

MEMO

TO: Archbishop Flynn, Bishop Pates and Andy Eisenzimmer
FROM: Fr. Kevin McDonough
DATE: May 5, 2006
RE: Father Michael Keating

On Thursday, May 4, I met with Father Michel Keating. He was accompanied by a long time friend of his, Tom Ryan. I had advised him to bring someone along to the meeting to serve as "another set of ears."

After reviewing with Father Keating the process that we have pursued so far, I told him I wanted to open a second phase of the inquiry. That phase relates to his interaction with a young woman in Italy named [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] had given me a memorandum (a copy of which I am attaching) in which he told me that Father Keating had admitted "a passionate physical encounter" with this young woman. At the time that this happened, as you can see from the memo, the young woman would have been a minor and Father Keating significantly older. I told Father Keating that if those words were an accurate report of what he had said to [REDACTED], and if he used those words to express what most of us would be expressing with them (namely, a fairly explicit sexual encounter), then he would be subject to immediate dismissal from the priesthood under the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People. I told him, however, that before I would recommend such a dismissal to Archbishop Flynn, Father Keating would have the right to dispute either the words themselves or the notion that they indicate that he had committed "an objectively grave violation of the sixth commandment with a minor."

I explained that, although he was accompanied by a knowledgeable friend, Father Keating was not acquired by a canonist. He would be within his rights to consult a knowledgeable canonist before responding. He told me that he had already set up a meeting with Father Bowers, but was unable to get that meeting until Wednesday, May 10, because Father Bowers is away from the Twin Cities. As a result, we set up another meeting for Thursday, May 11, at which time he will respond to my question about the accuracy and meaning of the words.

Late in our conversation, Father Keating told me that the words in fact did not mean what they might appear to mean on the surface. Nonetheless, he preferred to talk with a canonical advisor before responding further. I did not reveal to him that we already have a reassurance from [REDACTED] (which Andy Eisenzimmer received by e-mail) that Father Keating had done nothing improper with her. In other words, if all we had to go on was information from her, then the meeting on May 4 would have been unnecessary. Nonetheless, given that he made a disclosure of some sort to [REDACTED], and that [REDACTED] has in turn passed it on to me, I want to here in his own words what it was he meant.

Page two
Re: Father Keating
May 5, 2006

I also indicated to him that, even if there is a favorable explanation of those words, we still have one more issue to address. That issue concerns an ongoing pattern of irresponsible seductiveness (non-sexual) in Father Keating's life. Once we have cleared up the relationship that he had with [REDACTED], we either will already have disqualified him from further ministry because he will have proven to have violated the Charter, or alternatively, we will then get to work on the seductiveness question. I will wait to describe the next step in this process until we know how this matter of the young Italian woman is resolved.

Enclosure