

IRISH REPORT ON IRISH NUNS DEBUNKS MYTHS

Another interim report by Ireland's Commission of Investigation of the Mother and Baby Homes has been released, and it debunks some myths perpetrated by the critics of the Sisters of Bon Secours in Tuam, a town in County Galway. It also vindicates the position of the Catholic League.

Katherine Zappone, Ireland's Minister for Children and Youth Affairs, said there is "little basis for the theory that rather than having died, the children were 'sold' to America." In fact, the report explicitly notes that "there is no evidence whatsoever that could support that theory."

The report also shoots a hole in the theory that the remains of nearly 800 children were found in a septic tank on the grounds of the Mother and Baby Home. It concluded that "human remains found by the commission are not in a sewage tank."

The Irish, English, and American media have dealt with these two issues dishonestly; most failed to even mention the latest findings. In other words, the media are keeping the lies about the nuns alive by failing to report the truth.

In this country, for the past several years, no media outlet swallowed the moonshine about both hoaxes more than Irish Central. Only now is it acknowledging that the babies were not sold, but it has still owned up to its role in promoting the lie that the remains of 796 children were found in a septic tank.

Martin Sixsmith wrote the book about Philomena Lee and Steve Coogan did the screenplay adaptation. Judi Dench played her character in the movie, "Philomena." The number of bald face lies told about the nuns is staggering. Take, for example, an interview that Coogan granted to MSNBC in 2014 about the

movie.

Richard Liu, the host, said at one point, "And you're talking about a group of girls and women, out-of-wedlock, having children in these institutions [homes run by nuns for troubled young women], and their children were taken away from them."

This is a lie: the nuns did not walk the streets of Ireland seeking to rob kids from their mothers. In the case of Philomena, her father took her to the nuns to care for the baby she could not provide for.

Coogan replied to Liu that the home was "the only place that you could go to." He is correct about this: no one was kidnapped—the women came to the nuns *voluntarily*. Moreover, the alternative was the street. Lucky for Philomena, her father placed her with the nuns—the same nuns who found her a job after her baby was born.

Coogan said these women were "effectively incarcerated against their will." This is a lie: no one was "incarcerated"; Philomena did not live in a jail cell. The word "effectively" is interesting: either they were imprisoned or they were not. Coogan also says "their children were forcibly adopted." This is another lie: Philomena voluntarily signed a contract when she was 22. No one "forced" her to give up her baby.

It is important to note that Philomena never set foot in the U.S. until 2013; this was long after her son died of AIDS. Contrary to what the film contends, she never looked for her son in the U.S.

It must also be noted that the babies were never "sold" to anyone, never mind the "highest bidder." Did some American couples offer a donation to the nuns for their services? Yes. That was purely an expression of appreciation.

Regarding the "mass grave" sewage-tank hoax, anyone who was not an ideologue should have been able to figure that one out

a long time ago.

In 2014, a reporter for the *New York Times* wrote that “a dogged local historian,” Catherine Corless, “published evidence” that 796 children died in the Tuam Mother and Baby Home, and that the remains of “some” were found in the septic tank. In fact, Corless is not an historian—she is a typist.

Corless not only failed to mention a “mass grave,” she offered evidence that undermined her thesis. She wrote that, “A few local boys came upon a sort of crypt in the ground, and on peering in they saw several small skulls.” She mentioned there was a “little graveyard.” That is not the makings of a mass grave.

The primary source for Corless’ “mass grave” thesis is Barry Sweeney. When he was 10, he and a friend stumbled on a hole with skeletons in it. In 2014, he was asked by the *Irish Times* to comment on Corless’ claim that there were “800 skeletons down that hole.” He said, “Nothing like that.” How many? “About 20,” he said. He later told the *New York Times* there were “maybe 15 to 20 small skeletons.” In other words, Corless’ primary source contradicts her account!

The Church haters, naturally, are not going away, though even they must concede that no babies were sold and no septic tank strewn with bodily remains has been found. No matter, this is a sweet victory for the Catholic League—we were right all along.

NEW YORK TIMES COVERS

“UNPLANNED”

In the April 9 edition of the *New York Times*, there was a news story about the pro-life movie “Unplanned.” Of course, the term “pro-life” never appeared—such persons were described as “being against abortion rights.” The words were chosen carefully: those who defend human rights *in utero* are against human rights.

The story started with an observation about suburban theatergoers who saw the film the previous week. “A few—a gaggle of nuns in their habits, at least one collared priest—wore their dispositions on their sleeves. Others communicated in muted gestures, dabbed at tears, or lingered for long stretches in the popcorn-strewn vestibule at the AMC multiplex here, as if still processing the deliberately provocative movie they had just seen.”

The Cambridge English Dictionary defines “gaggle” as “a group of geese” or “a group of noisy or silly people.” We can assume that the reporter, Reggie Ugwu, was not referring to the nuns as “a group of geese.” That would make them “a group of noisy or silly people.”

The silly nuns were in habit. That makes sense given that pro-abortion nuns—Donohue has met more than a few of them—tend to dress like social workers. The priest with a collar (note: even liberal priests wear a collar when they go on TV) was, like the silly nuns, making a statement with his garb, clearly wearing his “dispositions on his sleeve.”

It is true that when people witness a movie about the wanton destruction of babies they tend to well up. Either that or they are sociopaths. And yes, there is much to process about a movie that is “deliberately provocative.” Films that honestly depict bodily invasions tend to be that way.

“Unplanned,” as many know, has been subject to considerable

Hollywood censorship. Ugwu accurately recounts how requests for songs to be used in the movie were denied, as were most TV interviews. The film was slapped with an “R” rating, a deliberate act, and the movie’s Twitter account was temporarily disabled. When it comes to explaining why these things happened, Ugwu wears his dispositions on his sleeve.

“Of course, no film is entitled to media exposure.” That’s true. The same could be said about the failure of the *New York Times* to review the movie—like virtually every other major newspaper in the nation (the *Washington Post* being the lone exception)—but that doesn’t empty the discussion. Why the blackout?

Ugwu anticipates this question and has a ready answer. He opines that “the belief among anti-abortion communities that powerful forces have arrayed against the film has kindled long-smoldering claims of liberal and anti-religious bias in the media and Silicon Valley.”

That Hollywood and the Silicon Valley are liberal and anti-religious is about as controversial as saying the Bible Belt is conservative and religious. Only liars or the ignorant would deny it. They are also intolerant and censorial.

Ugwu noted in a parenthetical remark that Planned Parenthood released a statement saying the movie “promotes many falsehoods.” We checked the full statement, which is three sentences long, and it does not provide a single example of a falsehood. Surely they could cite one.

In the movie, there is an ultrasound picture of the baby flinching when pierced by the abortionist. This scene has upset a lot of people: some are upset at the violence and others are upset because their argument implodes.

Ugwu says that this scene “shows a fetus with a discernible head, torso and limbs frantically squirming away from a doctor’s probe...before being liquefied by suction.” So there is

a body other than that of the mother's. And it moves. Temporarily that is.

He asked a doctor at the “nonpartisan American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists” about this scene and she said that the notion that the baby is “fighting for its life” is misleading; babies at 13 weeks cannot feel pain, she said.

There are two problems here. First of all, there is nothing “nonpartisan” about this woman—she performs abortions. Second, according to a study published in 2013 in the *Journal of Maternal-Fetal Neonatal Medicine*, “As early as 8 weeks the baby exhibits reflex movement during invasive procedures.”

So the question we have for Mr. Ugwu and his “nonpartisan” abortionist friend is, “If the baby cannot feel pain, why does he or she recoil when pierced?” Don't adults recoil when pierced by a dentist?

We could not help but notice that in the same edition of the newspaper there is an article about a change of leadership at *The Nation* magazine. It noted that the far-left publication was founded by abolitionists in 1865. What it didn't mention is that it strongly defended, and lied about, the mass murders committed by Stalin and Mao. If a magazine defended, and lied about, Hitler, it would surely be noted.

Abortion and communism have much in common: both are stories about the killing of innocents. And in both stories, the paper covered them up. This is what makes the *New York Times* tick.

“UNPLANNED” : FACING THE HORROR of abortion

Rick Hinshaw read “Unplanned” and saw the movie as well. He shares with us his insights.

Abby Johnson’s story first exploded onto the American consciousness in late 2009, thanks, ironically, to the machinations—and miscalculations—of the Planned Parenthood (PP) publicity machine.

As is well known now, thanks to “Unplanned,” the compelling, gripping movie taken from Abby’s 2010 book of the same name, Abby Johnson in late 2009 had just resigned as director of a Planned Parenthood clinic in Bryan, Texas, after having “come face-to-face with the true horror of abortion.” Planned Parenthood filed a lawsuit and a motion for a restraining order, in effect trying to prevent Abby Johnson from telling her story. Foolishly, they announced their legal action with a news release—bringing Abby’s story to the attention of the media, and leading Abby and the Coalition for Life to speak to the media themselves to get the truth out before they could be legally gagged. Ultimately, PP’s legal actions were thrown out by a judge, leaving Abby free to fully tell her story, which she does so movingly and powerfully in her book—first published in 2010 and now re-released, by Ignatius Press, in an updated edition—and through the major motion picture released in theaters nationwide March 29.

The book and movie open with the defining moment of Abby’s conversion: the day when, as director of the Bryan PP clinic, she was called in to assist in an ultrasound-guided abortion. This was the first time, in nine years volunteering and working at the clinic, that she had actually assisted in an abortion. What she saw—the desperate, futile struggle of a 13-week-old baby against the abortionist’s suction device, before

finally being “crumpled” and “sucked into the tube”—assured that it would also be the last time.

But this was neither the beginning nor the end of Abby’s miraculous story of pro-life conversion. It is also a story of the remarkable interactions between Abby and the pro-life advocates whom she considered her adversaries, but whose love, kindness and prayers, not only for the women entering her clinic for abortions, but for her and the other clinic workers as well, helped to open her mind and heart to the pro-life message.

It is a story of how Abby not only left the abortion industry, but actively joined the pro-life movement, finding there the true commitment to helping women and children that she had previously convinced herself was her mission at Planned Parenthood. And, in sharing her own experience, Abby now provides valuable insights for pro-lifers about how best to change minds and hearts.

As she was drawn, however grudgingly, to listen to the pro-life people who reached out to her, she shows how we, too, must first listen to abortion clients and abortion supporters before we can hope to change their minds and hearts. We must hear from women in crisis what is driving them to make the destructive—and self-destructive—choice of abortion, before we can respond with loving, life-affirming alternatives. We must listen respectfully to those who advocate for abortion, if we expect them in turn to respectfully consider our pro-life responses.

We must remember always that our goal is not simply to win arguments, but to win minds and hearts. Winning the argument is an important part of that, of course; but it must be done in such a way that, when at all possible, opens, rather than closes, minds and hearts. And as we see in Abby’s reaction to a few isolated demonstrators outside her clinic shouting “murderer,” and holding up gruesome photos of aborted babies,

that is seldom accomplished by getting in people's faces. Better to let them see, in us, the face of Christ—as the Coalition for Life people outside Abby's clinic always did—even as we persuade them with all the definitive scientific evidence that affirms the pro-life position.

This is not to say that we should allow abortion advocates—or society at large—to avert their eyes from what Abby correctly describes as “the true horror of abortion.” For as she affirms, even with the loving, prayerful persuasion she encountered for years—not only from her pro-life “adversaries,” but from her own family—it ultimately took that face-to-face encounter with the brutal reality of an unborn child's destruction to finally drive her out of the abortion industry. And she describes in the book—and we see in the movie—Planned Parenthood's gruesome “POC” room (“products of conception,” in PP's antiseptic term; “pieces of children” is what the clinic workers more accurately called it) where abortion clinic workers are required to piece dismembered babies back together, to assure that no baby parts are left in the mother.

Clearly, Abby means for us to read and see these things, to drive home the awful brutality of abortion. But there is a time and a place, and proper approach, to presenting such compelling evidence. Shoving it in the faces of women in crisis entering abortion clinics is neither the time, the place, nor the way to do it. As we see—and as pro-life sidewalk counselors all across America will tell us—that only undermines their efforts to offer these mothers a loving, life-affirming alternative.

Abby Johnson makes clear that she has learned much and received much from her loving friends across the pro-life movement. She also has much to give, and much to teach us—and she does so, by opening her life and her journey to us in “Unplanned.” See the movie, if you haven't already; and read the book.

BUTTIGIEG'S DISHONESTY IS ASTONISHING

South Bend, Indiana mayor Pete Buttigieg is being hailed in some quarters as an honest man who would make a good president. Picking up on this image, he is now selling himself as a committed Christian, one who is much more broad minded than Christian conservatives.

When asked by Kirsten Powers about his favorite Bible verses, his first response was to cite a passage from Matthew: "Whatever you did for one of the least of these...you did for me."

Who would qualify as being among "the least of these?" Surely those who are unable to defend themselves. Not to Buttigieg—unborn babies fail to make the cut. When asked about late-term abortions on MSNBC, he defended them, citing his objections to "involvement of a male government."

That was a dishonest answer. Buttigieg knows very well that whether the government is run by males or females, or a combination of both, such characteristics have absolutely nothing to do with judging the morality of late-term abortions. On another occasion he said, "I don't think we need more restrictions [on abortion] right now." A more honest answer would have been to say "not now, not ever."

Buttigieg's slipperiness was on display last year when he was faced with making a decision to allow a crisis pregnancy center (CPC) to locate next to an abortion clinic in South Bend. Lawmakers approved rezoning, thereby allowing for the CPC, but Buttigieg vetoed the bill. He feigned distress over his decision, offering two reasons why he had to say no. Both

were dishonest.

“Issues on the legality or morality of abortion are dramatically beyond my paygrade as a mayor,” he said. Then he should resign. Public figures are expected to make moral judgments about contemporary issues. More important, Buttigieg has no business running for president. If an issue such as abortion is beyond his pay grade, then he is not suited for the job.

Buttigieg, of course, was being dishonest. He has an opinion—he is solidly in the pro-abortion camp.

It was his other reason for banning a CPC that was not only dishonest, it was demagogic. Buttigieg cited potential clashes between the abortion clinic and the CPC. Thus, by sleight of hand he secured the right of the abortion clinic to operate, without allowing women an alternative voice.

Buttigieg offered another dishonest reason for not allowing the CPC to locate next to the abortion clinic. “I saw data that there was about triple the rate of violence or harassment issues when a clinic is located next to a crisis pregnancy center,” he said. The implication is that it is the CPC, not the abortion clinic, that is the occasion for trouble.

If there were problems of true harassment or violence accompanying the location of a CPC near an abortion clinic, such stories should not be hard to find, especially from abortion-friendly sources. But they are.

So where are the data that Buttigieg claims he “saw”? “The 2015 Violence and Disruption Statistics” published by the National Abortion Federation lists instances of harassment (e.g., picketing) and some violence, but it attributes none to CPCs.

The one source that appears to back his claim is the “2018 National Clinic Violence Survey,” published by the Feminist

Majority Foundation. It claims that when a CPC is located near an abortion clinic, the latter is seven times more likely to experience harassment or violence than one located further away.

There are several problems with this study. First, this pro-abortion organization did not simply publish this survey, it conducted it. In other words, it violated a central tenet of survey research: it did not outsource the survey to an independent research institute.

Also, researchers look to see the framing of the questions that respondents are asked. This survey offers none, just capsule summaries.

Perhaps the biggest flaw of all is the failure to consider whether CPCs are more likely to experience harassment or violence when situated near an abortion clinic. There is ample evidence that this is not uncommon. Consider the following underreported news story.

“An 85-year-old pro-life man was assaulted as he prayed outside a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic in San Francisco last Thursday and it was captured on camera. In the 22-second clip, an alleged Planned Parenthood supporter knocks the pro-life advocate, identified as Ron, to the ground, tells him to stay on the ground, then repeatedly kicks him as he tries to take away the ‘40 Days for Life’ banner for which Ron was peacefully protesting.”

This didn’t happen years ago—it happened at the end of last March.

“Clash Outside Planned Parenthood in Naples Sends One Man to Hospital for Injuries.” This was the headline of a story from October, 2018. A 65-year-old man, Joe Alger, was saying the rosary near a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic when he was assaulted.

“The unidentified man got close to Alger’s face and punched him, and Alger was knocked to the ground and punched a second time.” A Planned Parenthood spokeswoman told reporters that “a fight broke out.” Not true. A senior citizen was assaulted by a pro-abortion thug because he was saying the rosary.

Many other examples could be given. Pro-life offices have been torched, and many pro-life leaders have received death threats. Moreover, pro-life supporters on college campuses, especially women, are harassed and intimidated with regularity. It is therefore dishonest for Buttigieg to hold CPCs responsible for harassment or violence against abortion clinics.

Most Americans have never heard of Pete Buttigieg. The media, having found a young homosexual presidential candidate they like, are offering a sympathetic portrait of him. On closer inspection, however, he appears coy and dishonest, and not the least bit interested in serving “the least among us.”

BUTTIGIEG’S RELIGION AGENDA

South Bend mayor Pete Buttigieg chose Palm Sunday to announce his presidential bid. It is no accident: It accurately reflects his religion agenda.

“A devoted Episcopalian who fluidly quotes Scripture and married his husband, Chasten, in a church service last year, Mr. Buttigieg is making the argument that marriage is a moral issue.” That’s the way the *New York Times* described him on April 11.

It is not clear what a devoted Episcopalian looks like. Although the official position of the Episcopal church today

has abandoned two thousand years of biblical teaching on the subject of marriage—it accepts marriage between two men and two women—there are many Episcopalians in the United States, including bishops, who consider themselves devout precisely because they have not rejected what the Bible says.

Why is the *Times* crediting Buttigieg for “making the argument that marriage is a moral issue”? No argument needs to be made—it is axiomatic. The paper makes it sound as if it only became a moral issue recently.

What the *Times* is getting at is Buttigieg’s bid to cast marriage as a moral issue—even for homosexual unions—so he can seize the issue from evangelical Christians, traditional Catholics, and others. Good luck with that.

The fact is that the Democratic Party has aligned itself with the secularist agenda for the last half century. That agenda is hostile to religious liberty, even if some, such as Barack Obama, have been known for their God-talk skills. The reason Democrats put up with Obama’s religion-friendly words is that they knew he would not make good on them. Deeds are what counts, and on that score, Obama never disappointed his base.

Buttigieg is cut from the same cloth. He will not allow his God-talk to be controlling, because if it did, he would alienate those who like him but have a phobia (or worse) about religion. They need not worry—he is a loyal soldier in the secularist war on religion.

Buttigieg knows that Democrats are leery of talking about freedom these days. They prefer to talk about equality, social justice, climate change, and the like. This explains why he recently told George Stephanopoulos, “when we talk about freedom, I think Democrats need to be much more comfortable getting into that vocabulary. Conservatives care a lot about one kind of freedom and it’s freedom from. Freedom from regulation, freedom from government,” etc.

In the run-up to his presidential announcement, Buttigieg spent a lot of time trashing Vice President Mike Pence. Casting Pence as the bad guy is part of his religion agenda.

By attacking Pence he hopes to steal the mantle of religion. This won't be easy. After all, Pence supports religious liberty legislation, and Buttigieg does not. So who does the South Bend mayor think he can pick off? Surely not regular church-goers—they support the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA).

Buttigieg attacks Pence for signing an Indiana law in 2015, when he was governor, that was based on the federal RFRA. That law, which was supported by Democrats and Republicans alike, and signed by President Bill Clinton in 1993, stated that the government could not substantially burden religious exercise without compelling justification; even then it had to be done in the least restrictive way.

Buttigieg could have decided to simply say that he favors gay rights over religious liberty, but that would have deprived him of seizing the high moral ground. So he elected to set Pence up as his straw man so he could appear to be the real moral agent.

"If me being gay was a choice," Buttigieg recently said, "it was a choice that was made far, far above my pay grade. And that's the thing I wish the Mike Pences of the world would understand. That if you got a problem with who I am, your problem is not with me—your quarrel, sir, is with my creator."

That was a clever, if totally dishonest, ploy. Pence never once criticized Buttigieg for being gay, and if he did, the whole world would have known about it. The difference between the two men is over policy, not one's persona.

When Buttigieg "came out" in 2015, that is, letting everyone know he is a homosexual, his governor, Mike Pence, said, "I hold Mayor Buttigieg in the highest personal regard. I see him

as a dedicated public servant and a patriot.” Those are not the words of a gay basher, and it is malicious of Buttigieg to characterize him as such.

When Buttigieg and Pence first met, the mayor spoke highly of his governor. In 2011, he said that despite Pence being known as a “conservative warrior,” he found him to be “affable, even gentle.” The evidence shows that it is Buttigieg, not Pence, who changed.

“If I saw a restaurant owner refuse to serve a gay couple, I wouldn’t eat there anymore.” We would expect that Buttigieg would say something like that, and not someone like Pence. Yet those are Pence’s exact words, as spoken in 2015.

We know from survey research that most people see a profound difference between denying a gay couple the right to buy a cake in a bakery, and forcing a practicing Christian baker to personalize a gay wedding cake. The former is a matter of discrimination against the gay couple’s equal rights; the latter is a matter of discrimination against the baker’s religious rights.

Buttigieg disagrees. Fine. Then let him make his case against religious liberty without setting himself up as a religious moralizer. And let him do so without demonizing those with whom he disagrees. That would be the Christian thing to do.

DANA NESSEL OVERRIDES RELIGIOUS FREEDOM LAW

Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel is keeping her campaign promise to put her radical agenda ahead of the best interests

of children.

In 2015, Michigan's legislature passed a law to protect the religious freedom of faith-based foster care and adoption agencies, assuring that they wouldn't be forced to choose between their values and their mission to find homes for children. The bill was supported by the Michigan Catholic Conference.

Nessel, outspoken in her opposition to the law, promised that as Michigan's top law enforcement official she would not defend this state law against a pending legal challenge by the ACLU of Michigan.

Now she has made good on that promise. In a settlement with the ACLU, she has decreed that the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services must end state contracts with faith-based agencies, rather than allow them to make child placement decisions in accord with their religious beliefs.

Once again, Nessel demonstrates her contempt for the First Amendment's guarantee of religious freedom, decreeing that faith-based agencies must check their religious principles at the door before they will be allowed to provide services for children in need.

She also demonstrates her contempt for the democratic process of her home state, arbitrarily overriding a law duly enacted by Michigan's elected representatives.

Worst of all, by excluding faith-based agencies from the state's foster care and adoption program, Nessel shows utter contempt for all the children served by those agencies. As the Michigan Catholic Conference observed, this settlement "does nothing to protect the thousands of children in foster care looking for loving homes."

But that is of little concern to Nessel, an ideological extremist who has repeatedly demonstrated her animus toward

the Catholic Church and people of faith. We expect her decision will be challenged in the courts.

NESSEL IS A DISASTER

Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel is a disaster. She can't seem to shake charges of bigotry. Worse, she has no problem condemning bigotry when the victims are non-Catholics. Not to worry, Catholics are taking note of her selective interest in justice.

The latest controversy that Nessel is embroiled in concerns new charges of anti-Catholic bigotry, this time coming from Michigan State Rep. Beau LaFave, not the Catholic League.

He was incensed over a retweet by Nessel that cited the hiring of a retired judge by Michigan State University to address sexual abuse. The tweet in question noted his ties to the Catholic Church. LaFave further noted Nessel's previous comments attacking Catholicism.

Nessel's communications director, Kelly Rossman-McKinney, tried to deflect criticism of her boss' problems by claiming victim status. She said that when Nessel told parishioners that if investigators contact them, "please ask for their badge, not their rosary," some of the 500 emails were "vile and hateful," noting one anti-Semitic comment.

Those emails were sent in response to our news release condemning Nessel for her anti-Catholic remark; we listed Rossman-McKinney's email address in our statement. Never once did we cite Nessel's Jewish heritage. For good reason: a) it is irrelevant and b) we never knew she was Jewish until now.

What is most striking about Nessel's response is her condemnation of homophobia (she is a lesbian activist), anti-Semitism, and Islamophobia. She cited the latter in reference to some of the comments made about Rep. Rashida Tlaib, the Muslim congresswoman who has made a series of incendiary remarks.

Nessel did not include anti-Catholicism in her list of bigoted genres of speech that she deplores. Maybe that's because of her contributions to it. To wit: She has only been in office for a few months and has already drawn the attention of the Catholic League on several occasions.

On October 2, 2018, before Nessel won the election, we noted that Michigan Catholics had better brace themselves if she wins: She flat out said she would not enforce a religious liberty bill that protected the religious freedom of faith-based foster care and adoption services.

On February 25, 2019, we called her out for her anti-Catholic slur about asking investigators "for their badge, not their rosary."

On February 28, 2019, we drew attention to her religious profiling. To be exact, she singled out the Catholic Church for a probe of sexual abuse, never explaining why no other institution was targeted.

On March 13, 2019, after Nessel went on the attack again (this time joined by Governor Gretchen Whitmer), we asked Michigan lawmakers to address the issue of sexual abuse in the public schools. When *USA Today* did a 50-state investigation of sexual abuse in the public schools, it gave Michigan a grade of "F." Ergo, it was unconscionable not to include the schools in a probe of wrongdoing.

On March 25, 2019, Nessel merited our response again, this time over making good on her campaign promise not to defend a religious liberty law that protects Catholic social service

agencies from being encroached upon by the state.

In April Nessel was back in the news for incurring the wrath of a lawmaker about her Catholic problem.

Where this will end no one knows. But bet on the Catholic League to respond.

CISCO DISCRIMINATES AGAINST CATHOLICS

Cisco Systems, the multinational technology behemoth, has a reputation for fostering tolerance, diversity, and inclusion. It is undeserved. When it comes to Catholics, it makes an exception. As will be revealed, it also has a problem with others.

In April, Belen Jesuit Preparatory School in Miami was turned down by Cisco for participation in the company's matching gift program. The reason? It's Catholic. Of course, Cisco never came right out and admitted to its bigotry. It's too clever for that.

After the Catholic school submitted its application, it was asked whether it was in compliance with Cisco's non-discrimination policy. Like all Catholic schools, Belen Jesuit doesn't discriminate against anyone—not in hiring or in its student body population. But that wasn't sufficient to satisfy Cisco.

"Please confirm that your non-profit organization does not require exposure, adherence, or conversion to any religious doctrine for students and employees, and that you serve all

faiths and the community at large. For example, do you require attendance at religious services?"

This was the question, based on Cisco's policy on "religious proselytizing." It has no policy on "secular proselytizing."

Cisco is a private company so it can pretty much do what it wants. This means, however, that because it is not subject to the First Amendment, it cannot trot out the so-called establishment clause to justify its policy.

To put it differently, there is no separation of church and state issue here—Cisco's policy is purely a reflection of its own values. Those values are secular in nature. That they evince a clear animus against religion is not debatable.

Cisco is playing a game. It says Catholic schools can qualify for admission to its matching gift program provided they don't expose students to Catholicism, or expect them to adhere to Catholic teachings. In other words, if Catholic schools cease to be Catholic, they can qualify.

Cisco should simply admit to its bigotry and not try to play a Catch-22 game with Catholics. This ploy is reminiscent of white racist polling officials down South who once tested for citizenship by having one set of questions for prospective white voters and another set for blacks.

Whites were asked questions such as, "Who was the first president of the United States?" Blacks were asked the wording of Article II, Section 1 of the Constitution. As some astute blacks answered at the time, "That's easy. It says no blacks are going to vote here."

Belen Jesuit made the point that students and parents freely decide to enroll in the school, knowing full well its strictures. Theology classes are required, and while religions other than Catholicism are presented, most of the classes are not about Buddhism. Students are expected to attend Mass, but

no one is required to go to communion. That didn't cut it with Cisco: application denied.

What makes Cisco tick? Its values are not merely secular—they are radically secular.

- In 2017, when a bill was being considered in Texas that would ban males who think they are females from showering with elementary and secondary school girls, Cisco opposed it.
- In 2018, the U.S. Supreme Court decided, 7-2, to affirm the right of a Christian baker not to personalize a gay wedding cake. Cisco filed an amicus brief on the losing side trying to strip him of his religious liberty.
- Recently, when a bill was introduced in Congress that would add sexual orientation and gender identity to the 1964 Civil Rights Act (it has failed repeatedly), Cisco supported it. The bill would grant preferential treatment in hiring to homosexuals and to men who think they are women, and vice versa.
- The Southern Poverty Law Center, a far-left entity that brands Christian family organizations as hate groups, is lavishly funded by Cisco.

How clean is Cisco? Not very.

Cisco has had a string of serious complaints made against it for age discrimination. There are also racial issues. Last year it was sued for racial discrimination by a black woman. In 2018, federal investigators found that it discriminated against American workers; it prefers to hire foreign nationals over U.S. citizens. Regarding the latter, the Department of Labor found that Cisco “secured visas for foreign workers instead of hiring U.S. citizens for certain jobs and paid the visa holders at a lower rate than their American counterparts.”

In short, Cisco funds left-wing causes, especially those that work against religious liberty, and has had its fair share of

unjust labor practices.

More important, it has no tolerance for the diversity that Catholic schools offer, preferring to exclude them from its commitment to inclusion. No wonder it is located in the Silicon Valley, home to Marxist millionaires who say one thing and do another. It fits like a glove.

Not long ago, it was bigoted WASPs who fought the Church. Then it was militant secularists, followed by Muslim fanatics. Now we have the Fortune 500 to contend with.

ASSESSING THE ABUSE REPORT ON ILLINOIS PRIESTS

There are many news stories about the 395 priests in Illinois who have been named in a report on clergy sexual abuse, but most of them are incomplete. For starters, not all of those named are priests, not all of them are from Illinois, and most of the listings are unsubstantiated accusations.

Bill Donohue has read the report. He also read what five of the six dioceses have said about it (one diocese, Belleville, has said nothing). Let's start with the man behind the report, Jeffrey Anderson.

Who is Jeff Anderson?

As a young man, Anderson was a hippie and a college dropout; he finally graduated from the University of Minnesota. He made it to law school, though he wasn't known for his scholarship. However, in his last year at William Mitchell College of Law, he found his stride: He successfully defended a homeless black

man who urinated in a church.

Anderson then went on to bigger things. His clients included gay activists who fought bathhouse raids and murderers. A recovering alcoholic, he says his daughter was molested by a therapist.

Anderson has had quite a religious odyssey. He was raised a Lutheran, but that didn't work out too well. So he became a Catholic. Then he became an atheist—he called himself a “dedicated atheist.” Then he flipped again and became “deeply religious.” The last we read about him he was content to call himself an agnostic.

See the pattern. His first gig was to sue people of faith. He claims his daughter was sexually abused. And his own religious beliefs are a mess. In short, he was destined to sue the Catholic Church.

Anderson loves to sue the Church so much that he once boasted that his goal in life is to “sue the s*** out of the Catholic Church.” He has made good on his word. Filthy rich, in one case alone he netted half a billion dollars in a settlement.

His mission in life is not to defend all victims of sexual abuse, just Catholic ones. That's why he recently took out ads in New York City newspapers advertising his willingness to defend only victims of Catholic clergy abuse. The 5'4" activist-lawyer also likes to grease professional victims' groups: they give him leads on clients and he gives them big checks. That's quite a tag team. The media, of course, never focus on this collusion.

The Anderson Report

The sexual abuse crisis in the Catholic Church, as experienced in the United States, is long over. This explains why the allegations in the Anderson Report, as it is known, are about old cases. In fact, the report lists accusations going back

more than a half-century ago. Of the nearly 395 persons mentioned, 394 are either dead or out of ministry. That leaves one guy.

The report includes deacons, seminarians, brothers, and nuns—not just priests. Some of the priests are from religious orders, and are therefore not under the jurisdiction of a bishop. In other cases, the order priests are not from Illinois, and their alleged offense may not even have taken place there.

How many are truly guilty? No one knows. Even Anderson admits that “in most cases the allegations have not been proved or substantiated in a court of law. Consequently, unless otherwise indicated, all of the allegations should be considered just allegations and should not be considered proven or substantiated in a court of law.”

We did a search of how many news outlets nationwide quoted what Anderson said and found that the overwhelming majority failed to cite his admission. So the public has been duped again.

When it comes to the scandal, duping the public is a common game. How many organizations in the United States, secular or religious, have been subjected to an investigation about sexual misconduct extending back to World War II?

Why is there no appetite for probing ministers, rabbis, public school teachers, psychologists, psychiatrists, guidance counselors, athletic coaches, and the like? Why are the media so lacking in curiosity about this phenomenon? To find out, read the mission statement of the Catholic League on our website.

Anderson’s report critically notes that the Illinois Attorney General’s Office “determined that the Illinois dioceses had received allegations related to sexual abuse for approximately 690 clergy, but had only publicly identified 185 clergy as

being 'credibly' accused of sexual abuse."

So what? There is a profound difference between a mere allegation, an allegation deemed credible, a substantiated allegation, and a conviction in a court of law. Is Anderson suggesting that priests are not entitled to due process? What other institution is expected to post the names of those whose accusations have not been deemed credible, never mind substantiated or found guilty? None.

Response by the Dioceses

Fortunately, this time around the bishops and their spokesmen are fighting back. Mary Jane Doerr, the director of the Chicago Archdiocese's Office for the Protection of Children and Youth, expressed her exasperation with the report. "What's frustrating to me is the lists represent the past. And it was not a good past, but we don't do that anymore. That's not what's going on today."

Anderson says that the purpose of his report "is to disclose the scope of the peril that the Catholic Bishops have chosen not to disclose and keep secret." John O'Malley, the Archdiocese of Chicago's special counsel, isn't buying it. "These names were not secret. There was not an effort to conceal them. They were all reported to the authorities."

O'Malley also takes issue with Anderson for portraying as perpetrators those who have been investigated and cleared. In one particular case, the special counsel said, "Police didn't decide he was a perpetrator. The archdiocese did not. Jeff Anderson did. People are entitled to their reputations until proven otherwise."

Andrew Hansen, a spokesman for the Springfield diocese, aptly called Anderson's report "an impressive professional marketing brochure, but it does not represent, as Mr. Anderson suggests, a thorough and diligent review of the publicly available facts, and it is highly misleading and irresponsible."

The official statements released by those dioceses which have spoken publicly were not shy in their defense.

The Archdiocese of Chicago, following what O'Malley said, charged that Anderson "conflates people who have been accused, but may be innocent, with those who have substantiated allegations against them, referring to all as perpetrators."

The Diocese of Joliet said, "All of the allegations reflected on Mr. Anderson's list which were made to the Diocese of Joliet have already been reported to law enforcement authorities." Furthermore, the diocese argued that "All credibly accused priests have been removed from ministry."

The Diocese of Peoria maintained that 26 of the 29 priests named in the report have been reported to the authorities, and most of them are dead. The diocese contested the listing of the other three: one never had an accusation made against him; one accusation was never substantiated; and one was immediately placed on administrative leave and reported to the authorities, contrary to what Anderson said.

The Diocese of Rockford said Anderson's list "includes names already disclosed by the Rockford Diocese along with other names previously disclosed publicly but which are not on the Diocese's list of those substantially accused because the accusations either have not been substantiated or are completely without merit."

The Diocese of Springfield said it had already posted the names of 19 priests on its website who were credibly accused, "none of whom are in active ministry, and 13 of whom are deceased."

Donohue's Analysis

In some important ways, Anderson's report is consistent with the studies conducted by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice on priestly sexual abuse. For instance, most of the

alleged offenses took place in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Significantly, most of the victims were postpubescent males, victimized by homosexual priests. But, of course, the newspapers are not reporting on this, so the gay cover-up continues.

Regarding the listings, it is hard to come to definitive conclusions when the data are not uniform, but there are some entries that deserve to be discussed.

The report loses credibility when it lists people like Brother John W. McMuldren, C.S.C. He was from Alaska, spent one year in Illinois, and in the lone case where charges were made against him (in Alaska), he was found innocent.

A nun, Sr. Norma Giannini, was charged with sexually abusing two teenage boys: one said he was abused more than 100 times and the other said he was molested between 60 and 80 times. Such cases strain credulity.

It would be unfair to cast suspicion on all of the entries. Indeed, there are some that cry out for an explanation.

Why was Fr. Kenneth M. Brigham of the Archdiocese of Chicago able to partake in a "sex-ring with other priests"? Others must have known about this, so why didn't they act?

Ditto for Fr. Victor Stewart. He was another priest from the Chicago archdiocese who participated in a sex club.

Fr. Roger P. Schoenhofen, O.M.I., was a priest in the Diocese of Belleville who participated in a "ring of homosexual priests," sexually abusing young men at St. Henry's Seminary. Others must have known about this, so why didn't they act?

These are the most disturbing stories in the report. Bad as they are, we must keep in mind that all but one of the 395 persons mentioned in the report are either dead or are no longer in ministry. This is not an anomaly: this is true

across the United States.

Yet Anderson has the gall to say in his report that “The danger of sexual abuse in Illinois is clearly a problem today, not just the past.” He is a liar. He knows the evidence is just the opposite.

Anyone who thinks Anderson is in this game purely for the money is missing the point. He couldn't possibly spend all the money he has. No, he is in it for the same reason that so many others are in it: The name of the game is to “Get the Catholic Church.” It is not greed that motivates the Church haters, it is ideology.

MICHIGAN AG'S ANTI-CATHOLIC BIAS

Dana Nessel, Michigan's new Attorney General, is not off to a good start with Catholics. In February, she held a press conference where she insulted Catholics. Her topic was a state investigation into allegations of Catholic clergy sexual abuse. She threw a sucker punch at Catholics by telling residents to “ask to see their badge and not their rosary” when contacted by investigators.

Why hasn't Nessel launched an investigation of every institution, religious and secular, where adults intermingle with minors on a regular basis? Why did she cherry pick Catholic ones?

Would she allow the authorities to contact residents seeking information about street crime committed by African Americans? Wouldn't that be racial profiling? And would she make a racial

slur at a press conference on this subject?

By singling out Catholic institutions, Nessel is engaging in religious profiling. The only entity in the state, besides Catholic ones, that she is pursuing over allegations of sexual abuse is Michigan State University, home of the infamous Larry Nassar crimes and the cover up by university officials.

Is Nessel aware of the fact that the sexual abuse of minors is rampant in Michigan? In 2017, Michigan ranked 6th in the number of reported cases of human trafficking according to CARE House. In 2016, USA Today published a major story on how the 50 states deal with the sexual abuse of minors in the public schools. Michigan received an "F."

The newspaper noted the failings by reporting that "Weak screening, left to local school districts" was commonplace. "No information online about teacher disciplinary actions" was noted. Perhaps worst of all was the finding that "Some teachers' misconduct [was] not shared with other states." So Michigan just "passed the trash," as it is known in the public school industry.

Michigan gets a failing grade for handling sexual abuse cases in the public schools and Nessel gives them a pass! It is almost too hard to believe. It proves that she is not interested in combating sexual abuse, for if she were she wouldn't let public schools off the hook.

Further proof that Nessel discriminates against Catholics can be shown by accessing her website. Under "Initiatives" she lists five issues, the first of which is "Catholic Church Clergy Abuse." She even has a form where the public can submit information about alleged offenses. There is a similar form that applies to Michigan State University, but there is no form for anyone else.

The Catholic Church does not own this problem. More important, it has made such great strides in recent decades that it is

almost non-existent in this country today. The same is not true of other institutions.

To acquaint Nessel with the scope of the problem, we have compiled a tally of recent cases. Abusers include teachers, administrators, doctors, lawyers, family members, online predators, and law enforcement personnel. We have even included a list of recidivists, or repeat offenders.