

I am Marie Philippe, the niece of Father Marie Dominique PHILIPPE (1912-2006) and fr. Thomas PHILIPPE o.p.(1905-1993). They were recently denounced by their respective communities in 2013 and 2015.

Since then, they have once again been subjugated to accusations by a *television* program by ARTE on March 5, 2019 on the subject of “abused religious”. The press briefing of the network presents the context of the emission in the following terms: “*For decades female religious persons on all continents are sexually abused by predator priests. ARTE proposes a chilling investigation on the latest scandal of the Catholic Church at the moment when Pope Francis admits this sexual violence within the institution*”. Thanks to a strong media hype (even in the weekly *Famille Chretienne*...) and with the assistance of others outlets and events, there has been a record audience of 1.5 million viewers.

Fr. Marie-Dominique Philippe was the founder of the Community of St. John and was denounced by the General Prior of the Community of St. John seven years after his death on May 13, 2013 for, it was said, to have posed “acts against chastity” with adult women.

Fr. Thomas was, with Jean Vanier, the cofounder of l’Arche and was denounced twenty two years after his death by the coordinator of l’Arche International **Patrick Fontaine** in the spring of 2015 with the help of **Mgr. d’Ornellas**, Archbishop of Rennes.

Finally, Pope Francis has publicly implicated my uncle on February 5 in the return flight from the United Arab Emirates. He spoke of a feminine religious congregation of “where a slavery of women had taken place, a slavery that even meant a sexual slavery of women by clerics and the founder”. He made clear reference (confirmed by the Vatican) to the Congregation of St. John which as every one knows that the founder is Fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE.

This declaration by the Pope was clearly an opprobrium post mortem. It can only wound me and cast indignity on the PHILIPPE family and its descendants. (I am 66 years old and have 7 children). Thus, the Sovereign Pontiff equally implicated my uncle whereas no civil tribune, nor canonical trials have established the alleged facts. Also, the Pope is cause of confusion in targeting “a community dissolved by Benedict XVI pour sexual slavery” whereas the motive of the dissolution (see below) had nothing to do with that!...and that the targeted community was no longer in the Family St. John!

I propose above all to show that in this affair, that the affirmations of the accusers have not been correctly evaluated with discernment, that they have not undergone the necessary evaluations by experienced persons, and who are also “independent” of the protagonists.

At the end of a personal investigation about the accusations, I discovered aware of the names of the presumed accusers and have noted that there are many contradictory and incoherent statements. I am going to therefore try to bring forward proving elements to acquit my uncles. I have acquired the intimated conviction that these “gestures” of affection often posed by my uncles in the directions of their brothers, female religious, or young lay women principally during the moments of spiritual direction or confession, were filled with a pure and unequivocal intention.

The interpretation of the these gestures of affections have unfortunately been considerably amplified to the point of making them pernicious with sexual connotations or even making them out to be pornographic behaviors (see the testimony of Michele-France). The indictments seem to me to be therefore unfounded and I will add new attachments to this dossier.

Attention! I do not doubt the sincerity of these persons and their suffering. But it is obvious to see that the accusers that I have been able to identify have the notoriety of being very fragile at the psychological level. I do not doubt the sincerity of Fr. Thomas Joachim, General Prior of St. John who honestly believed that it was his civil duty to “denounce” its founder.

Reminder of the fact around the condemnation of Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE

-In 2008, a majority of contemplative sisters are opposed to the institutionalization project of the Family of St. John as a unique juridical entity(until that point, the three branches were autonomous)which the General Prior of the brothers of St. John would be the moderator. The Founder, Fr. Marie-Dominique Philippe, had of course foreseen an autonomy of government for each branch, but he had not given his support to the “hardness ” of the positions taken during the years from 2000-2006. Cardinal BARBARIN(Ordinary of the Congregation of Contemplative Sisters) thus demands a “change” in the government that was upheld by a minority number of sisters(around 20).

-June 6, 2009, Cardinal BARBARIN brutally deposes the General Prior, Sr. Alix, and names Sr. Johanna to replace her. A crisis quickly ensues. In July 2009, 70 out of the 80 religious sisters leave St. Jodard who were present there at the end of June.

-November 10, 2009, Rome revokes Sr. Johanna and names Mgr. BONFILS as the Pontifical Commissary of the Community of Contemplative Sisters.

-In 2012, thirty sisters reach the end of their simple vows. Mgr. BRINCARD(succesor of Mgr. BONFILS) refused the request for the renewal of their vows. So in June the “Sisters of St. John and St. Dominic” are founded in Spain under the direction of the Bishop of Cordoba, Don DEMETRIO, with the agreement of Rome. Quickly their number reaches 150 sisters welcomed in over 10 dioceses throughout the world.

-January 10, 2013, Benedict XVI, through the Secretary of State, Mgr. Bertone, dissolves this new community in reason of their “disobedience” whereas the bishops who had welcomed them had not stated any particular disfunction. In this entire story, there is no question of the “sexual abuse” that was evoked by Pope Francis. Pope Benedict XVI therefore did not dissolved this community of contemplative sisters for this motive which, moreover, was no longer part “of St. John”!

-All the same in 2014 Pope Francis regularizes the situation of the dissident sisters and authorizes the foundation of this new community in Spain under the authority of the bishop of San Sebastian, Mgr. IGNACIO.

Let us also make note of the events between this dissolution and the renewed foundation:

-May 13, 2013, the General Prior of the Congregation of St. John ‘denounces’ by letter(1st attachment) and by a press release(interview in La Croix et KTO) that Fr. Marie-Dominique Philippe is accused to have committed gestures “contrary to chastity” without sexual union. Let us make note of this “precision” which will be amply contested later!

-In June 2013, I personally met Mgr. RIVIERE, Bishop of Autun, who in this affair asked me, to trust the superior of the Community St. John, Fr. Thomas Joachim, regardless of the fact that he had not met *de visu(in person)* the accusers. He was though sensitive to my arguments about the mental health of the accusers and had promised to ask the Prior of St.

John to carry out a psychiatric 'evaluation' of the accusers or at least of their testimonies. Let us make note that as of today my requests have never been carried out.

-Not being assured that the 'investigation' on Fr. Marie Dominique PHILIPPE has been carried out according to the elementary rules of justice and required prudence, in Rome I met with Cardinal Burke on Feb. 13, 2014(at the time Prefect of the Apostolic Signature). He encouraged me to push for a canonical process which I introduced on March 25, 2015 under the jurisdiction of Mgr. RIVIERE, with the goal to publicly show that there are very serious doubts about the credibility of the accusers. (see farther down)

Reminder of the facts surrounding the denunciation of Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE

-April 28 2015, Mr. Patrick FONTAINE sends a letter which in principle is destined to a limited(see attachment 2)number of friends and members of l'Arche which states that:

"Fr. Thomas has committed sexual actions gravely contrary to the vows of religion that he pronounced and also the morals taught by the Church". These actions "attest to a psychological and spiritual control over women whom he asked to remain silent"... These actions and their justification show a falsified conscience which has led to many known victims, and without a doubt to many unknown ones, to whom justice must be rendered"

October 16, 2015, the journal *La Croix* brings up these accusations again. The divulgence of the letter was not a fortuitous one and could even be foreseen by the fact of the large diffusion of the letter. There is much to say starting from this time period about the accusations regarding my uncle which by that time had become 'viral', and had been the object of all sorts of deformations and amplifications which took place in particular on internet blogs whose speciality it is to denounce "sexual abuse" in the Church, whether they be they true or supposed.(1)

-Thus I decide to carry out my own investigation facing "the wall of silence" and without having access to the dossier. Rapidly, I perceive that there is a tight connection between the affair of Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE and the one of Fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE. Moreover, there are historical links between l'Arche and the Community of St. John to the point that numerous religious and priestly vocations are guided to the Community of St. John.

Analysis of the denunciation of fr. Thomas PHILIPPE

According to Patrick FONTAINE he divulgence of the 'fact' had two motivations:

1. "render justice to the persons who alerted l'Arche about the wounds of which they are the victims"
2. "to avoid the propagation of contradictory rumors"

Finally the teaching of Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE is also clearly questioned

This letter leaves no doubt about the culpability of Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE and the gravity of the facts.(2). According to Patrick FONTAINE, Fr Thomas PHILIPPE would have had a "confusing trajectory" and he does not want "to be silent on the grave zones of shadows which have ,marked his existence". He thus "reveals" a canonical sanction of fr. Thomas Philippe in 1956 yet he clarifies that he "does not know the object of this condemnation". He will look for fairly elliptical or second hand(3) information that evokes this affair and he "lets it be supposed that this condemnation is connected to non appropriate behavior the part of fr. Thomas and

which would have been the occasion of the complaints of several women”. Here again, the information that is presented as conditional is unverified.

On this subject, our family, and in particular my father(Joseph PHILIPPE), without knowing the precise object of this condemnation, had the conviction that fr. Thomas PHILIPPE voluntarily let himself be “condemned” in reason of a secret of confession or in spiritual direction that he could not invoke for his own defense.

Mr. Patrick FONTAINE the speaks about testimonies that he has received that report of “grave gestures at the sexual level”. A conditional form is not stated along with this affirmation nor one about the nature of these gestures. He even affirms that “no penal procedure can be carried out” in order to better mark the shameful, derelict, or even criminal character of the acts attributed to fr. Thomas PHILIPPE. According to him, the women “desire to be listened to while they make the truth known”, but that he wants to go “even farther in listening”.

Fr. MARCOVITS' o.p. investigation of fr. Thomas

The origin of this affair takes place in June 2014 when two witnesses(the one of Michele-France and probably of ‘Cecilia’ assistant of l’Arche) would have spoken to Mgr. d’ORNELLAS. He is the one who opens an investigation that is carried out by fr. MARCOVITS, a Dominican.

When I questioned around ten people who had known fr. Thomas PHILIPPE and who live at Trolly or close to l’Arche, they confirmed that pr. MARCOVITS had carried out an investigation alone. Moreover, he did not question the women because he had not been able to or because they did not want to go to his convocation at his Parisian offices. He did not carry out his investing on site by questioning numerous witnesses from the time period, and who would have been able to confirm(like myself...) that fr. Thomas PHILIPPE was often surrounded by numerous women with great psychological fragilities who did not want to be guided by mercy. (cf. the non public written testimonies destined for the religious authorities.)

Fr. MARCOVITS does not seem to have questioned credible listeners about his teaching. No serious witness can attest that fr. Thomas PHILIPPE would have said or written that the mystical life authorized “sexual gestures” with penitents, over and above human law. Or, even that sexual pleasure could lead to the “experience a mystical experience”. Fr. MARCOVITS seems to have received these accusation as “truthful” without an evaluation, or having taken into account the possible pathologies of the “accusers”. It should have been taken into account with as much circumspection as he accusations that fr. Thomas PHILIPPE was a priest completely given over to his ministry. His personality in no way had the ‘profile’ of an abusive or perverse priest.

There is a strange and even contradictory paradox in the reception of the complaints by fr. MARCOVITS and by the religious authorities. The accusers are presented as being “a little” fragile up to the point of having been “under control”, abused, and constrained to silence for more than 20 to 30 years! But they are not “sick” to the point that their complaints would be welcomed with circumspection and with a clinical approach in the medical sense of the term. Even if one were to abstract themselves from the religious question, these accusations do not seem to be humanly ‘rational’. These persons from the outset have been declared to be of sound mind.

Fr. MARCOVITS has also carried out his investigation without surrounding himself with notified professionals about the penal charges(instructed magistrates, psychiatric experts, etc...). In

the document that states the complaints of 14 “witnesses” reporting about facts directly or “indirectly by confidences”, let us note that:

- the real number of victims is not mentioned(to not be confused with the “witnesses”)
 - the testimonies are judged to be “*concordant and sincere*”
 - the actions are declared to be “*gravely contrary to religious vows*”(therefore ‘chastity’) and to the “*morality taught by the Church*”
 - the actions indicate a “*psychological and spiritual control over these women*”, and would “*come from a falsified conscience*” of Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE who sought to “*communicate a mystical experience*”
- In the statements of witnesses there is not mention about those who said that they have received from him “*a veritable paternal tenderness*” without equivocation.

La Croix on Oct. 16, 2015(attachment #3 article of *La Croix*) brings up all of these accusations and even points out that the “mariology” of Fr. Thomas had been severely questioned in the years of 1950 by Jacques MARITAN and Charles JOURNET who would have reproached him of speaking about the Virgin Mary as the “bride of Christ”.

Following this article, I asked for a voluntary “right of response” somewhat provocative which appeared 5 weeks later in the mail of the readers of Nov. 26, 2015(Letter to *La Croix* and publication)

The central witness of Michele-France PESNEAU in both affaires

Meanwhile, several people close to l’Arche pointed out to me a woman a Trolly who spoke a lot about her past “relations” with fr. Thomas PHILIPPE: **Michele-France PESNEAU**. I looked for her phone number in the yellow pages and directly contacted her on the first attempt on October 28, 2015 around 9:00 p.m. I put the phone on speaker so that my spouse who was present at my side could witness the conversation and take notes.

I explained to her that I am the niece of Frs. Marie-Dominique and Thomas PHILIPPE and that I “seek to understand” the facts. This woman expresses herself spontaneously, courteously, and very composed for nearly an hour. She tells me her “story” with details that seem to be coherent and credible at first glance. Here, I can transcribe certain important and significant phrases:

I entered the Carmel of Boulogne in 1966. I was accompanied by fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE in 1971 during in a period of psychological suffering.

After a few encounters with him, things went downhill. I let things happen to me. It was in July of 1972.

I confided to him that I wanted to leave the Carmelites or that if I don’t “I will open my veins”.

I left and I lived in Paris in a maid’s room where he came to see me every 15 days. At a moment he wanted to get rid of me and send me off to a priory of Benedictine Sisters at

Aze(with his sister. 'Mere Winfrida") where I stayed for 18 months and where I suffered a lot. Fr. Marie-Dominique then introduced me to fr. Thomas who listened to my confession.

Fr. Thomas then took me to his bed going even farther talking about the mystical graces of Jesus and Mary during their earthly life.

I was in great distress. Fr. Thomas was a board of salvation. I can say that fr. Marie-Dominique gave me over to Fr. Thomas.

Fr. Thomas asked me for the secret for we had mystical graces that no one could understand. From there I went to l'Arche in order to be close to the community, but not in the community; There was a defiled one in the bed of Fr. Thomas.

I was at the disposition of Fr. Thomas. I was not the only one to be invited into Fr. Thomas' bed. He was a sexual addict and that almost until the end of his life. Fr. Marie-Dominique made him go to Rimont in order to impede any talk about this.

There were blowjobs and masturbations. I was enclosed in the mystical arguments and I was being controlled. He considered himself to be infallible in the "mystico-sexuel" domaine. This is rooted in the theology of fr. DEHAU.

Beginning in 1989, I became close to a very depressive and suicidal assistant(until her death in 1997) who confided to me to have also slept with fr. Thomas. I was not at the "grandiose funeral" of fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE(4). I stopped all religious practice from 2000-2015.

I loved fr. Marie-Dominique despite the fact that he lied and I still love him. I spoke about all of this with an assistant of l'Arche in 2007.

I gave fr. MARCOVITS a list of women who may have been abused by Fr. Thomas.

First of all, the discourse about "control" would almost be believable if we were dealing with an organized sect at l'Arche in the midst of which one of the gurus, fr. Thomas PHILIPPE, would have continually exercised a true control and would have carried out his abuse with numerous and indispensable internal complicities within the community. It should be pointed out that Michel-France accuses **Jean Vanier** to be complicit with the abuse by "his silence" and according to her, "he knew". The accusation of a sect is brought up again by her in her interview on Konbini(attachment 20). On the site l'Avref(attachment 16, page 7) Michele-France does not hesitate to write: "Now in passing by the back door of his apartments, I have heard unmistakable noises of a sexual nature: noises of bedsprings, sighs of satisfaction...". This double life of Fr. Thomas would therefore not have been discrete and would have necessarily been hidden by the silence of the entire community of **l'Arche** including **Jean Vanier** for over 30 years.

Now, for those who have know the farm, l'Arche, and fr. Thomas PHILIPPE between 1970 and 1993, such accusations are not only unbelievable, but are more properly speaking grotesque. To present fr. Thomas PHILIPPE as a "sexual addict" and a pervert would be acceptable in other circumstances or even for other clerics. But he did not have the "profile", nor the physical condition. My husband who met him in 1975, found him to already be physically old! At 70 years old he seemed to be 85 or 90 and had to celebrate mass seated at a tall stool. Finally, spiritual direction and confession are not activities where a person can discreet and go

without punishment while exercising during a 50 year span “a control” above all in view of obtaining sexual “favors”.

The Investigation of Michele-France

The content of the discourse of Michele-France PESNEAU is the very proof of her psychological derangement. However, the testimony of this woman was a determining factor in this affair for in fact it is the only public testimony against my two uncles. Let us make note that since August 1974 Miss Michele France PESNEAU is no longer a religious sister! Also, when Arte uses Michele-France has a French example of “abused religious sisters” this is all the more evidence of a lie than of journalistic reporting...

Four days after the appearance of my letter to the readers in La Croix, my husband received an “anonymous” letter at his office from the postal district of l’Oise(attachment 5 letter of MF) that obviously, comes from Michele-France PESNEAU. She “responds” to my letter while at the same time she unmasks herself. She above all wants to show that fr. Thomas Philippe had “deviant mystical theories” that would be at the origin of his so called “sexual deviance”. This seems to be at the heart of her accusation. However, in her letter she does not speak about “victims” among whom however, she is censured to be one of. She textually says there that my uncle was “as...crazy, let us not be afraid of words, and...perverse”, and a little later that I would need to recognize “*the difficult truth, the one of his profound mental illness similar to the one of his brother Marie-Dominique*”.

She often returns to the theme of a “*family sickness*” and wants thereby to show that she knows well the great family PHILIPPE(from my 7 children to my great grandmother!) all the proffering threats and invectives. Later on I will continue to show the disequilibrium of this accuser.

Michele-France PESNEAU now delivers her testimony without any reserve. She writes on the site l’Avref in April of 2016 under the pseudonym of “Fournier”(attachment #16), then in the review “Coldblood” in autumn of 2016. Today, she is on Arte, Europe 1, France 3, France 5, Konbini, the regional press, etc....and even in Golias.

In Golias, Hebdo #562, she gives an astonishing enlightenment of her psychological state: “*On a Sunday in July 1972, he returns. When my turn comes for an individual meeting, he asks me from the outset if I would like to give him my hand. The grill in the parlor had recently been taken down, which made the contact possible. I think that for him it was a first step on the way to abuse that he mediated about-one can already almost speak of rape!*”(attachment #6 Golias).

Let us see that the fact “to take someone’s hand” for Michele-France PESNEAU is in the *intention* of fr. Marie-Dominique “a step” and that one can “almost speak of rape”!

Michele-France PESNEAU continues: “*Abuse of spiritual power. There is already a spiritual rape, and one is on the road towards a sexual rape”(..)”*On each of his visits, he reinforces his control over me. His gestures are transgressive, I am barely conscious of them, but he affirms me with his entire authority of a priest, Dominican religious, that I shouldn’t be worried*”.*

It is astonishing to see this former instructed and cultivated Carmelite, who expresses herself well and having received an extended religious teaching during her novitiate, say that she was “vaguely conscious” of the transgressive character of certain gestures...

Michele-France after a “detailed” description about her relations (page 7 of Golias, hebdo #562), explains this “control” in an astonishing fashion. This must bring into question those who have notions of religious and sacramental life. *“I go to confession regularly with Frs. Thomas and Marie Dominique.(...).My liberty is taken away from me. The “fathers” have authority. My will belongs to them. For me it is a matter of this obedience of which I vowed”*. The vows of obedience that she made were uniquely destined to be to the Mother Superiors of her Order (and she knows it!). When MF leaves the convent of Carmel in 1974, she de facto (in fact) is no longer a religious. Also, she does not owe any “obedience” to a confessor! Confession gives no particular authority to the one who hears it. It is therefore not serious for a person healthy in spirit to invoke past vows of obedience in order to explain this “control” of a confessor. Let us note that a Christian has the liberty to freely choose their confessor and it is forbidden for a priest to absolve his accomplice.

5.2 An erotomaniac diagnostic

Out of the blue, a clinical psychologist (attachment 17) wrote to me in May of 2019 after I put my analysis online and she confirmed to me that the testimony of this woman was “subject to caution”. She says that *“The allegations of this person, their posture, diverse elements make me think of a case of erotomania”*.

While reading her intervention in Golias, we can take from it assertions that confirm this hypothesis: *“I am totally under his control, and he can get from me whatever he wants. He takes advantage of it. There is though a limit: he substitutes the penis-vagina penetration with the mouth to penis penetration. He has first of all verified with his finger the presence of the mark of my virginity and he told me that he had “a very great respect for my virginity””*

It must be noted that to describe the presumed facts, MF makes an abnormal usage of terms such as “substitute to the penetration of penis-vagina” or even “the mark of my virginity”! (speaking of the hymen). This is one sign among others of problems of a sexuality more fantasied than effective.

We have here a literal proof of the insane story of MF for concretely it is impossible to “verify” with the finger the presence of the hymen in a woman. Only a visual examination done by a doctor in a gynecological position and with the adequate methods and instruments (with a short speculum) would be able to verify the presence of the hymen. One can ask why the interest in such a verification...

I can multiply the unbelievable examples of fantasy or incoherence. In her testimony in Golias, she does not hesitate to say (attachment #6):

“I have had to overcome from the beginning a little disgust, then I became used to the type of ‘rape’”.

Evidently he used:

-the element of surprise the first time” (what surprises)

-spiritual violence” (what is spiritual violence?)

-Psychological constraint by someone who has authority”(here she repeats a part of the juridical definition of aggravated rape whereas he did not have ‘authority’...What was the psychological constraint”?

“I am not the only one to have fallen under his control: he has seduced an entire group of his students at Fribourg University who will form the first core of the Congregation of St. John”

“Fr Thomas has many years of experience in the domaine of erotic-spiritual rape”?

“I am fearful of the love that I have for fr. Marie-Dominique “I am afraid of loving him too much, of loving him badly, of doing him harm”

“I am subjected, fascinated, a little like a bird is by a serpent and then they execute me. I am in this second state, I have lost all my critical sense”....”I discover unknown sensations”,.etc...

In l’Avfre(attachment #16): *“As for me, in the intervals between the visits from Father, I was more and more somber in the black hole of solitude and depression. I must say that I don’t understand Soeur XXX, the prior, who, despite all of her defects was an intelligent woman, has not understood to what point I was not well and did not offer me help.*

In the intervals between visits of fr. Marie-Do, I thought more and more often about suicide. The thought of Marie-Do attached me to life”(..)”Plunged into a sort of spiritual coma, I was not conscious, whereas I was swimming more and more deeply in the waters of folly”(..) “In a general way, in his spiritual accompaniment, Fr. Thomas imprisoned his interlocutor in a relationship where a person was no longer truly a person, where a person was no longer free, even he wasn’t free himself, for besides his sexual addiction(he sometimes had several visits during the same day, even the same evening, since it happened that I found his bed still warm with the previous frolics), he should at least been afraid that some of them would talk...

An objection can be made: “Why have these liaisons gone on for so long(20and!) and the wait so long to denounce them?” She anticipates this shrewdly in **Konbini**(attachment #20): *“I was conscious of having been abused, to have been mistaken, led down a toxic path. **But it is in collaborating in the film and in speaking to Eric Quintin(k: director...) that I realized that I had in effect been raped, first of all psychologically, spiritually, and even physically**”* One will note that the term rape “and even physically” in the end seems to her to be an accessory and like a consequence of psychological and “spiritual” rapes. Whereas normally control is destined to a finality: the physical rape!

The blindness of the General Prior of St. John

In the *Journal de la Saone et Loire* of March 10, the incoherent denunciations of MF against my uncles goes farther and farther, particularly against Marie-Dominique(because Rimont is in the Saone et Loire). Michele-France says there: **I was abused for 26 years by Fr. Marie-Dominique Philippe**”(5). A rapid calculation can show us how much this accusation is problematic: 1974+26=2000. In the year 2000 fr. Marie-Dominique at the age of 88 years olds would have still continued to “abuse” this woman. We also learn in this article that Mother Winfrida Philippe, my uncle’s sister, Benedictine and Prior of Aze(still in Saone et Loire), also mistreated Michele-France in her priory and also “was aware” of the abuses, etc....

Now, beginning in 1976, MF was definitively at Trosly-Breuil(in l’Oise) on the counsel of fr. Thomas and found a paying job at l’Arche(thanks to fr. Thomas?). Fr. Marie-Dominique did not often visit Trosly(which is 62 miles north of Paris and a two hour drive). Nearly once a year,

“like a gust of wind” without advance notice and for only a few hours would he visit Trosly to see his brother above all. How did MF “let herself be abused” by fr. MD? Did she also go to Rimont or to St. Jodard especially for this (more than 230 miles south of Paris or six and a half hours by car from Trosly)? This certainly would not have happened unnoticed... It must be known the Fr. Marie-Dominique did not have a driver's license and always traveled with a brother who was his chauffeur.. (a fact of public notoriety). When he would go to Paris, he always stayed with Mr. and Mrs. Marc JEANSON, ave. Gourgaud dans the 17th and had a full schedule.

Niether fr. Thomas Joachim, nor his bishop Mgr. Riviere, have found it opportune to even softly protest what the journal reported! I have asked them about this on several occasions, but they have not thought it useful as something to be corrected. One must read our “exchange” with the prior (attachment #18) in order to see how with little hidden scorn he refuses any dialogue or questioning. It is therefore legitimate to have serious doubts about the truthfulness of the other declarations that fr. Thomas Joachim considers to be “credible”, but the brothers must believe the statements and this in the name of obedience. The General Prior imposes onto the Community of St. John his opinion on this affair while threatening to put “on the sidelines” the brothers who doubt his accusations. (This is what in law we call an abuse of power). In order to excuse him, I truly believe he has been duped! But we are far from his initial objective in May 2013 when he just wanted to “quiet the rumors”.

When he affirms in his “letters to the brothers” on Feb. 20, 2019: “*I don't know of anyone, having read the whole of the testimonies, who would be able to doubt their veracity*” I said to him: “Ok! I want to see them in order to also change my own opinion” He said to me: “*Impossible!*” for I would surely cause an outrage to the victims, etc... So, I am not worthy of confidence, I am a woman and am not a cleric!. For me, this affair has become similar to a Stalinist process where only the accusers have a right to speak and have access to the documents...

The number of testimonies (around 12 according to him) would also be a massive argument as it also is at l'Arche for fr. Thomas. Now it is important to recall that in this type of affair there is often a mimetic and opportunistic effect. Thus in the affair d'Outreau, a priest, fr. **Dominique WEIL**, was accused of pedophilic acts by at least 6 children and was condemned by the Court of Assises of St. Omer in 2004 to 7 years of prison and subsequently acquitted by the Court of Appeals in 2005 along with the other accused (13 in all!) in this judicial fiasco. It was said at the time “*those who have read the dossier are formal, it is up to the priest's neck. So many children who accuse him, do you call that a judicial error?*” Freedom has thus made the portrait of the one who was abandoned by his bishop who has not even taken the trouble to hire a lawyer for his defense (attachment #21).

One can see similarities in the sequence of the events in the affaire d'Outreau and the one “instructed” by the General Prior of St. John: The essential causes of this fiasco of “outreau according to the rapport of the Commission of Parliamentary Investigation(6) was:

1. The blindness and inexperience of the judge of instruction Fabrice Burgaud who has dragged an entire “para-judiciary community” (police, public prosecutors, experts, social actors,...) with moreover a media pressure that always looks for wrong doers.
2. The listening to the words of the “victims” took place without precaution, without a method, and without recollection. By a perverse “effect” this word became all the more “believable” as the accusations became more grave... Thus the rapport notes with sideration that the deposition of a child has been recognized as

being “*coherent and believable*” after having described a scene of rape during which she said to have been the victim of a triple penetration.

3. The hyperbolic recourse to the notion of credibility. “Erected as an absolute, credibility no longer has to be evaluated” the commission notes! I bring up again a “difficult “ part about the coherence of the witness of Michele-France against fr. Marie-Dominique in the Emission TV de France 5-C a vous- on Feb.19, 2019.

At the 3:40 minute mark, the animator asks her about her passage a Aze and prepares a question that to him seems logical from the story he has thoroughly examined. He therefore asks MF on the subject of fr. Marie-Do:

“This sexual control, umm, it has not lasted that long, it lasted only two years because...”

MF: Pardon, it has lasted 20 years...

Animator: It has lasted 20 years? But not with...Umm?

MF: Yes, yes, there was both of them at the same time. Umm, at last....

Journalist : alternatively!

MF: yes, yes

Journalist : the two brothers...

MF: Yes...

Animator: (who without a doubt wants “to catch up”): He has confided you to his older brother, fr. Thomas, a man of the community of l’Arche where you have lived for the next 20 years...”

Journalist: A passing of sordid power!

MF: Yes, something that I did not understand at the time, etc...

Therefore, 20 years “of abuse” from 1976 with Fr. Thomas who already very sick in 1991 and died in Feb. 1993...this is only 15 years. 26 years “of abuse” with fr. Marie-Dominique that she no longer saw from 1976 onwards...this only makes possible “technically” two years of possible abuse!

This brief passage linked to the other declarations shows how inept the discourse of Michele-France really is! By her own theses she demolishes herself when she affirms with aplomb to have “undergone” “26 years of abuse by fr. Marie-Dominique” and “20 years by Fr. Thomas!

What is even more astonishing is the stubbornness of the Father Prior Thomas Joachim before such ineptitude...However, the General Prior, in a recent letter to his brothers which was aimed at me publicly affirms that “*steps that are taken questioning the credibility of the victims are a grave violence for them*”. Thus he accuses me of “violence” whereas I am seeking the truth and justice. He casts me an anathema without any argument whereas I have amply shown that the credibility of certain accusers is problematic. He only uses **an argument of authority** of

the canonical procedure and above all his own good will in order to postulate about the credibility of the witnesses which have been validated only by him and his entourage.

Yet, I have told him of the importance to not remain in a subjective and affective impression vis-a-vis the presumed victims. Thus, Dr. Lachaux reminds us that: *The role of an expert is to determine the presence or absence of a type pathology which would be delirious, mythomaniac, fabricated, intellectually insufficient, or a passionate conviction. In the absence of these pathological factors, clearly identified and clinically described, the presumed victim is credible in the medico-legal sense, but no conclusion can be carried out in what concerns a judicial truth. A person can suffer from a pathology and have been authentically aggressed, or not suffer from a mental pathology and lie for non pathological motives, but being deliberately false.*"(7)

- **The Other Testimonies of Arte**

"Cecilia" also gives her testimony in the show of Arte. Previously, she had reported it on the site l'AVREF under the name of Cynthia Howard(8). Her testimony is in fact a "cut-paste" of the one by Michele-France. For example, she says that she found Fr. Thomas in "his bed every 15 days" and that he would have "abused her based on her confidence and naiveness".(In view of this description and according to French law, we will say that it would rather be a case of consent and not one of abuse...)

Let it be remembered that MF says in her emission on Arte(16:30) "*this could not have happened every day because I was not the only one to be invited into the bed of Fr. Thomas*". This affirmation is absolutely not credible for people who have known Fr. Thomas and should be a source of interrogation about those who accord credit to this presumed victim(like the Prior of St. John and of l'Arche).

Giovanni **Marcotullio** who is very engaged in the Italian Catholic front, does not ask many questions about the truthfulness of the facts of the brothers Philippe, however, he does bring up a piece of interesting information in **Aleteia**(9) about the "credibility" of the young German woman in the story on Arte:

*Here, if there is a personage who is manifestly controversial among the witnesses it is precisely **Doris Wagner**: Her reference to the "clan of criminals" is a passage from the movie *Female Pleasure*(2018), a feminist documentary by Barbara Miller on the relations between women and religion.*

"The Church has become a clan of criminals, a place that it is better to stay out of.(...)All religions are used in order to justify those who are in power.(...)Without public pressure, the Church will never try anything".

Doris Wagner has not only vowed her life to the cause of the revolt against the Catholic Church(until now, it would be equally understandable, even if a commentator less empathetic would be able to suggest a better job...) but above all, her attitude has radically changed in 2012 after having met an ancient confrere(and priest suspended a divines) Philipp Reisinger (they are now civilly married and have a son). Finally, her penal pursuit against an abusive priest-in Austria and in Germany-have both been rejected because the Court seems to have had proofs and indications in order to speak of a consensual relation, even though clandestine, more than of a rape. More recently, the same person has denounced a priest in charge of

service at the Roman Congregation of the Doctrine of Faith (abbe Hermann Geissler), who had to demission from Cardinal Ladaria on January 28 (who has accepted)[10].

It must be made known that the original community of Doris Wagner has protested by means of the press against the “information” in the emission by raising important point (consensual sexual relations of religious)[11][12]. It has equally protested against **Cardinal SCHONBORN** who thought that it was a good idea to show a lot of empathy to Doris Wagner during an encounter with her on the television station ORF on February 7, 2019.[13]

The abbot Geissler who was immediately deferred by Pope Francis and was facing canonical instances, was acquitted on May 17, 2019 by the tribunal of the Apostolic Signature because of a lack of sufficient evidence (attachment 22).

Let us note certain “delusions” of this young woman on religious questions when she says in l’Avref (again...): *“In no way has virginity appeared to me to be a promising prospect. And yet, I was called to live it (there is no doubt about this subject!) I felt very strongly my desire to have children. I wanted to be loved also in a physical manner. At the same time, I knew that forever this would be impossible for me. My superior has not helped me, she did not seem to understand my problem, and instead, she gave me certain meditations on virginity. Finally, I became angry at God. As long as I would live, I would be called to virginity and to live without following this call would inevitably signify to be unhappy. I knew that there was only one way to escape God, suicide”[14]*

All of the mystification of this woman who defines herself as a “theologian, philosopher, and author” does not impede her to be an influential person in the German Church and one who is often consulted[15].

Of course, she militates with others for the “*limitation of clerical power*”, for the “*reform of sexual morality*”, for the abolition “*obligatory celibacy of priests*”, and for the ordination of women which would enable the avoidance of “*masculine solidarity*” turned in on itself. She also has some theories on “*spiritual abuse*”, which would be according to her an “*impairment to auto determination in the domain of faith and spirituality*” (attachment 23).

I have not been able to carry out an investigation on the testimony of the African sister who says to have undergone forced abortions while being 6-8 months of pregnant and of a former religious sister whose face was masked and claims that she received “*death threats*”, but here again the set up is not very believable. It is remarkable that after 3 years of investigation and a considerable budget (it is close to 1 million euros that were spent) the documentary would be so inconsistent and unbelievable.

- **On “converging” and “contradictory” accusations**

There is a strong contradiction between the testimony of Michele-France PESNEAU and the definition that fr. Thomas JOACHIM gives in his accusation of Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE. In his letter he speaks about “*gestures without sexual union*” (attachment 1), whereas Michele-France PESNEAU gives a very “*sexual*” version about her relations with fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE. The testimonies do not “*converge*” as the accusers of Frs. Marie-Dominique and Thomas PHILIPPE affirm. They are also no longer credible as I will show farther on.

The Congregation of Religious Life in the Vatican had to know about the complaints against fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE. Cardinal RODE who was prefect of this congregation from

February 2004 until January 2011 had complete access to the initial complaints that have motivated the accusation of the Prior. Now Cardinal RODE verbally confided to an oblate couple of the Community of St. John ,Mr. and Mrs. LAGRANGE, about his doubts on the subject of the accusations against fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE. Informed about this conversation C. RENDU has questioned Cardinal RODE in writing who clearly responded to his missive and has indicated it in a letter that dates from Nov. 17, 2015:

“Here is my response: in my capacity as Prefect of Religious I have had access to certain documents about father, where I found nothing really grave”(attachment #7)

Cardinal RODE was verbally more explicit to Mr. LAGRANGE **“there is nothing in the dossier!”** and *“that it is an affair brought up by the Dominicans who have never forgiven him for having founded the Community of St. John”(attachment #8)*

By these fundamental testimonies one is forced to see that the accusation (of which the ones of Michele-France PESNEAU) are not coherent. There are incoherent facts between the first and last accusations. From this very fact, Michele-France loses in large part her credibility. As often happens in this type of affair, people have a tendency “to let themselves go” as time goes by.

However, the Prior of St. John persists and shows his accusations in his last letter of Feb. 20, 2019:

Besides this testimony, the dossier of Fr. Philippe contains around fifteen testimonies relating to gestures of diverse gravity, principally with regards to religious sisters (essentially the contemplative and apostolic sisters of St. John), in the cadre of spiritual direction, confession, sometimes with justification and intimation of secrets, during a period that lasts from 1974-1992. To my knowledge, 5 cases makes the state of acts that can be characterized as being sexual (and not only as strongly sensual), of which three, have been repeated over a long period of time.

We now observe changes in the exposition of the Prior: at the beginning the testimonies were “converging”. Now, there is only one third of the acts which are “characterized as sexual”. The others are not...Where then is the convergence? Why are there so many contradictions? Why these precautions of speech, the annoyance and ambiguity with this: *“to my knowledge, 5 cases can be characterized as being sexual”*? Should an accusation that is worthy of this name not be sure and precise?

- More “unbalanced” complaints from l’Arche

I found another “key” accuser in this affair close to l’Arche: Anick (not her real name) with whom I have not been able to talk to because her husband Peter (another pseudonym) makes a complete dam. In the conversation that I had with him, he avoided my questions and restrained herself to say and repeated “I trust the Church and its investigation” (because for him Church=Fr. Markovits...)

For many years Anick lived at Trosly where she meet her future husband who himself was very fragile. Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE encouraged them to found a family. She was employed until recently, while inversely her husband has often been unemployed. They now live in the Drome. The 4 children entered the Legionaries of Chris. Three left rather quickly, but one son, very perturbed, perserved longer but now finds himself in invalidity.

What is astonishing is that fr. Thomas PHILIPPE continued to see them even after they left Trosly, and after his death, Anick and Peter became close to fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE who they continued to see until the end....Anick only spoke "of fr Thomas". So, Peter had to take umbrage. The couple had difficulties that they do not seem to have been able to overcome despite the efforts of accompaniment by the frs. PHILIPPE. Anick would recently have said to be a victim of Fr. Thomas.

However, it is Peter who has pushed Anick to file a complaint with Cardinal BARBARIN. Without a doubt they are also marked by the difficulties of their children in reason of the scandals of the Legionaries of Christ. Numerous witnesses would be able to attest to the great psychological fragility of Anick and Peter who probably believed to be able to make fr. Thomas PHILIPPE responsible of their own difficulties as, in an analogical fashion, they would have been able to make fr. Maciel and the Legionaries of Christ responsible for the difficulties of their children.

Recently, new confidential pieces (reserved to the Roman authorities) attest to the psychological derangement of the identified accusers.

- **Did Jean Vanier know?**

Of course, this is the thesis of Michele-France but "for the moment" she hasn't spoken much about it publicly. Without a doubt it is "in reserve" for the future. Jean Vanier was the figure of a living icon and is "untouchable". This is what explains the pressure he received to at least speak out against fr. Thomas or at least to remain silent in order to give the impression to consent to the accusations. Now a recent witness worthy of faith (which I do not make public at the request of the witness) shows that **Jean Vanier** has undergone pressure so that he would not say anything against the **official version** of l'Arche. Separately, he said that he was "*obliged by 3 bishops, in obedience to the Church, to assist at the mass of reparation to listen to their discourse*"

11-Did Fr. Thomas have a "perverted" theology?

To assess these accusations, Mr. Patrick FONTAINE in his letter evokes "grave zones of shadows" with fr. Thomas PHILIPPE and makes a rather free interpretation of the canonical sanction of 1956 about which he knows nothing. *La Croix* will evoke his "mariologie" and the questions asked about it by his friends Jacques MARITAIN and Charles JOURNET (who would have reproached him to associate the Virgin Mary as the "spouse of Christ"...) in order to explain the possible origins of his "errant ways". According to those responsible of l'Arche this condemnation would hide a shameful affair about which he sought to justify in his astray theology.

Mr. Patrick FONTAINE cites as his support of this theory a "bibliography" like the work of the historian Wedling on Dr. Thomson or by an exchange of letters between Cardinal JOURENT with MARITAIN. These out of context conjectures along with these fragmentary elements would serve therefore to enforce the thesis of that Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE was perverse for a long time and who would already have been condemned in 1956 for acts, it is said, of a sexual nature and about which he it is said he would have sought to justify himself in invoking, according to the words of Michele-France PESNEAU, a "mystico-sexual" theory. Mgr. d'ORNELLAS seems to also adhere to these theories affirming that he "sought to communicate a mystical experience".

How can they make such an affirmation? Without a doubt having acquired the declarations of Michele-France PESNEAU...This theory of "perversion" of the frs. Thomas and Marie-

Dominique PHILIPPE would have had according to Michele-France PESNEAU a far reaching familial origin with their uncle fr. DEHAU (1870-1956) also a Dominican himself.

This theory of the “hidden affair of 1956” often returns in the given explanations the people I questioned (Xavier Le PICHON, Michele-France PESNEAU, Patrick FONTAINE, certain brothers of St. John, etc...). It is also repeated in the media and in anonymous “posts” on internet blogs (attachment 9).

To give an example of the amalgams that can be made about this subject, I note that during one of his conferences, fr. Thomas PHILIPPE easily used analogical approaches speaking about the “sensation of touch” as a communication that one can have above all with elderly people, newborns, and the seriously handicapped.[16]

In speaking about “Mary Mystical Spouse of Christ” there was not the least bit of ambiguity in his speech...How would he have been able to preach for 50 years theologically holding that a person could have sexual acts within a mystical experience? When fr. Thomas PHILIPPE speaks of “Mary, Spouse of Christ”, he does it in a very classical approach and within the tradition of the Church[17]. Therefore, we can affirm without difficulty that the theology of fr. Thomas, even if it can give way to legitimate objections, is totally conformed to the teaching of the Church.

12-Does the Community of St. John need to purify itself of its original sin?

At the beginning of my investigation, I was surprised to discover particular connections between former sisters, who today are in the world and who are accusing my uncle, with certain influential brothers in the Community of St. John and with certain Dominicans.

In a fortuitous fashion, fr. Albain Marie de COSQUER (at the time in the Community of St. John) brought to me his analysis of this affair. According to him, fr Marie-Alain d’AVOUT, very active in the research of the witnesses, develops a supposed thesis about the “original sin” of the Community. It seems that this thesis is shared by more and more people, one of whom is the Prior Fr. Thomas JOACHIM, but above all by Golias! (attachment 13). Whereas during his lifetime, fr. MD had asked the Prior to defend the community (attachment 17 bis)

According to fr. Marie-Alain d’AVOUT, it also appears that Cardinal SCHONBORN (friend of fr. Jean Migeul Garrigue) has sought for many year to constitute “a dossier” on my uncle, fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE (attachment 10).

This information seems to be verified by an exchange with an accuser Corinne (changed name) who gave witness already in 2008 about an affair that took place in 1992(!) implicating a brother of St. John. The complaint of “abuse” was documented without a follow up by the Procurer but did give way to a canonical process of which the judgment was stopped in Rome by an appeal considering that no proof had been established. Corinne who was a young religious at the time and was a sister for 10 years is now married. It is notorious that according to rumors[18] this beautiful young woman had a tendency (voluntarily or not) to “arouse” certain brothers. It is still astonishing to see that the same people are witnesses in the two disjointed affairs, but are connected in their resources and on their dates....Corinne also knows well Cardinal SCHORN BORN (a Dominican who was a young professor at Fribourg when MD was still there...) and his ex-secretary fr. Jean-Miguel GARRIGUE [19] who himself knocked at the door of St. John in 1995 and then rejoined the Dominicans of Toulouse along with some other brothers 2002. Corinne says that she witnessed things during the lifetime of Fr. PHILIPPE and “would have thus forewarned two former sisters” one of whom is Françoise

(name changed). This one has also confirmed the role of Cardinal SCHONBORN in this affair, and who asked her to write a testimony. The demand was confirmed by fr. Marie-Alain d'AVOUT, in the summer of 2010 in an email exchange with fr. Alban-Marie du COSQUER concerning his deposition on the subject.

This is what explains the “off the record” declaration of **Cardinal RODE**: “It is an affair started by the Dominicans who have never forgiven him for founding the Community of St. John.” (attachment 8)

It is undeniable the the Community of St. John allowed into its home without discernment unbalanced men or even perverse men, and without a doubt in greater proportion than in other communities. The priors of St. John have had to face numerous serious problems including judiciary procedures leading to prison. But, it is not a reason to make fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE bear this responsibility who during his lifetime had managed the questions of mores “in the old fashioned way”. Let us not forget, it was, before the firm directive of Pope Benedict XVI about this question. The “old fashioned” way is most emblematic in the example in the affair of **Fr. Preynat**, by the Archbishops of Lyon, Mgrs. **Decourtray, Balland, and Bille**. As with **Mgr. Barbarin** in the affair Preynat, fr. Marie-Dominique has become, with his philosophy on the love of friendship, the “escape goat” of all of the problems of mores in the community. It is the central position of “Corinne” who correctly said that “things were taking place in St. John”. She also wanted to give to the authorities of the Church under the mode of “confidentiality” her causal explanation by an astonishing but mortal accusation, for the memory of the founder of the Community of St. John It has also become the position of the government of the community.

13-Psychological considerations of the accusers

We do not want to doubt the sincerity or the good intentions of the accusers who subjectively have felt wounded in one way or another by the frs. PHILIPPE. On the other hand, we have all the reasons to think that the accusers have made a psychological “rereading” in which the imagination plays an important role. Above all, it is not rare to see in the affaires of mores, witnesses or victims, make depositions which turn out to be “fantasies”. The American psychotherapist E. LOFTUS has testified as an expert in over 100 criminal affairs in the United States to sensitize the juries of his country about the fact that memories are flexible and that the testimonies are far from being perfect recording of real events.

One can find actualized psychological “rereadings” in spiritual direction made with Fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE. Thus the testimony of br. Alban Marie (attachment 10) gives an explanations on the erroneous interpretations which have been made about the gestures of fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE by a young woman named Gabrielle(name changed): *“She gave me her testimony saying this: “ One time I entered into the parlor with Fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE to go to confession, I had a split dress on and during the confession Father had posed his hand on my knee and that bothered me”. Without hearing more, I asked her the questions: “and after?” she then responded: “well nothing, but it bothered me!” I told her my great sadness to see this type of rereading had been provoked by the influence of fr. MA who sought out this type of testimony”.*

The psychiatric doctor **Paul Bensussan**, and the lawyer, **Florence Rault** have describe accurately the mechanism that leads the accusers to make erroneous allegations. They are coauthors of a work *“The Dictatorship of Emotion”*[20] which analyses this mechanism. **Dr. Benussan**, is an expert of the Court of Cassation and has been extended among other cases to the one in the cadre of the parliamentary investigation on the affair of Outreau.

In a conference given on September 1, 2001, he insists upon the difficulty of proof "I am often asked about the frequency of unfounded actions of sexual abuse. The numbers are so disparaging that you will immediately understand to what point they are empty of meaning. One of my eminent colleagues head of pedopsychiatry recently said during a broadcast that according to him the unfounded allegations were around 3-6%, for certain actor on the contrary like Hubert Van Gijseghem estimates this number going to 50-75%, the American Psychological Association which is not in the habit of advancing numbers by chance speaks of 50%. You see the large disparity is between 3-75% this only proves one thing, we will never know anything. I mean to say by this that we are in a domaine where certitude is practically impossible to attain. Of course I am speaking about touching, I am not talking about rapes which unfortunately leave physical traces and are more often proved, but in matters of sexual touch the proof in the criminal, judiciary, psychiatric, scientific sense of the word is impossible to obtain. We are therefore going to work with a part of doubt. This doubt is defined as "an intermediary state of spirit between ignorance and certitude".

In an article that appeared in the journal Liberation, he notes that "Very often, under the influence of emotion, of pressure, of the fear to pass to the side of real abuse, justice has a hard time to fulfill its role. For a justified condemnation, how many broken lives, annihilated careers, and suicides?"

He equally remarks that "under the influence of certain particularly atrocious affairs, the adhesion of public opinion has insidiously moved to be a blind vindictive. In matter of pedophilia, there is "before Dutroux" and an "after Dutroux".

Paraphrasing this psychiatrist, we can say that in the Church there is a "before Maciel" and an "after Maciel" to the point that the word of order of "zero tolerance" is now transformed into a principle of precaution before any other consideration. In a hurry one sometimes denounces as quickly as possible to a prosecutor of the Republic the clerics about whom there would be a suspicion of abuse of any sort. I know the case of a priest who recently was the object of an immediate denunciation by his own Bishop to a Prosecutor of the Republic and about which the affair was finished by not ever taking place....

Following the recent lawsuits in 2018 of two young "denounced" priests this should make us reflect. The four to be accused in the media of a "culpable silence" as become the source of precautionary behaviors often opposed to the simple principle of prudence and justice (without speaking of the pastoral senses and of the virtue of prudence...) To this fear is added the one to be implicated in a penal or civil process by a victim or a parent for a non-denunciation. We can read about this subject in the contribution of Fr. du **PUY-MONTBRUN**[22] emeritus dean of the Faculty of Canon Law of Toulouse, on this disturbing tendency.(attachment 11: art of Puy-Montburn).

Certainly, the Motu Proprio of the Pope "Vos Estis Lux Mundi" dated from May 7, 2019[23] makes it an obligation of the bishop to denounce "sexual abuse". But this must be done in very precise conditions. It concerns criminal acts (meaning most often from a Court of Assises for what is a matter of French law) as acts of pedophilia, child pornography, of rape (art 1). It must be done after an investigation according to the rules of laws (art 3) and must be covered by secret or at least "strict confidentiality in the sense of canon 471" (art 2.2). That which therefore excludes publicities which would be made by clerical authorities by means of the press or others (interviews, alerts, internet, etc...).

Finally it must be remembered that according to canon 1717, the bishop must make “a prudent investigation” and must “*watch that this investigation would not compromise the reputation of anyone*”! The application of the all to one “principle of precaution” badly understood has led Fr. du Puy-Montbrun to publish an article in January of 2019 that he entitles “**Let the Bishops Apply Canon Law!**” inviting them to not overstep the elementary rules of law and to not cede to “*the ambient and mortifying fear leading the bishops to “substitute themselves for the victims”, who are not always true victims, despite their emotional appearances*”[24].

Psychologists note[25] that “*accusations about sexual facts can come from specific pathologies in which the accusers develop a strength of susceptible conviction of believing the reality that they denounce. Most of these motivations are hard to identify, are too inconceivable by non-specialists, which explains that it can happen that accusers can fool police, doctors, magistrates, popular juries...et even psychologist with the status of experts*”.

Already, in 1909 in their work “The Reasoning Follies”[26] **Drs. Capgras and P. Serieux** describe people who have been affected by this psychopathy in these terms: “*they conserve all of their vivacity of spirit, with a remarkable aptitude to discuss and to defend their convictions.(...) One can observe a correct fashion to express oneself, the normal association of ideas, very faithful memories, an awakened curiosity, an intact intelligence, sometimes fine and penetrating. We can't have any evidence neither of active hallucinations, nor excitation, nor depression; no confusion, no loss of the sense of affective sentiments. Prolonged conversations or repeated ones are often necessary to discover certain particularities.*”.

Now by the strength of observation there has not been any psychiatric evaluation done as regards the accusers. Mgr. d'ORNELLAS has confided an investigation to a cleric who it seems does not have the required competence to detect a psychopath. The “anonymous” letter of Michele-France PESNEAU is in this regard enlightening above all as she presents herself as being victim of harassment by me. Without a doubt Michele-France PESNEAU presents a certain number of symptoms that one finds among paranoid people and who are often well described in the works of psychiatry.

Thus for JUIGNET[27]: *Certain traits are characteristic: pride, scorn, susceptibility, rigidity, irrationalism, and falsity of judgment. The paranoiac is proud and sometimes scornful of others, for they consider themselves to be superior. Aggressiveness is important, expressed indirectly to the point of scorn, or directly under the form of unwanted topics, or insults. Scorn and suspicion are systematic. The subject waits until others harm him or exploit him and always fears an attack coming from them. He doubts the honesty and loyalty of those close to him, he is almost always jealous.*

The paranoiac easily feels disdained, he fears that he is not respected and sometimes imagines it even when it is not the case. Susceptible, he badly tolerates remarks and criticism. A disagreement, an unfavorable judgment by another, unleash anger and bitterness. The prestige and social titles, illustrious filiations, real or fictitious, tend towards compensating this fragility. The paranoiac is rigid and without any autocritique. Hard towards himself and with others, he has unshakeable opinions. The journalistic term of “unique thought”, is suitable to designate his way of thinking: it is the only power that exist and the entire world must adhere to it. At any moment the subject is unable to take a critical distance towards himself. Rationalism is constant and is fed by interpretations. He puts in place dogmatic arguments by an avalanche of argumentations, and assertive reasonings entirely put at the service of the starting postulate”.

We can find this assertive reasoning in the affirmations of Michele-France PESNEAU on the “mystico-erotic” theory of Fr. Thomas Philippe...

En looking at specialized blogs such as “l’Envers du Decor”[28] one finds anonymous accusation like the one of “Serenity” (attachment 9) which is very similar to the one of Michele-France PESNEAU et beard the mark of a paranoid ration by its assertive and evasive character: *“And the combat of the victims to make themselves heard during these years” It’s like they didn’t exist. MD PHILIPPE began with my aunt more than 50 years ago (a friend of the family well before the foundation of the community) and has formed around ten disciples in his mystico-affectivo-perversions with a control and everything that is known. Facts known by those who are responsible. Facts of today.”* Let us point out that in the blog, a dialogue has taken place between “Serenity” and another blogger. And curiously after asking for an explanation by a reader of this story, “Serenity” refuses to go any further in the accusation and claims as a pretext a “wound” in order to know justify this affirmations.

JUINET continues: *“The sensitive form characterizes itself by a more gentle character, a feminine predominance, and sometimes a network of delirium. Sensitive people are sensitive to the reactions of others, easily wounded, who flee from contact. Fear leads them to put in place a distance towards others who are felt to be hostile, which gives way to a search for protection. The subject is on the who-lives, fearing to not be respected, to be aggressed. Without feeling oneself to be frankly persecuted, these subjects have the impression that people are interested in them in an way that is excessive to their own eyes, and that is not benevolent.*

It happens that one can see these symptoms and character traits appear transitorily in other psychotic or limit personalities. One then can speak of paranoiac reactions. In the case of paranoiac reaction, there are often real triggering circumstances (prejudice, incivility, etc). They bring about the certitude to have been injured or mistaken. What follows is a will of reparation or of vengeance. The will to vengeance is triggers diverse behaviors of revendication, and frequently the engagement of procedures with regards to authorities to obtain reparation.

It must be noted in the interview of Michele-France PESNEAU on Europe 1, the importance that is given to the mass of “reparation” organized for her and “at her request”, by **Mgr. d’ORNELLAS!**(see the emission of Europe 1). She also speaks about asking for a meeting with the Pope[29], and which was granted to her, but she refused to go because the journalists of Arte would not have had the possibility of attending it in order to film the Pope “asking for forgiveness”!

In fact there exists a continuum going from normality to graver forms of paranoia passing by “the paranoid personality”. In the case that interests us here, numerous witnesses at the time of the Community of St. John as with l’Ache would be able to abundantly speak about the numerous depressive, pathologically jealous, very anguished women who were looking for a benevolent and appeasing presence in fr. Thomas or fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE.

We can see these character traits in these women: insane jealousy, seeking of protection, recourse to ecclesiastical authorities as elevated as possible (Cardinals or Archbishops), dogmatism, sentiments of harassment, assertive reasonings about the “PHILIPPE family”, etc...With time these women would seek to compensate their difficulties by public denunciations (but anonymous) of personalities who would not have been able or could not ameliorate their psychological discomfort.

One comes across the description that the psychiatrist **Ernst Kretschmer** make about the sensitive paranoiac personality that is marked by a sense of elevated moral values: pride (an esteem of oneself, that leads to consider oneself as never being sufficiently recognized at their just value) a hyper sensitivity to relational touch leading to a great vulnerability in interpersonal contacts; a tendency of auto-criticism, an sorrowful internalizing of failures and a great susceptibility.

By staying in relative anonymity of their denunciations, the accusers calm their anguish all the while by not risking a confrontation with someone who would counter them. In a penal process, the victims must publicly testify and undergo counter arguments. It is often psychically difficult and “risky” for them, but it is always indispensable so that human justice may be exercised, if possible, without arbitration in order to avoid judicial errors. In this path of denunciation post mortem(after death) with regards to an “ecclesiastical authority” there is no risk! The accusers find a benevolent and compassionate reception from this authority and they can take advantage of it. They “comfort” themselves in an astonishing way by accusing personalities who they once admired, but have since disappeared.

In rationalizing even more on this question, I wish to put forward a “hypothesis” on these accusers and to make a parallel with a situation that is found quite often in psychology: the fathers **Thomas and Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE** had humanely speaking a very strong charism of compassion which had the effect of appeasing a large number of people who were in deep anguish, depressive, neurotic, unstable, etc...who have experienced this charism and took advantage of their complete availability. The tenderness (absolutely non sexual!) that they could give in a paternal fashion must once again be placed in the context of this time period.

Beyond the sacramental aspect and faith in God that the priest can (or must) bring, compassionate listening in spiritual direction coupled with the one of confession is similar to certain aspects to a psychoanalytical listening. Therapists apperceive that sick people (generally feminine) develop amorous feelings towards the person that listens to them.

Thus S. Freud notes in *Selbstdarstellung (Sigmund Freud presented by himself)* in 1925, “*there is established in each analytical treatment, without any medical intervention, an intense affective relation that cannot be explained by any real circumstances. It is of a positive or negative nature, and it goes from a fully sensual passionate amorous stat, to an extreme expression of revolt, of exasperation, and of hatred. This relation, that in order of brevity, we call transfer, soon takes its place in the patient as a desire of healing and then becomes, in as much as it is tender and moderate, the support of a medical influence and a veritable spring of common analytical work.*”

Freud notes that this sentiment is in contradiction with the reserved attitude of the analyst, and the fact that it often has nothing seductive about it: the rapport of the patient with the analyst “*should only have a certain dose of respect, confidence, recognition, and human sympathy*”.

Freud also notes that the compulsive character of this “love” is not foreign to other loves. And he indicates in “*Psychoanalysis and Medicine*” (page 196 or 42) that the transfer is “*a general human phenomenon, it dominates all the relations of a person given to their human entourage*”, “*the patient repeats, under the form of this love for the analyst, psychic events that they have already lived-he has transferred onto the analyst psychic attitude that were already present in him and are in intimate rapport with his neurosis. He would like to reproduce, in his rapports with the analyst, all of the forgotten vicissitudes of his life.* [30]

Would it not be logical to also find these attitudes among some of the neurotic people who went to “consult” fathers Thomas and Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE?

14-The Canonical Procedures

It is true that I made fr. Thomas Joachim “undergo” two canonical process of defamation. One in France, the other in Rome. Naively, I thought that this procedure was similar to the one of the civil tribunals in France with its great principles of law. In fact, in this case the judge was Mgr. Riviere, the hierarchal authority of the Community of St. John and who has upheld the Prior in his path of “transparency”. It happens that he finds himself as judge and defendant. !

In the process, I found myself in Paris before the Abbot N. who convoked me and made me promise on the Bible to keep the “procedure” a secret! It wasn’t difficult for me to keep the “secret” because concretely the essential part of the exchange was a conversation of salon (or rather of a sacristy...) which the goal was to make me “admit” the names of the clerical or lay persons who were “behind” me giving me support! But there was not debate, no exchange of documents, no conclusion, no speeches of defense. The great secret!

Anyways, in fact of judgment, I received a decree from Mgr. Riviere that in less than 10 lines puts a halt to my investigation on Dec. 1, 2015 without any other explanation.

I contacted Rome by sending the dossier in mail. There was absolute silence until January 2017 when I received an 8 page decree ,this time signed by Cardinal BRAZ de AZIZ and that is dated Dec. 20, 2016 which allows me to proceed again! In fact of judgment, it is rather a matter of a written dissertation by the French section of the dicastery and which gives a lengthy explanation that the Prior has truly, “verified the testimonies”, and has acted in full accord with the authorities of the Church, and has done so “for the good” of the Community and therefore is right! It is true that the sincerity of the father Prior, and of his unshakeable belief , make that without a doubt he did not have the intention to harm the reputation of fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE...

I incline myself without any problem before this decision which affirms that there is not any defamation on his part. But this decision does not rule out the question of the pertinence of this nor of the accusations! This does not impede the brother Prior to exhibit in a public letter this “secret” procedure in order to continue to justify himself, to complain about the time he has lost and of my “unjust” behavior. I had to tell him that even so I was “in my right” and that I was not like an accuser to him but rather an “advocate” ...

So here, I ask forgiveness, to Fr. Thomas Joachim to have made him lose time in this useless procedure! The process “canonical-penal” had nothing important at stake since in the worst case, fr. Thomas Joachim would only have had to go to his bishop or constrained to make a written public denial. Naively, I believed that I would have access to the documents in order to justify my position.

When a complaint is made with the police or a prosecutor, the procedure is confined to people whose job it is to do. The police dispose of numerous means to “prove” a threat or a suspect: listening to telephone calls, stake outs, prerequisites, shadowing, scientific police analysis(DNA, etc.), reports of flagrant offenses, legal medical reports, etc...courts of instruction taking over. They instruct against or favorably in a case: interrogations, confrontations, psychiatric expertise, technical expertise or others, seeking out witnesses, etc....Then at last comes the acts of the prosecutor, a public audience and a process of defense which seeks establish the truth all the while being under the control of an appeals

courts, of the Court of Cassation, sometimes with a possible recourse to a Constitutional Council and even to the CEDH!

In a penal canonical process, we have nothing like that! However, this ecclesiastical justice which remains very human can change the life of a priest or of a religious. "The canonical secret" covers with a layer of silence the acts of judges who do not have all of the tools to establish culpability. No public audience, nor confrontations! Always the secret. The only proofs that are always invoked are these famous written testimonies! We can legitimately tremble when we see priests judged on these elements alone![31]

Justice, Right, and Truth

By right, to affirm that there have been "*sexual actions*" "*gravely contrary to the vows of religion*" and "*to the morality taught by the Church*", is to suppose not only that these faults were really committed, but that they have been verified by the author and if possible admitted. When one advances that no "*civil or penal pursuit can be engaged*", this clearly induces that these facts imputed to Fr. Thomas PHILIPPE should have been given place to penal pursuit. Now the susceptible act gives place a penal incrimination against fr. Thomas PHILIPPE for acts committed against adult persons "non consensual" are :

1. rape (passible crime of 20 years of criminal reclusion according to art. 222.24)
2. sexual aggression (7 years in prison according to article 222.27 of the penal code). Let us note that "the abuse of authority" is of its nature to be qualified as sexual aggression (or even rape...) on person even in appearance
3. "The psychological control" and spiritual of Fr. Thomas. But if the control is detained, the sexual aggression or rape is has a penal characteristic.

One is forced to observe that all of this has been done to give to the Fathers PHILIPPE the image of men particularly perverse from the fact of their authority and charism of which they would have used and amply "abused". It makes even more evident the infamous nature of these denunciations from the top to the bottom of the hierarchy of the Church. To declare this witness "true", it is to go beyond the competence of whoever it may be: In the Church to denounce this type of act which leads to penal sanctions can only be established in a judiciary way.[32]

The defense of presumption of innocence is set as a fundamental contribution, from the Jewish people, as from Roman law, to the human community.; the examples of decisions in this sense are abundant in Holy Scripture event to the latest legislative dispositions.[33] Also from the juridical point of view these denunciations without a trial should have entered into the definition of offense foreseen in canon 1390.[34]

In conclusion, the family of fr. Marie-Dominique PHILIPPE would be favorable to put into place the same politics of transparency about the presumed facts that has motivated these controversial denunciations.

It is why, I am asking the Ecclesiastical Authorities to give me access to the documents of the dossier so that I would be able to exercise a complete and substantiate "right of defense" facing these accusations mentioned above. I engage myself to not unveil the contents and to only put forward a global opinion.

By default, I ask that a veritable investigative commission independent from the Church which would have as its mission to infirm or to confirm the facts that have led to the “condemnation” of the deceased and wish to be a part of if possible.

This commission in conformity with the letter and objective of the recent *Motu Proprio* of the Holy Father of May 9, 2019 “***Vos estis lux mundi***: should “imply qualified persons” (cf. art 13 du Motu proprio) in order to serenely examine and in a “quasi-judiciary” fashion the accusations. Let us also make note that the motu proprio recognizes at last the presumption of innocence (art 12). This commission should therefore ideally have in its midst an active or retired magistrate having at least 20 years of experience in jurisdiction of instructions and an expert psychiatric doctor collaborating with a Court of Appeal. It is desirable that no cleric would be part of it and this is in conformity with the request of Pope Francis in his letter to the people of God from August 20, 2018: *Clericalism favored by the priests themselves or by the laity, engenders a schism in the ecclesial body which encouraged and helps to perpetuate many evils that we denounce today. To say no to abuse, is to say no, in a categorical fashion, to every form of clericalism.*

I also ask the authorities of the Church of France and to the Superiors of the Dominican Order to publicly protest against the constant violations in the press on the principle of the presumption of innocence of which the beneficiaries should be the deceased Fathers Marie-Dominique and Thomas PHILIPPE. And in particular to protest about the subject of the television emission fo ARTE on March 5, 2019.

Marie PHILIPPE

