

Page: 108

Some parishioners may think they know of a case of abuse though the priest remains in ministry. They believe this is a sign of a cover-up because they are not privy to the results of independent investigations – nor should they be.

Commentary: As reflected in the minutes, the Internal Review Board does not believe parishioners are entitled to information regarding allegations of childhood sexual abuse and whether or not their priest may be a danger to their children. Instead, the Internal Review Board and the Archbishop believe they are the only ones who should possess knowledge of child safety in the Archbiocese.

Anderson translation: "Zero transparency instead of Zero tolerance under the Charter for the Protection of Young People."

Page: 95

Redacted description of first allegation of abuse on Easter Sunday was not supported by information in DG's interview that there was no Easter Sunday Mass at St. Vincent's School for Boys, only a Vigil Mass. Also, the details of Redacted abuse allegation did not seem credible. Kesook felt the evidence and details presented did not sustain the allegations.

Commentary: This is one of many examples in the minutes demonstrating that the Internal Review Board and the Archbishop will discredit survivors and protect perpetrators for the most mundane and inconsequential reasons. Here, a Board member discredits a victim of childhood sexual abuse by "DG" on the basis that the victim, who was a child when he was sexually abused, recalled an "Easter Sunday Mass" whereas it was a "Vigil Mass." "DG" is identified as the subject of multiple allegations of childhood sexual abuse throughout the minutes.

Anderson translation: "The Internal Review Board discredits survivors for ridiculous reasons, i.e., an Easter Sunday Mass versus a Vigil Mass on Easter."

Page: 95

Msgr. Talesfore shared that he comes from a mindset that he can never comprehend the claims made against the priests.

Commentary: The Internal Review Board purports to be independent. However, that assertion is defied by the minutes. Here, Msgr. John Talesforce, a priest of the Archdiocese of San Francisco and member of the Internal Review Board, expresses his bias. He shared that "he can never comprehend the claims made against priests."

Anderson translation: "Archbishop Cordileone appoints priests to the Board who will never believe victims and who will always protect predators."

Page: 95

documents presented, questions asked and answered, and observations of the members, it was moved, seconded and unanimously approved that the allegations brought against DG and MH are not sustained and that the recommendation to Archbishop Cordileone is to return DG and MH to full ministry and restore their faculties.

Commentary: The Internal Review Board minutes reflect multiple allegations of childhood sexual abuse against a priest identified only as "DG." Despite this, the Internal Review Board returned DG to "full ministry" without any indication that they informed parishioners that their priest had been accused of sexually abusing multiple children.

Anderson translation: "DG is an accused serial offender. There are multiple claims pending against him."

Page: 86 - 87

She asked if he could be limited in his exposure to children in

his ministry. Archbishop replied if that were to occur, it would be an admission that we thought he was a danger to children, and, if that were the case, he shouldn't be ministering at all.

Commentary: As recently as 2021, Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone has prioritized protection of priests over the safety of children. Here, an Internal Review Board member suggests that a priest under investigation by the Board have his exposure to children limited. Archbishop Cordileone rejects this suggestion, risking the safety of children to protect the appearances of one of his priests. There is no indication that any action was taken to reprimand the priest or protect the safety of children.

Anderson translation: "Cover-up is the coin of Cordileone's realm."