

PUSH FOR CELIBACY IMPLIES GAY GUILT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue addresses the spate of articles on priestly celibacy:

Reports in Ireland and Germany of decades-old cases of priestly sexual abuse have triggered an array of articles, surveys and talk-show discussions on the need for the Catholic Church to end the celibacy requirement. The implication, of course, is that more heterosexuals, and less homosexuals, would therefore be drawn to the priesthood, thus alleviating the problem.

The reasoning is sound: as we have seen from several studies—including the one just released by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops—80 percent of the victims are male. Just as important, the majority of the victims are post-pubescent. In other words, we are talking about homosexuality, not pedophilia.

Those who fancy themselves progressive would never, of course, say there is a homosexual link to priestly sexual abuse. But they know it to be true in their heart of hearts. For example, no one seriously believes that pedophiles would be inclined to marry if celibacy were lifted—they are not interested in adults. But surely homosexuals would find the seminaries and parishes less attractive if most of the men were married.

So as not to be misunderstood, it is nonsense to say that homosexuality causes sexual abuse. Moreover, it is both untrue, and unfair, to say that most gay priests are molesters. They are not. But it is also true that most of the molesters are gay. Is this not the unstated predicate of progressives pushing for an end to celibacy? Why else

recommend doing away with it?

In short, the only difference between most progressives and most conservatives on this issue is that the latter are not afraid to identify the elephant in the room.

MICHAEL WOLFF'S BIGOTED ATTACK ON CATHOLICISM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue replies to an article posted today on the website of *Vanity Fair* by contributing editor Michael Wolff (it is a slightly smaller piece than the one posted on Wolff's own website, newser.com):

Wolff begins his column fair enough. "In an age when all religions must be treated by right-thinking people with the greatest tolerance and respect, much of the reaction to the sexual abuse story in Europe and the Pope's involvement with it, is, nevertheless, deeply and specifically anti-Catholic." Correct.

Inexplicably, Wolff then descends into a rant so vicious it might warrant editing at an alternative newspaper. Does he not realize how his own anti-Catholicism undercuts his lead statement? For example, he writes, "There might not be a Church, as we know the Church, without sexual abuse. The Catholic Church equals sex abuse." Didn't an editor realize how foolish Wolff looks?

Now try this one on for size. "There might not be Islam, as we know Islam, without violence. Islam equals violence."

There is literally no moral difference between this bigoted

assault on Islam and Wolff's bigoted assault on Catholicism.

Contact Wolff: michael@newser.com

*Please note that Newser is the sole publisher of this article; *Vanity Fair* merely provides a link.

APPEAL OF "AVE MARIA" BAN DENIED

The U.S. Supreme Court refused to hear an appeal by a high school student who sought to sue her school for banning the instrumental version of "Ave Maria" at her 2006 graduation. Therefore, the decision of the Ninth Circuit stands: the court agreed with school administrators that the song was obviously religious.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on this today:

Now that students need to be protected from hearing "Ave Maria," what will school administrators do if there is a request to play Beethoven's "Missa Solemnis" at a school concert? Will they resort to another gag order? What if the request is to play Duke Ellington's "Sacred Concert"? Will they censor that one, too?

The same civil libertarians who routinely defend obscene speech in high schools offered no help to this student. In other words, "Ave Maria" is obscene speech to them—not the "F" word. And they say they don't make moral judgments.

DISINFORMATION ON HEALTH BILL IS RAMPANT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue seeks to set the record straight on the status of the Catholic Church's position on the health care bill:

We are delighted that Sister Mary Ann Walsh, director of media relations for the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), issued a news release yesterday clarifying the position of Catholics on the health care bill. She explicitly cited a dissident Catholic group, NETWORK, for giving the false impression that 59,000 nuns have lined up in favor of the bill. "The letter had 55 signatories, some individuals, some groups of three to five persons. One endorser signed twice."

Perhaps the most commonly disseminated piece of disinformation concerns the question of abortion in the legislation. Is it true, as Catholic dissidents are saying, that the Senate bill does not cover abortion? And if so, are the bishops the ones promoting false information?

The answer does not require legal analysis. All it requires is an ability to read and exercise common sense. If abortion coverage is not in the bill, then why is it that every single amendment written to make absolutely sure that abortion funding is not in the legislation was defeated by pro-abortion senators?

We are happy to note that a health group of real professionals, namely the Catholic Medical Association, has formally opposed the bill; Catholic doctors should be listened to on this issue. The fact that they see right through the

disinformation is heartening.

Those in the media who want to know what the Catholic position is on this issue, and every other public policy issue, need only access the website of the USCCB. What others say is intriguing, but hardly determinative.

NEW YORK TIMES GIVES WRONG IMPRESSION

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a front-page article in today's *New York Times* on a sex abuse incident that took place in Germany 30 years ago:

"For decades it was common practice in the church not to involve law enforcement in sexual abuse cases." Thus does the *Times* give the impression that outside the Catholic Church, secular and religious organizations typically called the cops when they learned of abuse cases by employees. This is pure, unadulterated bunk. The rule, not the exception, was to deal with such matters internally.

Only recently have there been any laws mandating that the authorities be notified. What really takes chutzpah is the fact that the *New York Times* did not endorse a bill last year in New York State which would have treated public institutions the same way it would have treated private institutions in dealing with sex abuse.

In the 1960s, 70s and 80s—the very period when the vast majority of cases of priestly sexual molestation took place—the prevailing zeitgeist was to rehabilitate and renew. Had the Church dealt punitively right off the bat with alleged

offenders, it would have been branded heartless and un-Christian at the time. How perverse it is, then, that those who sold us the idea that every malady could be cured by rehabilitation are now the very ones condemning the Catholic Church for following their prescription. That they are selectively doing so is all the more infuriating.

Anyone who thinks this twisted thinking is confined to the *New York Times* isn't keeping up with liberal sentiment on this issue. It's the norm.

Contact NYT Public Editor Clark Hoyt: public@nytimes.com

ORANGE COUNTY REGISTER GETS THE MESSAGE

Yesterday, the Catholic League protested the blog site of the *Orange County Register* which showed the silhouette of a priest in a Q & A section on sexual abuse. Bill Donohue, the league's president, is pleased with the outcome:

Thanks to our members who pounded the newspaper with e-mails, the president and publisher of the *Orange County Register*, Terry Horne, released a letter of apology to complainants. "Singling out one group, especially in such a recognizable way, was unfair and inappropriate." He ended his letter by saying, "We hope you will forgive the lapse in judgment. And I hope you will accept my personal apology."

On the blog site, yesterday's news release of the Catholic League is posted. The logo of the Catholic League is placed at the top.

We accept the apology. Case closed.

WHAT WOULD JESUS DO? JUST ASK “THE VIEW”

On yesterday's episode of “The View,” the panelists criticized the decision of a Colorado Catholic school not to enroll students of a lesbian couple. Catholic League president Bill Donohue responded today:

When this story broke last week, I told the staff it was inevitable that the gals on “The View” would address it. Why? Because they never miss an opportunity to rip the Catholic Church whenever it fails to ratify the secular thinking in the dominant culture.

“We'll be hearing from Bill Donohue tomorrow probably,” said Joy Behar on Monday. Was she at all uncertain? If five Catholics with a history of anti-Semitism bashed the house rules of a yeshiva, would it not occasion a news release from Abe Foxman at the ADL?

I cite this example because none of those upset with the Catholic school is Catholic. Behar, Elisabeth Hasselbeck and Whoopi Goldberg are all ex-Catholics. Sherri Shepherd (the only one who is not offensive) is Protestant. And Barbara Walters is Jewish. Hasselbeck, in particular, needs to let go: it's been a long time since she shopped around to find some new religion and yet she is still obsessed with Catholicism.

Both Behar and Hasselbeck said yesterday that Jesus would not have approved of the Catholic school's decision. Nice to know they have a pipeline to the Almighty, and that they consider

themselves to be tolerant, non-judgmental and without a trace of bigotry.

Contact the executive producer: bill.geddie@abc.com

NEW YORK TIMES TARGETS THE POPE AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest attack on the pope by the *New York Times*:

Once upon a time there was a homosexual priest who was accused of molesting boys in Germany. That was 30 years ago. At the approval of Archbishop Joseph Ratzinger (now the pope), he was sent away for therapy and was later reinstated; years later, under a new archbishop, there was another incident and more therapy.

We know this because the *New York Times* (which does not like to report on molesting rabbis in 2010), told us about this on Saturday in a front-page article. Today, it ran a front-page article on the same story. Was there any difference? Yes. On Saturday, the *Times* was only able to identify the priest as bearing the initial "H." Today, it has real news: his name is Hullermann. And now "H" has been suspended.

Was it wrong to send abusers to therapy? Is it wrong today? The *Times* does not say. While it is painfully obvious that psychologists and psychiatrists have oversold their competency in treating abusers, it has long been considered to be both scientifically and ethically sound. It still is. Perhaps that view is unwarranted, but it is flatly unfair to cherry pick Catholic decision-makers for indictment when therapy fails.

The *Times* also wrote today that when the pope was Cardinal Ratzinger under Pope John Paul II, he was “in charge of reviewing sexual abuse cases for the Vatican.” In doing so, the *Times* leaves the impression that Ratzinger was in charge of overseeing these cases when the scandal developed. Nonsense. The *Times* reported on January 9, 2002 that he had just been appointed to this role. Thus, he had nothing to do with this issue at the time when most of the abuse took place (mid-60s to mid-80s).

The *Times* has a vested ideological interest in keeping this story alive. To say it dislikes Pope Benedict XVI intensely is an understatement.

Contact NYT Public Editor Clark Hoyt: public@nytimes.com

HANNITY IS RIGHT: OBAMA IS “THE ANOINTED ONE”

On the front page of the “Week in Review” section of Sunday’s *New York Times*, there was a piece on health care titled, “Is Failure Forgivable?” Accompanying the article was a [photo](#) of President Obama in shirt sleeves with his finger pointed upwards. Superimposed in the background was an illustration that showed an illuminated cross; a halo over Obama’s head was also depicted. A small picture of the White House was shown at the bottom of the cross.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue commented as follows:

Sean Hannity refers to President Obama as “the anointed one.” The only difference between Hannity and the *New York Times* is that his characterization is meant as sarcasm. The *Times*

actually believes it.

This is the same newspaper that refused to run the Danish cartoon imagery of Muhammad. Nice to know that it obviously has no problem misappropriating Christian imagery to make a political point, even during Lent. What a class bunch.

Contact NYT Public Editor Clark Hoyt: public@nytimes.com

NEW YORK TIMES GUNNING FOR THE POPE?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue takes on the *New York Times*:

On March 10, the *New York Times* ran an article on sex abuse in the Catholic Church stating that in Austria a priest abused a boy 40 years ago. Yesterday, readers learned of a German case where a man says he was abused in 1979. But when Rabbi Baruch Lebovits was found guilty last week on eight counts of sexually abusing a Brooklyn boy, the *Times* failed to report it. This is not an accident—it is deliberate.

Worse, on Saturday, the *Times* ran a front-page story saying that in 2002, when the sex abuse scandal in Boston hit, the pope—then Cardinal Ratzinger—“made statements that minimized the problem.” No quotes or evidence of any kind were given. “Minimize the problem.” Interesting phrase. In 2005, the *Times* reported that in 2002, Ratzinger believed that “less than 1 percent of priests are guilty” of sex abuse (it was later found that 4 percent was a more accurate figure). The *Times* characterized his remark by saying he “appeared to minimize the problem.” Looks like they got their talking points down

just fine.

What the *Times* could have said over the weekend was that on January 9, 2002, three days after the *Boston Globe* broke the story on sex abuse, it ran a story reporting that Ratzinger had sent a letter to the bishops worldwide saying that “even a hint” of the sexual abuse of minors merited an investigation. But to do so would have compromised the conclusion it sought to reach.

If the *Times* were truly interested in eradicating sex abuse, it not only would report on cases like Rabbi Lebovits, it would not seek to protect the public school establishment. But it does. Here’s the proof. Last year, there were two bills being debated in Albany on the subject of sex abuse: one targeted only private institutions like the Catholic Church, giving the public schools a pass; the other covered both private and public. The *Times* endorsed the former.

Contact NYT Public Editor Clark Hoyt: public@nytimes.com