

# Carta aberta do Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond

Carta aberta do Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond, Presidente do Colégio de São Justino Mártir, e testemunho do padre Andrés Morello sobre o caso Urrutigoity

<http://www.saintjustinmartyr.org/news/CarlosUrrutigoityinLaReja.htm>

September 2, 2002

Dear Friends,

In a letter dated December 8, 2001, I revealed that Fr. Carlos Urrutigoity, the founder and former superior general of the Society of St. John, had been dismissed for homosexual behavior when he was a seminarian at the Society of St. Pius X (SSPX) seminary in La Reja, Argentina. In that same letter, I noted that Urrutigoity, after he had been dismissed from the seminary in La Reja, was admitted as a seminarian into the SSPX seminary in Winona, Minnesota, where he was eventually ordained and made a professor. Finally, I further mentioned that Fr. Urrutigoity was subsequently expelled from the seminary in Winona as a result of his subversive activities.

My letter left many readers with the same question: How could it be that the SSPX dismissed Carlos Urrutigoity for homosexual behavior from one of its seminaries, but subsequently accepted him into another SSPX seminary, and then ultimately ordained him a priest and even made him a professor there?

I put this same question to Bishop Richard Williamson of the SSPX whom I contacted shortly after I learned that Fr. Urrutigoity had been accused of homosexual behavior as far back as his seminary days in La Reja. Bishop Williamson explained to me that Carlos Urrutigoity had indeed been dismissed from the SSPX seminary in La Reja for homosexual behavior, but that he was received into the SSPX seminary in Winona because the key SSPX authorities in North and South American did not believe the charges against him.

According to Bishop Williamson (and others within the SSPX with whom I spoke), the charges against then seminarian Urrutigoity were not believed because of a deep division that was then taking place within the SSPX district in South America. Fr. Andres Morello, the rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja, was the head of the sedevacantist group. The District Superior, then Fr. Alfonso de Galarreta, led the opposing group. The division was apparently so intense that the two factions avoided each other. As a result, the SSPX authorities - other than Fr. Morello - were willing to believe that the charges of homosexual behavior made against seminarian Urrutigoity were trumped up. Urrutigoity himself claimed that he was being persecuted and slandered because of

his stance against Fr. Morello's group.

Bishop Williamson further explained that when seminarian Urrutigoity arrived in Winona, he was questioned and given the opportunity to write a defense, or "manifestation of conscience," in response to the accusations against him. Bishop Williamson then presented Archbishop Lefebvre himself with Urrutigoity's written defense. According to Bishop Williamson, Archbishop Lefebvre, after reading Urrutigoity's defense, told Bishop Williamson to admit Urrutigoity to the seminary, but to "watch him like a hawk."

Bishop Williamson then told me that he never saw any evidence of Urrutigoity's homosexuality while Urrutigoity was a seminarian, priest, or professor at Winona. Bishop Williamson said that Fr. Urrutigoity was eventually expelled from the seminary in Winona not for homosexuality, but for subversive activities, namely, the secret planning of the Society of St. John in concert with others. Bishop Williamson hastened to add, however, that after Fr. Urrutigoity had been expelled from Winona, a young seminarian, who had left Winona with him, subsequently accused Fr. Urrutigoity of homosexually molesting him. This young seminarian, with whom Fr. Urrutigoity had had a very close particular friendship at Winona, had been under Fr. Urrutigoity's spiritual direction for two years before Fr. Urrutigoity molested him.

Bishop Williamson also told me that he had accompanied this young seminarian when he gave testimony against Fr. Urrutigoity at a Diocese of Scranton inquiry in July 1999. The inquiry was held at the request of Bishop James Timlin of Scranton who sent his auxiliary bishop, John Dougherty, along with another diocesan priest and an attorney, to hear this young seminarian's testimony. Bishop Bernard Fellay of the SSPX had set this whole process in motion when he formally accused Fr. Urrutigoity in a letter to Bishop Timlin dated February 11, 1999. Bishop Fellay had sent this letter to Bishop Timlin because Bishop Timlin had welcomed Fr. Urrutigoity and his followers into the Diocese of Scranton after Fr. Urrutigoity's expulsion from Winona. At the time of Bishop Fellay's formal communication to Bishop Timlin, Fr. Urrutigoity was working as a chaplain at St. Gregory's Academy, an all-boys high school in Elmhurst, Pennsylvania, owned and operated by the Fraternity of St. Peter. Despite Bishop Fellay's letter and the testimony of the molested seminarian, Bishop Timlin allowed Fr. Urrutigoity to continue in his position as chaplain to adolescent boys.

In order to learn more about the charges against seminarian Urrutigoity, I next contacted Fr. Andres Morello, the former rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja. Fr. Morello is currently the rector of a group called "*Campania de Jesus y de Maria*" located in the Andes. **I wrote to Fr. Morello to ask him about the accusations against Carlos Urrutigoity while he was a seminarian at La Reja. Below is a literal translation of Fr. Morello's response :**

---

I was the rector of the seminary of La Reja from 1981 until 1988, having been previously the vice-rector; therefore I was able to witness the behavior of now Father Urrutigoity all throughout his stay in that seminary

I was transferred to the priory of Santiago in Chile in 1989, and I remained there from February until July of the same year. I was expelled because of a denunciation or better said a confidential request I made for a canonical investigation of some priests members of the Society of St. Pius X, and also because of the support I gave to some seminarians who left the seminary of La Reja.

When I was rector at the seminary of La Reja, I had the intention of expelling the then seminarian Carlos Urrutigoity for a number of reasons, mainly:

- a significant pride
- maintaining particular friendships
- forming a faction of seminarians under his influence
- grave denunciations regarding moral matters (probably the very ones you already know about)

Against my intention of expelling him, as the product of a delicate situation of intrigues which at the time affected the seminary, and undoubtedly with the support of certain priests and the then superior of the district (bishop de Galarreta), instead of being expelled he was sent to the priory of Cordoba (Argentina). The good recommendations obtained there, as well as the support which I just mentioned, motivated his transfer to the seminary of Winona (USA). Meanwhile I had already been posted at Santiago, Chile.

His imminent ordination to the major orders obliged me in conscience to write a confidential report to the rector of Winona's seminary, bishop Williamson, in order to stop the ordination. A canonical report of such characteristics demanded reciprocal confidentiality, and in particular to keep it secret from the person in question. Bishop Williamson made it known to the then seminarian Urrutigoity so that he could defend himself from our accusations.

On July 1989 we traveled to Winona, and bishop Williamson read to us the defense of Father Urrutigoity, defended his "humility" and accused us of lying. A few days later, on July 16, 1989, I was expelled from the Society.

You know better than I the rest of the story.

---

According to Fr. Morello's account above, he not only sought to expel Urrutigoity from La Reja for the four reasons stated, but he even traveled all the way to Winona from Chile to argue against Urrutigoity's ordination to the priesthood. The "grave denunciations in moral matters," which Fr. Morello mentions as the fourth reason for expelling Urrutigoity, were set down in writing as part of a dossier given to Archbishop Lefebvre when Fr. Morello requested a canonical investigation of certain SSPX priests (as Fr. Morello explains in his letter above). The accusations of homosexual behavior made against seminarian Urrutigoity appear in this dossier as part of a report entitled "Documento No. 2." This report was signed by a group of priests and seminarians from the seminary of La Reja. Below is a literal translation from the three pages of "Documento No. 2" which focus solely on Urrutigoity:

---

#### **Page 4, three last paragraphs.**

The third case is the one of seminarian Carlos Urrutigoity. Here the subject becomes profoundly disagreeable because of the turpitude of the issues involved, and therefore it is for us very difficult to speak about them. This is why we will only present to you the most serious items.

During his stay in the seminary of La Reja, this seminarian was denounced by a young layman who lives in the seminary, for the following reasons which became most serious as the time passed. Frequently the seminarian brought up in conversation the subject of chastity. He asked him if he had temptations and what did he do in such cases. Also he asked him whether he was a virgin, or if he performed dishonest acts alone or with women.

In a particular conversation he asked him if he went to the movies, and if the films excited him provoking temptations. The lad answered yes, and Urrutigoity asked if this prompted him to search for women, to which the young man replied again yes. Then the seminarian asked if he would consider making the dishonest act with a man. The lad said no.

#### **Page 5.**

The same witness denounced as well the seminarian for entering his room without knocking previously. One night at about 3:00 AM he woke up and found him inside the room uncovering him. The excuse that Urrutigoity gave next day was that he had entered the room in order to cover him. Before this situation the lad went to Father Canale, a priest whom he trusted. He laughed and said to him: "The only thing I can tell you is to lock the door." Father Canale was therefore fully aware of the situation and he never talked about it with the superior of the house.

The witness says also that on one occasion the seminarian entered into his room and, finding him in bed, told him that he had a fever. The lad replied that he was feeling well, but Urrutigoity insisted that he had a fever and that in order to confirm it he was going to fondle his genitals to see if they were inflamed, and he did it.

One day Carlos Urrutigoity gave him underwear, insisted that he should get naked and try it on before him to see if it fit. He proposed that he take measurements every week of his physical development, naked and with his back towards the wall, which the young man refused to do.

He gave him a shot and insisted on massaging his buttocks, which he did.

We finish here the testimony of the young man, and we wish to make it clear that these are not all the incidents, just those which we consider more relevant.

A seminarian declares that being in the restroom he touched him in his private parts, and that often he told him things about the private parts, among others that "he adored his buttocks" (the seminarian had not yet received the soutane). He said: "I adore your little round butt" (and made a gesture with his hands).

Another seminarian tells us that he asked him about the sexual life of his past and about his present temptations.

Two traditional young laymen declare that during a summer camp organized by Carlos Urrutigoity - with the inexplicable authorization of Bishop de Galarreta, who knew about the situation, and while the seminarian was in the priory of Cordoba under observation because of his disciplinary problems - he went to the river with a group of young men. There he removed his clothes before the others and remained in underwear. One of the youngsters offered immediately a swimming suit which Urrutigoity rejected, and in such attire he bathed in the river.

(Handwritten) De Galarreta did not expel him because of the problems this could cause, especially with the Calderon family.

We ask your forgiveness, Father, for writing about these unpleasant issues but we consider it necessary since nobody has heard our complaints. What worries us right now is that (a) the superiors know about this situation. Not only was the seminarian not expelled, but the solution to his moral and disciplinary problems is simply to send him to another seminary. (b) Carlos Urrutigoity is about to receive major orders in Winona, USA. (c) a serious investigation was never started.

### **Page 6, first paragraph.**

We are worried and scandalized by all this. We have tried by all means to inchoate an investigation to no avail. Bishop de Galarreta made it impossible to take measures against him, and despite the fact that he now acknowledges his mistake, he still does nothing to repair it.

---

Those who are familiar with Fr. Urrutigoity's more subtle *modus operandi* will readily recognize in the testimony above the incipient techniques of a sexual predator who was not yet able to manipulate others by means of the full authority of the priesthood. Indeed, the above account confirms reports of Fr. Urrutigoity's frequent initiation of discussions on "chastity" in order to test the willingness of his objects of seduction. And given what is already known about Fr. Urrutigoity's fondness for suppositories, it is not surprising to read about seminarian Urrutigoity's efforts to manipulate "medical problems" for his own perverse purposes. We also see in the account above a slightly more modest version of Fr. Urrutigoity's willingness to parade naked in front of potential victims. Moreover, we see here further testimony of Fr. Urrutigoity's penchant for late night visits to those who are asleep and thereby vulnerable to his advances. Although Document No. 2 does not accuse seminarian Urrutigoity of sleeping in the same bed with other seminarians, there is ample testimony that Fr. Urrutigoity slept one-on-one with seminarians under his authority at Winona, and with boys and young men under his spiritual direction at St. Gregory's Academy and at the Society of St. John's property in Shohola.

Document No. 2 and Fr. Morello's letter also reveal that Fr. Urrutigoity's present suspension is nothing new for him. Carlos Urrutigoity has been formally accused of homosexual molestation in three different places, yet each time he has managed to evade justice by enlisting episcopal support. Urrutigoity was first accused, as we have seen above, when he was a seminarian in La Reja, Argentina. After Urrutigoity was ordained a priest, and soon after he left the seminary in Winona, Minnesota, he was accused again, this time by the young seminarian who left Winona with him. The third accusation was made in a federal lawsuit by a graduate of St. Gregory's Academy when Urrutigoity was the superior general of the Society of St. John. Note that Fr. Urrutigoity's

victims came from three completely different backgrounds and that they knew nothing about the prior victims. Hence, there is absolutely no basis for the Society of St. John's claim that the accusations of homosexual molestation reflect a conspiracy against Fr. Urrutigoity.

Note also that even those who initially found themselves on opposite sides, such as Bishop Williamson and Fr. Morello, are now all agreed on at least one thing: Carlos Urrutigoity is a homosexual predator. How then can Bishop Timlin, without whose assistance and support Fr. Urrutigoity would have long ago been stopped, continue to protect this Rasputin in a Roman collar? Although Bishop Timlin has been repeatedly warned that Fr. Urrutigoity continues even to this day to create scenarios that place him in the company of young men, Bishop Timlin still does nothing but claim that all the accusations against Fr. Urrutigoity have been fabricated by his enemies.

All who are disgusted with Bishop Timlin's failure to protect his flock from a clear and present danger should write to him at xxxxxx. I also encourage all concerned parties to contact Mr. Andrew Jarbola, the District Attorney of Lackawanna County: (1) to exhort him to ensure that the ongoing criminal investigation of Fr. Urrutigoity and Fr. Eric Ensey is both rigorous and independent of diocesan influence; and (2) to ask why there is no news of impaneling a grand jury.

Sincerely,

**Dr. Jeffrey M. Bond**  
**President**  
**The College of St. Justin Martyr**  
**142 Market Road**  
**Greeley, PA 18425**

[jmb3@ltis.net](mailto:jmb3@ltis.net)

[www.saintjustinmartyr.org](http://www.saintjustinmartyr.org)

---

Revision #4

Created 25 September 2024 01:02:44 by Admin

Updated 26 September 2024 01:27:07 by Admin