

“AID IN DYING” CROWD LOVES ABORTION

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) today passed a statement on physician-assisted suicide. Commenting on its critics is Catholic League president Bill Donohue:

Those who delight in helping people die like to invoke the values of compassion and choice. Indeed, Compassion and Choices (C&C) is the name of the organization previously known as the Hemlock Society. They are none too happy with the bishops today, and that is because the Catholic hierarchy values life over death. The head of C&C, Barbara Coombs Lee, said it “alarms us” to see the bishops “use their standing” to work against her agenda.

In a statement released today, the USCCB addressed the issue of choice, counseling that “even apparently free choices may be unduly influenced by the biases and wishes of others.” Addressing the matter of compassion, the body pointedly said, “True compassion alleviates suffering while maintaining solidarity with those who suffer. It does not put lethal drugs in their hands and abandon them to their suicidal impulses, or to the self-serving motives of others who may want them dead.” It also noted that “Dutch doctors, who once limited euthanasia to terminally ill patients, now provide lethal drugs to people with chronic illnesses and disabilities, mental illness, and even melancholy.”

Not surprisingly, C&C praises Dr. Death, Jack Kevorkian, for his groundbreaking work, though they caution it is “safer” to stay within the law. More important, C&C is top-heavy with pro-abortion activists.

Lee is a champion of abortion rights, and so is Patty Berg, a former state official and member of the board of directors. Ditto for several ministers who are on the advisory board, including the infamous Rev. John Shelby Spong. Donors include David Rockefeller and the NYS NARAL Foundation. A real

standout is the anti-Catholic gay phenom from San Francisco, Mark Leno: he likes to make his contributions in the name of Dr. Death.

Pro-abortion and pro-euthanasia—that's what makes C&C tick. To say they are deadly consistent is an understatement.

SEXUAL DEVIANT DAVID LETTERMAN INDICTS PRIESTS

On last night's "Late Show with David Letterman," the CBS host said he was "stunned" and "fascinated" by Anthony Weiner's predicament. He then said the following: "Honest to God, is this the kind of behavior you'd expect from a congressman! No. In simple terms, no. It is not the kind of behavior you'd expect from a congressman. It is the kind of behavior you'd expect from a priest."

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments as follows:

In addition to Rep. Weiner, the following members of Congress have been involved in cases of sexual improprieties in recent years: Rep. Chris Lee, Rep. Mark Souder, Rep. Eric Massa, Rep. Vito Fossella, Rep. Mark Foley, Rep. Gerry Studds, Rep. Barney Frank, Rep. Daniel Crane, Sen. Larry Craig, Sen. David Vitter, Sen. John Edwards and Sen. John Ensign. In addition, the following governors have a sordid record: Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, Gov. Jim Gibbons, Gov. Jim McGreevey, Gov. Eliot Spitzer, Gov. Mark Sanford and Gov. Bob Wise. President Bill Clinton was similarly compromised.

Regarding priests, 149 of them are responsible for 27 percent of all the alleged cases of abuse over the past half-century—out of a total of 100,000 priests. More important, almost no priests today are the subject of allegations.

We know one thing for sure: the average person working for David Letterman is far more likely to have been the subject of sexual harassment—by him, no less—than those working for a priest. Perhaps the next time he will be more accurate and compare himself to Weiner. But he should note one caveat: Weiner, so far as we know, is unlike Letterman in this respect—he did not commit adultery, never mind serial adultery.

Contact Kimberly Izzo-Emmet, director of “Late Night” publicity: krizzo@cbs.com

BOSTON PRIEST-SUING LAWYER GOES BONKERS

In today’s *Boston Globe*, there is a column by Brian McGrory about Rev. Charles Murphy, a priest twice sued by attorney Mitchell Garabedian.

In 2006, Father Murphy was sued for improperly touching a minor, a girl who claimed the incident occurred 25 years prior. Father Murphy maintained his innocence, and on the eve of the trial, the woman dropped her suit.

In 2010, Father Murphy was sued by a man who alleged that he was fondled 40 years ago. The accuser, it turns out, was deep in debt and had his credibility questioned even by his family members. Father Murphy was exonerated after an archdiocesan review board took six months to examine the charges.

Father Murphy died last Saturday, a broken man. McGrory says that what Garabedian did is “a disgrace.”

Catholic League president Bill Donohue called Garabedian today

about this matter, and reports as follows:

I simply asked Mr. Garabedian if he has any regrets for pressing charges against Father Murphy, and he responded by screaming at the top of his lungs. Indeed, he went ballistic, bellowing how he lost his case because of the archdiocese's "kangaroo court." I asked him several times to calm down and to speak rationally, but instead he engaged in more boilerplate, making sweeping condemnations of Boston priests.

It is a sad day when a priest is falsely accused of sexual abuse. It is an even sadder day when it happens a second time. Sadder still is the scenario where a falsely accused priest goes to his deathbed suffering such indignations. It is worse than sad—it is obscene—when lawyers who lose in their bid to take down an innocent priest not only express no remorse, they behave like barbarians.

Contact Garabedian: (866) 345-2214, or e-mail him at mitchell@garabedianlaw.com

NEW YORK TIMES ERRS IN ABUSE STORY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a story in today's *New York Times* about priestly sexual abuse:

Laurie Goodstein is wrong to say that in the 37 cases of priests indicted by a grand jury in Philadelphia, none was brought to the attention of the review board.

Ana Maria Catanzaro, a member of the Philadelphia review board, said that her panel reviewed ten of the cases. Moreover, subsequent to the grand jury report, all 37 cases were reviewed by a former Philadelphia Assistant District

Attorney, Gina Maisto Smith, with the aid of her team, and a forensic psychiatrist. Here is the breakdown of what happened:

- Three priests were placed on administrative leave in February and ordered to refrain from public ministry pending the results of a second review.
- In March, 21 additional priests were suspended. According to Pennsylvania psychiatrist Dr. Richard Fitzgibbons, and Dr. Peter Kleponis, both of whom have dealt directly with this issue, “the majority of the 21 priests identified for further evaluations of accusations made against them previously went through such an intensive process in the past conducted by competent professionals without any new charges being filed against them. The result of the investigation was that the charges were not substantiated against many of those 21 priests.”
- Five others would have been subject to administrative leave but one was already on leave; two are incapacitated and not in active ministry; and two no longer serve in the archdiocese (they are members of a religious order).
- Of the eight remaining priests, the initial examination found that no further investigation was warranted.

Furthermore, not all of these allegations involve sexual abuse (which Goodstein acknowledges); many involve “boundary issues.” We will ask the *New York Times* to correct this story.

BOSTON

GLOBE

LECTURES

ARCHDIOCESE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the *Boston Globe's* response to Cardinal Sean O'Malley's decision to halt a Mass at St. Cecilia's in honor of Gay Pride Month:

In today's editorial, the *Boston Globe* pretends that "No one would have had the misimpression that the church was endorsing gay sex" by allowing the Mass to be said. Columnist Kevin Cullen also plays the role of virgin, wondering why anyone would think that such a Mass might turn the church "into an outpost of Sodom." The front-page news story goes one better, maintaining that the Boston archdiocese "gave the impression that St. Cecilia's supported the annual Gay Pride Celebration." The priest behind the Mass, Rev. John Unni, also feigns ignorance, saying of the Gay Pride agenda, "I don't know what that is."

Sounds like they all need a reality check. In the June 5 weekly bulletin of St. Cecilia's, it says quite plainly, "The Rainbow Ministry of Saint Cecilia Parish invites all friends and supporters of the LGBT community to a Mass *in celebration of Boston's Pride Month*." (My italics.) So there is no need to lie about the purpose of the event.

Gay Pride Month, for the uninitiated, is not exactly like Black History Month: the latter commemorates the achievements of African Americans, while the former celebrates libertinism. That's why African Americans do not appear naked on their floats. Nor do they engage in simulated sex. While evidently the marchers managed to keep their shorts on this year, they've had difficulty doing so in the past. In the late 1990s, naked women fondled each other on a mattress, and a man on stilts exposed himself, and yet the same *Boston Globe* that likes to lecture the Catholic Church said absolutely nothing about it.

At last Saturday's Gay Pride Parade, men dressed in leather—along with their trusty harnesses—marched alongside the drag queens and dancing go-go guys, while the boys from MassEquality "gyrated on a flatbed." As usual, organized

homosexuals mocked nuns. But none of this disturbs the *Boston Globe*. Indeed, it pretends not to know what's going on!

Contact editorial page editor Peter Canellos:
canellos@globe.com

“NASTY THOUGHTS” OF MICHAEL SEAN WINTERS

On the website of the *National Catholic Reporter*, Michael Sean Winters says he had the following “nasty thought” today: “Where is Bill Donohue When You Need Him?” This is in reference to Donohue’s silence in the wake of Father Robert Sirico’s recent article on Ayn Rand, and her fictional character in *Atlas Shrugged*, John Galt.

Winters accuses Father Sirico of treating Galt as a Christ-figure: “He considers him as a God-Man.” Winters then questions, “how is this different from ‘Piss Christ,’ the infamous work of art by Andres Serrano in which the artist took one of Catholicism’s most sacred symbols, the crucifix, and submerged it in a bottle of urine. Is not the suggestion that Galt is a Christ-figure just as insulting in its way as ‘Piss Christ’ is in its way? Is this not sacrilege? Should we wait for a press release from the Catholic League? Or does Donohue only throw aspersions on the indecencies of the left?”

Here is Bill Donohue’s response:

Winters’ accusation is false. Here is what Father Sirico actually said: “He [Galt] is, in a real sense *for Rand*, the God-Man.” (My emphasis.) Moreover, while Sirico notes certain strengths in Rand’s writings, he is not exactly her cheerleader. In the piece which Winters claims to have read, Sirico flatly says, “I disagree profoundly with Rand,” adding

that “people who reverence Western Civilization must reject Rand.”

It insults the intelligence of the reader to compare Sirico to Serrano. As for fairness, I took on the entire Republican leadership when they tried to stiff a priest nominated to be the first Catholic House Chaplain, and in the last election hammered John McCain for an endorsement he sought.

What’s really going on is Winters’ obsession with Father Sirico. He doesn’t like him. Fair enough. We do. Indeed, we think he’s great. No matter, even adversaries are obliged to get the facts straight.

SPIKE IN SUSPECT ALLEGATIONS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments as follows:

As the bishops assemble this week in Seattle, they will once again grapple with the issue of clergy abuse. While some recent allegations are worthy of pursuit, others don’t pass the smell test. All of the following cases have been reported in the news since June 1:

- A Tennessee man claims he was abused in the 1970s, though he and his lawyers admit his memories are returning “a little at a time”
- A Louisiana man claims he was abused in the 1970s, though he admits that he “suppressed” his memories until recently
- A Texas man claims he was abused in the 1980s but can’t remember the accused priest’s name
- A convicted murderer from Pennsylvania claims he was abused in the 1960s, though two of his own brothers don’t believe him

- A Kansas man who initially accused a priest of wrestling with him back in 1970s, now claims he was groped
- The Seattle archdiocese is being sued by a woman who claims she was fondled in the early 1960s at a church picnic by a man who was not a priest
- After a New York man read about the death of a priest whom he knew, he claimed he was abused by him in the 1960s
- A Tennessee man claims he was abused in the 1970s, though the suit never names the priest, who died in 2002
- A California priest who lives in a retirement home and has never been charged with anything, is being accused of abuse in the 1960s
- After one Ohio woman came forward claiming she was groped in the 1960s, four other women in the area now claim victim status
- A man from Pennsylvania says he was touched inappropriately in the 1970s, and even though he never contacted the police, the accused priest has been permanently removed from ministry and has had his job terminated at the diocese

We hope the bishops take note of these suspect cases. While the guilty must pay, all accused priests are entitled to a presumption of innocence.

U.N. PANEL'S BOGUS APPEAL TO IRELAND

A United Nations panel, the Committee against Torture, has asked the Irish government to investigate allegations of

mistreatment of young women who used to work in Catholic laundries. Specifically, the panel says that alleged abuses in the so-called Magdalene Laundries, workhouses run by nuns from the 1920s to the mid-1990s, should be investigated with an eye towards prosecuting the guilty parties.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue addressed this issue today:

The Irish government correctly notes that it cannot “rewrite its history or right the wrongs that were done.” It should have used stronger language: it is obscene for an international body to hold the women religious of one nation accountable for alleged abuses that took place nearly a century ago. If this is the new standard of justice, then no nation can claim innocence. What’s driving this initiative is more than revisionist history—it smacks of an agenda.

Ironically, of the ten nations on the U.N. Committee against Torture that are recommending the investigation, half of them are guilty of torture today! Freedom House’s latest annual report says that “arbitrary arrest and torture” still exists in Morocco. Amnesty International said last year that “Senegal’s security forces continue to torture suspects held in custody, sometimes to death.” Regarding Cyprus, in a June 4 “Special Report” by Cyprusnewsreport.com, it said that “Human trafficking is a huge problem in the north of the island” and that “cabaret owners routinely threaten women with torture in chambers beneath their nightclubs.” Last year, the International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims said that “torture and ill-treatment” are “still highly prevalent” in Ecuador. And Freedom House concludes that “torture remains widespread” in China today.

From top to bottom, this entire attack on Irish nuns reeks of politics and intellectual dishonesty.

JON STEWART INSULTS CATHOLICS; YAHOO! NEWS COVERS IT UP

On last night's episode of "The Daily Show with Jon Stewart," the host joked about Rep. Anthony Weiner's situation with correspondent John Oliver. During their skit, Stewart ridiculed Weiner by sipping frantically on a Margarita, imitating the way Weiner sips from a water bottle.

Stewart then accidentally broke his glass. Oliver, seeing Stewart's hand bleeding, joked, "Don't be so Jewish about it. You're fine, you're absolutely fine."

On Yahoo! News, in both the video clip and the news story, this is where the skit ends. But on the show, it continued with Stewart replying, "I should be Catholic." Next, referring to his blood, he offered, "I should turn this into a drink."

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Weiner sends porn pictures to strangers and his buddy Stewart laughs it off. This is to be expected as the ethical bar for people like Stewart and Weiner is quite low. But for Stewart to impulsively lash out at the heart of Catholicism—when discussing a subject that has nothing to do with it—reveals a side to him that is troubling. Indeed, it suggests that it doesn't take much to bring out the worst in Stewart: when the bigotry is visceral, the pus gushes to the surface at the slightest rub. Catholics deserve an apology.

Moreover, Yahoo! News was singularly dishonest in the way it tried to paper over Stewart's insulting remark: it deliberately cut his offensive quip, knowing full well it would have put the skit in a totally different light. Catholics deserve an explanation.

Contact Comedy Central CEO Doug Herzog:

doug.herzog@comedycentral.com

Contact Yahoo! News Blog Deputy Editor Chris Lehmann:
chrisblehmann2@yahoo.com

WHAT IF REP. WEINER WERE REV. WEINER?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Priests who engage in lewd conversations with teenagers are suspended from ministry for committing a “boundary violation,” and are charged with sexual abuse. But Rep. Anthony Weiner can send pornographic images of himself to young girls and he is free as a bird. Indeed, the majority of New Yorkers say he *should not* resign.

Joe Garofoli of the *San Francisco Chronicle* says Weiner’s “biggest sin may not have been sexual”—it was “lying.” Former Democratic National Committee Chairman Tim Kaine says that “Lying is unforgivable,” but has no comment on his sexual offenses. Joan Walsh of Salon confesses that “The lying is what disturbs me.” S.E. Cupp’s article in the *New York Daily News* is flagged, “The disgraced congressman should resign, but immorality has nothing to do with it.” Similarly, Leslie Savan of the *Nation* wonders, “How can you be so stupid?”

Ilene Angel of the Huffington Post opines, “I honestly don’t care” what Weiner did. Glenn Greenwald of Salon chalks it all up to “voyeuristic fun.” Conor Friedersdorf in the *Atlantic* contends that we, the people, are the problem: we spend too much time “focusing on the sexual behavior of egocentric alpha males who spend a lot of time traveling far from home.” In a *Time* interview, Erica Jong not only gives Weiner a pass, she exculpates Dominique Strauss-Kahn, Arnold Schwarzenegger,

Rep. Chris Lee, John Edwards and Eliot Spitzer: they all suffer from “a form of mental illness.”

To top things off, Joy Behar believes that “Somebody is out to get him, apparently ’cause they don’t like his politics.” Weiner agrees: he told a donor last week that this was all due to a “vast right-wing conspiracy.”

In other words, if the guilty party were Rev. Weiner, he would be sanctioned by the Catholic Church’s “zero tolerance” policy. But because he is Rep. Weiner, there are no penalties. As usual, it’s not the offense that matters—it’s the status of the offender.