the workshops. This could be part of the work component of his aftercare without being perceived as ministry. Minors should not be present when he trains the staff. Br. Szczerba himself should not be present when the workshops are presented by the staff.

The Board further recommended that group therapy should be used in this case and, in fact, in all of these kinds of cases.

Moreover, the Board determined that a representative committee of the Board could meet with Br. Szczerba. Final decision on the above recommendations is pending the outcome of this meeting.
MINUTES
Meeting: #88 - Thirteenth Board

Date: September 17, 1993
Place: Priests' Placement Board


Absent: Rev. Daniel P. Coughlin

i. Opening Prayer: Rev. Donald J. Nevins 10:29 A.M.

II. Minutes: Approved 4 - 0 - 3

III. Reports:

1.
5. St. Dorothy Parish: The parish is on the open list. Some parishioners have contacted the Board expressing their confusion regarding the status of Thomas Swade '61. Tom is still very much present at the parish. Some parishioners don't understand why he can't be nominated for the pastorate. The Board will have to be sensitive to this situation.
IV. Acceptance of Agenda: Accepted 7 - 0 - 0

V. Business:

A.

B.

C.
VI. Old Business: None

VII. New Business:

VIII. Adjournment: 1:25 P.M.
MOTION: 7 - 0 - 0
Meeting: Friday, October 17, 1975

Present: Laurence Kelly, Michael Adams, George Brown, John R. Keating, Kenneth Velo, Robert Mockenhaupt, James Hardiman and John McNamara

Place: Clergy Personnel Board Office.

1. Minutes of Meeting No. 9, approved 7 - 0
3. Agenda:
   Agenda approved as amended: 7 - 0.

4. Pastorate: Our Lady Gate of Heaven
   wants to be considered a formal applicant for this parish.
   Reports on men contacted for consideration for Pastorate of this parish:

   A. L. Kelly contacted:
      1. Tom Swade - "NO" because he is involved in a program for high
         school boys in the Black community that takes most
         of his time.
      2. [Name redacted]

   B. [Name redacted]

   C. [Name redacted]

   Motion to postpone the first reading on this parish until next week 7 - 0.

   Cf. Reports for other names of men who were contacted and said "NO".
13. Meeting adjourned at 3:20 P.M.
MINUTES

Meeting: #88th - Fifteenth Board

Date: October 17, 1997

Place: Priests' Placement Board/Pastoral Center

Present:

I Opening Prayer: Rev. John Siemianowski 10:05 A.M.

II Acceptance of Minutes: Accepted 7-0-0

IV Acceptance of Agenda: Accepted 7-0-0

V Business:
A. Vicar For Priests Agenda: 10:30

I PRIESTS:

1.

2.
14. **Thomas Swade '61**: Tom is doing well with the Jesuits on Clark Street and is working on various projects with the Ethnic Ministries Office.
VI  **Old Business:** None discussed.

VII  **New Business:**

VIII  **Adjournment:**  **TIME:** 1:00 P.M.
     **MOTION:** 8-0-0
MINUTES

Meeting: #52nd - Fifteenth Board

Date: November 22, 1996

Place: Priests' Placement Board/Pastoral Center

Present:

I Opening Prayer: Rev. Kevin J. Feeney 10:10 A.M.

II Acceptance of Minutes: Accepted 6 - 0 - 1

III
IV Acceptance of Agenda: Accepted 7 - 0 - 0

V Business:

A. 

B. 

2
6. **Thomas Swade '61:** Tom is on administrative leave. Fitness review Board recommends part time assignment.
VI Old Business: None discussed
VII  New Business:  None discussed

VIII Adjournment:  TIME:  3:00 P.M.
   MOTION:  7 - 0 - 0
MINUTES
Parish Staffing Team

Date: November 29, 1993

Place: Priests' Placement Board


Absent: Rev. David Baldwin, Rev. Edward Salmon, Ms. Savannah Smith
Review of Parishes:

A.

B. Parishes:

1.
2. St. Dorothy:

f) Staffing concerns: There are tensions in the community regarding the unexpected resignation of Michael Nallen '89 [Pastor]. There is confusion and
pain in the community regarding the status of Thomas Swade '61 [Former Associate Pastor on Administrative Leave].

RECOMMENDATION: The Parish Staffing Team recommends that a full-time priest be appointed as pastor, if possible.
Adjournment: 3:00 P.M.
MINUTES
Meeting: #96 - Thirteenth Board

Date: December 3, 1993
Place: Priests' Placement Board


Absent: Revs. Robert P. Heinz and Victor J. Sivore

I Opening Prayer: Rev. Donald Nevins 10:15 A.M.

II Minutes: Approved 6 - 0 - 0

III
IV Acceptance of Agenda: Accepted 6 - 0 - 0

V Business:

A. Vicar for Priests Agenda:

1.

2.

3.
4. **Thomas Swade '61**: On Saturday December 4th, the parishioners of St. Dorothy's will be informed that Fr. Swade will no longer be an associate at St. Dorothy's. Also any of his connections with LINK will be severed. The Vicars were concerned about the future of LINK. It is recommended that a team of priests perhaps serve in a Chaplain's role with Robert Anderson [Current Executive Director].

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.
VI. Old Business: None discussed.

VII. New Business: None discussed.

VIII. Adjournment: 1:05 P.M.
      MOTION:  6 - 0 - 0