

SAN ANTONIO SPONSORS HATE SPEECH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the upcoming Terrence McNally play, "Corpus Christi," which will be performed at the San Pedro Playhouse in San Antonio from June 17 to July 10:

On February 22, I wrote to Mr. Julián Castro, mayor of San Antonio, about this outrageously anti-Christian play, "Corpus Christi," but never heard back; I sent a copy to Felix Padron, executive director of the Office of Cultural Affairs for the City of San Antonio, and to Ricardo Briones, chairman of the City's Cultural Arts Board. Here is an excerpt:

"The San Pedro Playhouse is in the process of holding auditions for a notoriously anti-Christian play, 'Corpus Christi.' What makes this so disturbing is that it commits the City of San Antonio to sponsoring hate speech against Christians: the Office of Cultural Affairs, advised by the Cultural Arts Board, is one of the play's sponsors.

"I do not assume that you know anything about this offensive play, and that is why I am enclosing a news release which I wrote in 1998 after I saw it. It is a direct in-your-face assault on Christian sensibilities."

I also provided these three public officials with information about the play. It depicts the Christ-figure, Joshua, having sex with the apostles, branding him "King of the Queers"; it portrays Jesus saying to the apostles, "F*** your mother, F*** your father, F*** God"; and it shows Philip asking Jesus to perform oral sex on him. Moreover, the script is replete with sexual and scatological comments.

It will not do for the San Pedro Playhouse to advertise this play as having "Adult language and content." It is not only obscene, it is a frontal attack on Christians, all of whom in San Antonio are being forced to underwrite it. Mayor Castro

has acted irresponsibly and deserves to be publicly rebuked for his unwillingness to cancel this play. Indeed, he even refuses to condemn it!

Contact Felix Padron: Felix.Padron@sanantonio.gov

DONOHUE RESPONDS TO JOHN JAY STUDY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue has prepared a 24-page response to the John Jay College for Criminal Justice Report on the “Causes and Context” of clergy abuse. While he praises the study on several counts, he faults the authors for not allowing their own data to drive their conclusion on the role that homosexuality played in the abuse crisis.

Sections within Donohue’s critical analysis include the following: Overview; Comparative Data and Tainted Sources; Bishops Respond; The Role of Homosexuality; The Elephant in the Sacristy; The Seminaries; and, The Resolution of Cognitive Dissonance.

Copies are being sent to all the bishops, many in the media, and to a select group of educators and attorneys; members of the league’s board of directors and board of advisors will also receive a copy.

To read Donohue’s rejoinder, click [here](#).

CREDIBILITY OF VICTIMS' GROUPS SHOT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the reaction of two victims' watchdog groups, Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests (SNAP) and BishopAccountability.org, to reports this week on sexual abuse:

On Monday, the Vatican issued guidelines on how to address the issue of sexual abuse. The day before, SNAP condemned the guidelines. On Wednesday, the bishops' conference released the John Jay College of Criminal Justice report on the "Causes and Context" of abuse. The day before, BishopAccountability condemned the report.

We knew their credibility was shot long ago—both are relentless critics of the Catholic Church and neither is open to reason. Regrettably, not everyone has figured them out, and this includes many in the media. Either that, or the enemies of the Church are just given a pass.

What happened this week should be a wake-up call to fair-minded journalists. If the critics of any person or institution are to be deemed credible, they must first pass the test of rationality. But to SNAP and BishopAccountability, evidence doesn't matter. They've made up their minds, and nothing the Catholic Church can do will alter it.

Those in the media who continue to give voice to these irrational sources cast doubt on their own integrity.

MEDIA JUMP ON ABUSE REPORT

Bill Donohue will issue an extended analysis of the John Jay College of Criminal Justice report on the "Causes and Context" of priestly sexual abuse next week. Today, he addresses what the media are saying:

The report says that fewer than 5 percent of abusive priests were pedophiles. The *New York Times* takes issue with the report for defining prepubescent children as those age 10 or younger, mentioning that the American Psychiatric Association uses the age of 13. However, the American Academy of Pediatrics says puberty begins at the age of 10. This is important because the lower the age when puberty begins, the more it implies that heterosexuality or homosexuality was at work, and neither the authors of the report, nor the *Times*, want to squarely address the obvious.

The report says homosexuality was not a factor because a) not all homosexuals define themselves as such b) sexual relations with adolescents is ephebophilia c) the degree of abuse declined after gays entered the priesthood in large numbers in the late 1970s and 1980s, and d) they did not have access to altar girls when the abuse peaked.

A homosexual is defined by his actions, not his identity. Ephebophilia has no clinical definition and is nothing more than a description of adult men who have sex with adolescent males. The surge of gays in the seminaries began in the 1960s—not in the late 1970s—and as the report says, "Men ordained in the 1960s and the early 1970s engaged in abusive behavior much more quickly after their entrance into ministry." Finally, there are so few incidents of abuse these days (an average of 8.3 per year since 2005), that it makes no sense to compare the percentage of male victims at the peak of the scandal to what has happened since altar girls were allowed. The latest study on abuse notes that 83 percent of the allegations made in 2010 were by males, and the bulk of incidents took place in the early 1970s. Besides, priests had

nothing but access to male altar servers before the 1960s, and the report notes that sexual abuse was not a problem then. That's because there were fewer gay priests then.

Finally, the report says that 81 percent of the victims were male and 78 percent were postpubescent. Since 100 percent of the abusers were male, that's called homosexuality, not pedophilia or heterosexuality.

VATICAN ABUSE NORMS RELEASED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Vatican's guidelines on sex abuse and the early reaction to it:

The three most noteworthy features of the Vatican's new guidelines are (a) its commitment to the due process rights of priests (b) its insistence on cooperation with civil authorities and (c) its restatement of episcopal authority in these matters.

It was reassuring to learn that the Vatican says, "The accused cleric is presumed innocent until the contrary is proven." Significantly, the guidelines say that "the prescriptions of civil law regarding the reporting of such crimes to the designated authority should always be followed." It also puts the ultimate authority in these matters squarely in the hands of the bishops or major superiors.

The guidelines are respectful of episcopal autonomy and do not attempt a universal template. This is important because cooperation with the civil authorities in some nations is tantamount to suicide: hostile environments for Catholics exist, and any cooperation with the authorities in these nations is bound to come at the expense of justice. With regard to authority in these matters, the Vatican understands

the role that diocesan review boards play, but it also recognizes that they are not a substitute for the authority lodged in the bishop.

The news story by the Associated Press speaks of priests who “rape and molest children,” referring to them as “pedophile priests.” It is factually wrong: few were raped, most were not children, and pedophilia is not the problem. In fact, the data show that “inappropriate touching” has been the most common form of abuse, and that most of the victims were postpubescent males, meaning that homosexuality was at work.

Finally, I was disappointed to read that John Allen of the *National Catholic Reporter*, who cited criticism of the guidelines by SNAP, did not inform his readers that those comments were made yesterday, before the Vatican’s statement was released.

NEW YORK DAILY NEWS: DOES IT HAVE THE RIGHT TO HIRE JIMMY BRESLIN?

Catholic League Survey:

Should the *Daily News* be allowed to hire columnist Jimmy Breslin, despite his long record of Catholic bashing?

_____ Yes, it’s a private newspaper and it has the right to do so.

_____ No, we’re talking about a bigot, so the right doesn’t apply.

_____ I don’t know.

Submit your response to rmoore@nydailynews.com

Bill Donohue explains why he devised this survey: On the website of today's *Daily News*, readers were asked whether St. Anthony's High School on Long Island has the right to bar a female student from bringing her ex-girlfriend to the prom. Readers were asked the following: "Should the Catholic school have the right to bar same-sex couples at the prom?"

_____ Yes, it's a private institution and homosexuality goes against church teachings.

_____ No, we're talking about a prom, not marriage, the school shouldn't exclude anyone.

_____ I don't know.

By posing the question in terms of rights—instead of asking whether readers agree with the decision—the *Daily News* is making this issue into a matter of church and state, implying that it is a rebuttal assumption on the part of St. Anthony's that it has the right to determine its own rules. Hope they get my point.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL INDICTS HOLY SEE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responds to Amnesty International's 2011 Annual Report where it said the Holy See "did not sufficiently comply with its international obligations relating to the protection of children":

Amnesty International's 2011 Annual Report lists not a single instance of a human rights violation that took place anywhere

in the world in 2010 under the auspices of the Holy See, yet it still managed to condemn its human rights record. So what's going on?

The Annual Report indicts the Holy See for "child sexual abuse committed by members of the clergy *over the past decades*, and of the enduring failure of the Catholic Church to address these crimes properly, [continues] to emerge in various countries." (My italics.) This is ideology at work, not objective research. Coming up empty with cases of abuse that occurred last year, it decided to adopt a "look-back" strategy, one that it exclusively applied to the Catholic Church: the Annual Report on the other 156 nations details human rights violations that occurred in 2010.

Moreover, it is preposterous to hold the Vatican responsible for the behavior of priests all over the world. Moreover, the vast majority of incidents of homosexual priests who preyed on adolescents occurred between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s, having nothing to do with any alleged culpability on the part of the Holy See in 2010.

Amnesty International also indicts the Church for not mandating that the civil authorities be contacted in cases of sexual abuse. But this is true of virtually every nation, so why single out the Holy See? The fact that Amnesty International condemns canon law for not honoring this mandate suggests that it has now given itself the right to police the religious prerogatives of the Catholic Church.

The Holy See should now issue a report on secular organizations which disrespect marriage and the family, listing Amnesty International's embrace of gay marriage as Exhibit A.

CATHOLIC PROFS OBJECT TO BOEHNER

On Saturday, House Speaker John Boehner will give the commencement address at the Catholic University of America. More than 75 professors from Catholic universities have signed a letter expressing their criticism of the Ohio Republican. Former college professor Bill Donohue addresses this issue today:

The anti-Boehner letter alleges that the House Speaker's "voting record is at variance from one of the Church's most ancient moral teachings," namely, support for the poor; it cites the Magisterium of the Church as its contemporary source. It is delightful to learn that all of these professors are now on record expressing fidelity to the teachings of the Catholic Church. Despite this breaking news, many concerns loom.

The professor cited as playing the lead role in writing the letter is Stephen F. Schneck of Catholic University. After most Catholics revolted against the Democrats last fall for their disastrous economic record, Schneck wrote that the vote "dealt a blow" to the Church's concerns for the poor. His conclusion is curious: under the Obama administration, no segment of the population has been punished more than the poor (the poverty rate climbed to 14.3 percent in 2009, the highest since 1994).

The most oppressed among us are the unborn. Schneck, it should be noted, signed a letter in 2009 praising the nomination of Kathleen Sebelius as the new Secretary of Health and Human Services. She defends the killing of babies who are 80 percent born, was the proud recipient of tens of thousands of dollars from George Tiller, the king of partial-birth abortion, and was openly denounced by the last three archbishops of Kansas City. Moreover, Schneck supported the Obama health care bill over the objections of the bishops. Fidelity anyone?

Rep. John Boehner, on the contrary, is not only pro-life, his support for school vouchers for residents of Washington, D.C. shows his strong commitment to the poor. But he received no support from these “pro poor” professors. The Catholic League is proud of John Boehner, and wants him to know that the carping professors are not representative of Catholic sentiment.

PELOSI NOW BACKS JESUIT—BUT DeFAZIO DOESN'T

Yesterday, Rep. Nancy Pelosi expressed her concerns about voting for Father Patrick Conroy, selected by House Speaker John Boehner to be the new House Chaplain. She cited the priest's association with the Oregon Province of the Society of Jesus, which has been the subject of sex abuse claims. The Catholic League criticized her objections yesterday. Now she says she is satisfied with his nomination. In a new development, Rep. Peter DeFazio is raising questions about Conroy.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Rep. Pelosi is ascribing her change of heart to the responses provided by Father Conroy to questions posed by her office. Pelosi's staff is now saying that this “additional information” accounts for her new position. This reply, however, strains credulity.

Since Father Conroy's bona fides were never the issue, what changed? What could he possibly say, or provide in the way of “additional information,” that would change Pelosi's mind? After all, her reservations about the priest had nothing to do with him, but with his associations.

Rep. Pelosi had an opportunity to condemn the principle upon which she expressed her initial concerns, namely her embrace of “guilt by association,” but she refused to do so. This does not speak well of her.

We noticed that Rep. Peter DeFazio wants to know more about Father Conroy’s knowledge of sex abuse in his religious community. Perhaps DeFazio should first explain to us what he knew about the sexual exploits of his fellow congressmen over the years. After all, there are quite a number of sexual deviants in both parties that DeFazio may have known something about. Now would be a good time for him to come clean. He is in a position to put moral turpitude front-and-center for all elected officials, so let’s see what he does. We will contact his office immediately.

PELOSI READY TO STIFF JESUIT?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responds to a story in *Roll Call* on Rep. Nancy Pelosi’s concerns over the nomination of Rev. Patrick Conroy as the new House Chaplain:

Rev. Patrick Conroy was selected by House Speaker John Boehner to be the new House Chaplain, and within no time the Jesuit priest won the plaudits of many Catholics, including Rep. Nancy Pelosi. But now Pelosi is having second thoughts, citing Conroy’s association with the Oregon Province of the Society of Jesus. Why? Because of claims of sexual abuse made against these Jesuits. Were there accusations made against Father Conroy? No. Are the accusations recent? No, they extend back decades. Did Father Conroy have any role to play? Yes—he was a whistleblower who reported at least one case of an abusive priest.

It would be easy to criticize Rep. Pelosi for questioning Father Conroy’s nomination on the basis of “guilt by

association." That criticism is justly deserved. But there is more. When the San Francisco Board of Supervisors viciously condemned the Vatican for its position on gay adoptions, Pelosi was silent. She is the same person who has never once criticized homosexuals in her district who go naked in the streets, sell Catholic symbols as sex toys, mock Jesus, ridicule nuns and disrespect the Eucharist. All of this has been brought to her attention by me and by reporters. To be specific, I am talking about the events of the Folsom Street Fair, the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence and others. In other words, it's a little too late for Pelosi the Puritan to now present herself.

A decade ago, the Catholic League got into a major fight with Republican Catholics and evangelicals who sought to sunder the nomination of Father Daniel Coughlin as the first Catholic House Chaplain. We won, and they acted disgracefully. Now Father Conroy is in the hot seat, this time because a prominent liberal Democrat is raising issues. But Conroy is not the issue—Pelosi is. She, too, is a disgrace.