

THE SHAMELESS NEW YORK TIMES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responds to today's *New York Times* editorial, "More Shame":

The editorial says, "The Roman Catholic Church in this country has promised accountability and justice for children sexually abused by priests. We fear it has a long way to go." Wrong: no religious or secular institution in the U.S. today has a better record than the Catholic Church. To wit: from 2005 to 2009 (the last year data are available), the average number of credible *accusations* made against a priest for the sexual abuse of a minor is 8.6; in 2009, the number was six (out of more than 40,000).

The *Times* cites the latest grand jury report against the Philadelphia Archdiocese as evidence of wrongdoing, noting that three priests and a teacher are accused of abuse extending back to the 1990s, and that there are many more abusers in active ministry.

The first grand jury report was issued in 2005 and not a single priest was indicted. The Philadelphia prosecutors blamed an "inadequate" state law for coming up empty. The "inadequate" law was an elementary civil liberty called the statute of limitations. So they redoubled their efforts, got the law changed and reinstituted another grand jury. The grand jury has now smeared the previous Philadelphia Archbishop, Cardinal Anthony Bevilacqua, with baseless charges, being forced to admit that "we cannot conclude a successful prosecution can be brought against the cardinal." Moreover, when the law was changed, it gave special protection to public employees, something which is music to the ear of the *Times*: it has never once editorialized how outrageous it is to discriminate against Catholic and Orthodox Jewish teachers by having one set of penalties for them, and another for public school teachers.

Finally, the *Times* needs to put up or shut up: if it has evidence that today's Philadelphia Archbishop, Cardinal Justin Rigali, is wrong to say that "there are *no* archdiocesan

priests in ministry today who have an admitted or established allegation of sexual abuse of a minor against them," then it should say so. (My italic.)

Contact NYT public editor, Arthur S. Brisbane:
public@nytimes.com

UNSEEMLY ATTACK ON ARCHBISHOP DOLAN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue defended New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan today:

Jeffrey Anderson, who has made a killing suing the Catholic Church, is angry there isn't more money in the Milwaukee Archdiocese for him to milk. Now he is pointing his finger at the one Milwaukee archbishop who did more to render justice than any of his predecessors, Timothy Dolan (he headed the Milwaukee Archdiocese from 2002-2009).

Anderson wants to know why the Milwaukee Archdiocese moved \$75 million to the parishes in 2004. Because it was held as an investment account for the parishes and was returned to them. That's why. If this is illegal, then Anderson will need an army of lawyers: huge transfers of funds take place every day in religious and secular institutions. Only those with base motives just assume wrongdoing.

Anderson also wants to know why \$55 million was moved to a cemetery trust in 2008, a year after a Wisconsin court said victims could sue for fraud. Actually, the cemetery transfer took place in 2007, and was entirely consistent with previous practices: the cemetery trust existed, de facto, since the early 1900s and was not formalized until 2007.

Assisting Anderson in this witch hunt is Los Angeles lawyer, Gillian Brown. She is cut from the same cloth: on Friday, she got so out of hand in her rambling attacks that presiding Assistant U.S. Trustee, David Asbach, had to put the arm on her. As if we needed any further proof of the vindictiveness at play, Brown asked about the monetary value of the bishops' rings and crosses. This is exactly the kind of shakedown we would expect from the likes of Anderson and Brown.

SNAP, the professional victims' group, is salivating again. And no wonder: their latest 990 tax return shows they're in big trouble—their revenues are plummeting and they're operating in the red. So they badly need Anderson to grease them again. They are incapable of being shamed.

INVESTIGATE ESQUIRE

On the front page of the website of *Esquire* magazine, there is an article by its executive editor, Mark Warren, titled, "Investigate the Vatican" [[click here](#)]. Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on it today:

Mark Warren's article gives new meaning to the word "rant," for it is the most turgid declamation on the Catholic Church in print. He begins by applauding the *New Yorker* for its critical piece on Scientology, founded by L. Ron Hubbard. But he is angry nonetheless. "Wouldn't the resources and time of journalists be better directed at the finances, earthly corruption, and raw power of the Catholic Church, an institution that wields influence incalculably greater than L. Ron Hubbard's itty-bitty religion?" Then the rant begins in earnest.

"I mean, I grew up believing that every breath I drew sent a god-made-man named Jesus Christ writhing on the cross to which he had been nailed...so that he might die for my sins so that I might live. And yet, I was born not innocent but complicit in this lynching, incomprehensibly having to apologize and atone

for this barbarism for all my days and feel terrible about myself and all mankind.” Only an ex-Catholic would be capable of writing something like this. Then, of course, he laces into the pope blaming him for the homosexual scandal.

Having never heard of this guy, I quickly found out that Warren’s hero is poor Christopher Hitchens. More revealing is his characterization of Osama bin Laden as merely “ridiculous.” By contrast, he speaks of “the dashing Bill Donohue” in comparatively worse terms, provoking him to ask “what on earth have we done to deserve [him]?” Much, I would say.

The time has come to “Investigate *Esquire*.” You know it’s in trouble when it features screeds like this, and when it flags such penetrating articles as, “How to Sew a Button Easily” and “How to Hit a Softball.” Now we know why *GQ* has a circulation more than double that of *Esquire*’s.

Contact Mark Warren: mwarren@hearst.com

AIR FORCE ACADEMY FOES LOSE

Yesterday, a federal judge upheld the right of the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) to hold a prayer luncheon; it is scheduled for today. Addressing the decision is Catholic League president Bill Donohue:

On January 24, I wrote to Lt. Gen. Michael C. Gould, Superintendent of the USAFA, applauding him for standing by the decision to welcome 1st Lt. Clebe McClary as the guest speaker at the February 10 luncheon. Lt. McClary is a national hero who should be welcome to speak on any campus. Unfortunately, there are some who sought to silence him because he is a committed evangelical; they even sought the ouster of Lt. Gen. Gould.

What was most striking about the lawsuit, brought by a long-time enemy of the USAFA, the Military Religious Freedom Foundation, and an economics professor, David Mullin, was that

it was all based on a hypothetical scenario: U.S. District Judge Christine Arguello ruled that Mullin did not have standing to sue because “he has not met his burden that he will actually or imminently suffer the injury he fears.”

The judge was right. Not only was the event voluntary, Mullin testified that he never suffered retribution when he decided not to go to previous prayer luncheons. Indeed, as told by a reporter from the Associated Press who interviewed him after the verdict, Mullin acknowledged “he couldn’t say with certainty that he would face retribution for not attending.”

In other words, this entire lawsuit was an exercise in demagoguery: unsupported claims of reprisal were made by those who sought to censor the religious speech of a person they dislike. It is too bad they weren’t fined by the judge for bringing a frivolous lawsuit.

The usual enemies of religious freedom, such as Americans United for Separation of Church and State, have been at war with the USAFA for years. Their immediate enemy is evangelicals, but their real enemy is the public expression of any religion.

JAY LENO’S PATHOLOGICAL CONDITION

On last night’s “Tonight Show with Jay Leno,” the host made the following joke about the new Confession application:

“Well, the Catholic Church has come out with a new app for the iPhone. This is real. You can confess right on the phone. How perfect is that? You can now cheat and atone for your sins all on the same device. Perfect for Bret Favre. Fantastic. You know what the name of the app is? I’m not making it up. It’s called ‘Priest in Your Pocket.’ Really. Is that the best name

they could come up with?"

Catholic League president Bill Donohue commented as follows: When the app was released, we knew it would be fodder for comedians and pundits, but we decided to say nothing unless the remarks were insulting or totally misleading. That is why we said nothing about a joke made by George Lopez about the app, nor did we comment on Maureen Dowd's piece on the same subject. In fact, we never commented on Leno's app joke made a few days ago. That's because none of these quips were disrespectful. But last night's monologue by Leno is a different story.

The worst part of Leno's commentary was not that he deliberately misled the public—there is no such thing as Confession on the phone (the app is designed to help Catholics prepare for Confession)—it was his below the belt shot at priests: The name of the app is called, "Confession: A Roman Catholic app." It is not called "Priest in Your Pocket."

Why does this matter? Because Leno has an obsession with priests—he habitually portrays all of them as sexual predators. If you have any doubt about the man's pathological condition, [click here](#) to read about some of his previous remarks (we list more than 30 of them). There is no late-night host who even comes close to matching Leno's bigoted record.

Contact the executive producer: Debbie.vickers@nbc.com

PLANNED PARENTHOOD IS ANTI-WOMEN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Planned Parenthood's response to charges that it is acting unethically:

Thanks to Lila Rose, the president of Live Action, the public is learning more and more about the deeply entrenched culture of corruption that permeates Planned Parenthood. The latest videotape of Planned Parenthood employees shows how

cooperative they are in offering friendly advice to persons posing as pimps and prostitutes in the Bronx: the imposters were assured of confidentiality, thus enabling them to proceed with their sex-trafficking enterprise with under-age girls.

Joan Malin, the president of Planned Parenthood in New York City, is quoted in the *New York Times* today defending her employees. "Under New York State law, we are not required to report criminal activity." She's right about that, but she disingenuously failed to say why.

The reason why there is no mandatory reporting law in New York State (only some professions are covered) is because liberals—not the Catholic Church—have worked hard to defeat one: Family Planning Advocates, the lobbying arm of Planned Parenthood, has teamed up with the New York Civil Liberties Union and other liberal groups to kill these bills.

Why does Planned Parenthood oppose a mandatory reporting law for cases involving the sexual abuse of a minor? Because it threatens their livelihood. Their counselors learn of statutory rape cases all the time, and if they were forced to call the cops, it would hurt their business. So they just go along, in effect working as an accomplice with rapists.

And they call themselves champions of women's rights. But what rights? The right to be raped? The right of an abortion worker to kill their child? The first feminists, those who pioneered women's rights in the nineteenth century, knew that abortion allowed men to exploit women. They got it. Sadly, Planned Parenthood does not.

Contact Joan Malin: joan.malin@ppnyc.org

BOGUS CLAIMS ABOUT iPhone CONFESSION APP

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how Internet sites have characterized last week's announcement that a Confession application is now available for iPhone, iPad and iPod Touch users:

"Confession: A Roman Catholic App" was developed by Little iApps to prepare Catholics for Confession. Specifically, the application guides Catholics through an examination of conscience, steering them through a series of questions that tap into issues addressed by the Ten Commandments. It received an imprimatur from Bishop Kevin Rhoades of Fort Wayne-South Bend.

Patrick Leinen, the developer of Little iApps, cannot be faulted for the way some are characterizing this program. This application was never designed as a substitute for Confession: on the contrary, it makes it clear that only absolution by a priest in the confessional constitutes the Sacrament of Reconciliation. Even though most Internet stories mention this, many of the headlines are misleading. Here are some of them:

- "Can't Make it to Confession? There's an App for That"
- "Catholic Church Approves Confession by iPhone"
- "Bless Me iPhone for I Have Sinned"
- "Catholic Church Endorses App for Sinning iPhone Users"
- "US Bishop Sanctions Cell Phone in Confession"
- "Forgiveness via iPhone: Church Approves Confession App"
- "New, Church-Approved iPhone Offers Confession On the Go"
- "Confess Your Sins to a Phone in Catholic Church Endorsed App"
- "Catholics Can Now Confess Using iPhone App"
- "Catholic Church Approves Online Confession"

Headlines like these, coupled with remarks like, “The Church is gonna make a killing...\$1.99 and your sins are digitally washed away,” are irresponsible. The best we can say about those pitching these bogus claims is that they are clueless. The worst we can say is that they might benefit from purchasing the app and putting it to good use.

ALBERTO CUTIE CROSSES THE LINE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article by Alberto Cutie that appears today in the Huffington Post:

Alberto Cutie is known for breaking his priestly vows, quitting the Catholic Church, running off with his lover, and becoming an Episcopal priest. Since his public journey began in 2009, he has been parading himself on TV, most recently discussing a book about his exploits. Always the victim, he has now reached a new level: he is comparing his Catholic critics to Muslim terrorists.

Though Cutie’s article is allegedly about priestly celibacy—a subject he cannot walk away from—it soon becomes apparent what his real agenda is. He quickly launches into an invidious analogy. “All this has led me to confirm that religious extremists are not only a small group of people associated to [sic] Islam. Instead, intolerant views and verbal threats by some Roman Catholic extremists that I have received rival any monopoly by Muslim radicals.”

We are used to him playing fast and loose with the facts—he continues to float the myth that 100,000 Catholic priests left to marry (the real figure is considerably lower)—but this time he really crossed the line. Quite frankly, anyone who can’t distinguish between catcalls and calls for jihad is in

trouble.

Those of us who are in the public eye are routinely maligned, oftentimes cruelly, but to compare hotheaded critics to machete-wielding terrorists is more than a stretch—it is despicable. We are used to Cutie’s lamentations, but this time he went beyond his usual sour-grapes oratory.

[Contact Cutie: info@padrealberto.com](mailto:info@padrealberto.com)

ARE CATHOLICS LIKE ISLAMISTS?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article in today’s *New York Times* about the events in Egypt:

The Catholic community and the Islamists have much in common, so says the *New York Times*: “As the Roman Catholic Church includes both those who practice leftist liberation theology and conservative anti-abortion advocates, so the [Muslim] Brotherhood includes both practical reformers and firebrand ideologues.” Sure. So Sister Mary Alice who leans left while working with the poor, and Father Murphy who works with pro-lifers, have much in common with Muslims who differ with each other on whether to kill Jews now or wait until they’re elected.

The headline reads, “Islamist Group is Poised to Be a Power in Egypt, but Its Intentions Are Unclear.” They didn’t say an Islamic group—they correctly used the term that describes Muslims who blend Islam with extremist politics. Yet the *Times* still can’t figure out their intentions.

When the Brotherhood was founded in 1928, its motto was “Jihad is our way.” Nothing has changed since. Their current leaders believe it is important to “Kill Jews—to the very last one.” On Monday, another leader said Egyptians “should prepare for

war against Israel.” Even the *Times* admits today that “its leaders have endorsed acts of terrorism against Israel and against American troops in Iraq.”

Last night, another leader said that any government which takes over should withdraw from the 32-year-old peace treaty with Israel. And just today an Al Queda-run website, Muslim.Net, said, “We call upon the Islamists to support the Muslim Brotherhood,” a clear indication that whatever differences the two groups have previously had, it’s more important that all terrorists unite.

Yeah, just like Sister Mary Alice and Father Murphy.

Contact the *Times*’ public editor, Arthur S. Brisbane:
public@nytimes.com

CHRISTIAN AND SIKH STUDENTS’ RIGHTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on two news stories that emerged this week on the religious rights of students:

Tomorrow, a fifth-grader in a Los Angeles public school will be allowed to sing a song at a talent show that mentions Jesus, but only because his mother acquired the services of the Alliance Defense Fund threatening a lawsuit: he was initially denied the right to sing the song, “We Shine,” because it mentions Jesus *too many times* (it was not disclosed how many times it would take to violate the unwritten quota).

Earlier this week, a Michigan public school district overturned a school-board ban on wearing a kirpan, a dagger carried by Sikh students for religious reasons; the new rule

says the blade of the knife must be dull, not exceeding two-and-one-fourth inches.

The right of students to sing a religious song at a school event should not even be contested—it's a free speech issue. But dropping the name Jesus is enough to set off the alarms, at least in Los Angeles. On the other hand, no lawyers were necessary to secure an exception to a "Zero Tolerance" policy on students carrying weapons to school in Michigan.

These cases are not an anomaly: in a nation that is 80 percent Christian, Christian students have to fight for their rights more vigorously than Sikh and Muslim students do.

What's at work is more than an anti-Christian bias—what's at work is the logical residue of a highly politicized multicultural curriculum. Quite frankly, it is the animus against the Judeo-Christian ethos that marks Western Civilization that accounts for such disparate treatment. Instead of celebrating our roots, the educrats are bent on trashing them. But they have plenty of tolerance for those who do not share our heritage. It's as perverse as it is unjust.