

# ART GALLERY LIES ABOUT DONOHUE



Yesterday evening, Bill Donohue held a press conference protesting the Andres Serrano “Piss Christ” display at the Edward Tyler Nahem gallery; the gallery is located on the second floor of a building at 37 W. 57th Street in New York City. He now responds to what the gallery is telling the media:

The gallery is saying that (a) the police showed up after they were summoned (b) 30 or so protesters barged into the building, and (c) Serrano confronted me to discuss the controversy but I balked. *All of it is a lie.*

There were no police—none (to prove me wrong, the gallery should release the names of those whom they say were there). No one barged into the building: As I entered the lobby, there were supporters and members of the media behind me, but no one bullied their way in. Serrano and I never met. We have all of this on video, so it is not a debatable issue.

Gallery officials intentionally denied me the right to enter because I am a Catholic activist whose criticisms of the display they reject. And now they are fabricating a story out of whole cloth about what occurred.

I would also like to correct a Huffington Post story: the Serrano supporters who dressed as nuns came after we left—they were not at the press conference, nor were they there when I was denied entry. No wonder the story is inaccurate. We were not there for “about 20 minutes”; rather, the press conference lasted for 35 minutes, followed by the confrontation in the lobby. A crowd of 40-50 people turned out, mostly supporters

of ours. Had a reporter from the Huffington Post contacted our office about what happened last night, these errors could have been avoided.

I will discuss the gallery's decision to stop me from seeing the exhibit, along with their lies, tonight with Lou Dobbs (Fox Business Network); the scheduled airtime is approximately 7:30 p.m. ET.

---

## DONOHUE BARRED FROM EXHIBIT



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Last evening, I held a press conference outside the Edward Tyler Nahem gallery in New York City protesting the Andres Serrano exhibit featuring "Piss Christ." After talking to the media, I attempted to enter the gallery; it is on the second floor of a building at 37 W. 57th Street.

When I entered the lobby, I was stopped by a man who works for the building. He asked for ID and requested that I sign in. I said okay, and then asked if I could go to the gallery. He said the gallery and the building are two different entities, and that I had to ask the men from the gallery; they were right in front of me in the lobby. I then asked them if I could enter, and they said no, without explanation. At that point I turned to the crowd behind me explaining that my First Amendment rights were being censored by the same people who were proudly displaying Serrano's crucifix in a jar of urine.

No one else was barred from entering the gallery. Just me. We have all of this on tape, and the quality of both the audio and the video are excellent. Stay tuned.

---

## ANYONE FOR “SHOCK ART”?



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

In the Arts section of today's *New York Times*, there is a discussion about the shock value of art. Roberta Smith, co-chief art critic for the *Times*, cites the “Holy Virgin Mary” portrait that was displayed at the Brooklyn Museum of Art in 1999 as one that offended “the tender sensibilities” of some people. She also says that the art, which she notes featured elephant dung on Our Blessed Mother, was “agitated by the Catholic League, Mayor Giuliani and others who never laid eyes on it.”

Would homosexuals be guilty of allowing their “tender sensibilities” to skew their thinking if they exploded in anger over an artistic display depicting them as slave masters sodomizing African Americans? Would Jews be guilty of allowing their “tender sensibilities” to cloud their thinking if they objected to art portraying them as Nazi sympathizers?

Muslim sensibilities are not only quite tender, they are respected by the *New York Times*. That is why the *Times* refuses to show a still from the recent anti-Islam movie. It also explains why the *Times* refuses to reprint the Danish cartoons.

Perversely, in a column about these cartoons in 2006, the *Times* decided not to insult Muslims, but it did decide to reprint the dung-on-the-Virgin Mary “art.” Indeed, it did so again today!

Smith is wrong on the facts. I did see the exhibit, but what I saw was not exactly what she describes: she forgot to mention the pictures of vaginas and anuses that were shown alongside the excrement on the Virgin Mary.

Tonight, at 5:30 p.m., I will hold a press conference outside the gallery which is hosting “Piss Christ” at 37 W. 57th Street: my “tender sensibilities” are agitating me once again.

---

## BILL DONOHUE REPLIES TO “PISS CHRIST”



To see the video of Bill Donohue replying to Andres Serrano’s “Piss Christ,” click [here](#). The Serrano “art” will be featured at the Edward Tyler Nahem gallery from September 27 to October 26.

The Catholic League will hold a press conference on September 27 outside the Nahem gallery at 37 W. 57th Street, New York City at 5:30 p.m., one-half hour before the exhibit opens.

---

# NAKED GAY SADISTS HIT THE STREETS



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Last Sunday, homosexuals paraded around naked in the streets of San Francisco at the annual Folsom Street Fair. There were no arrests. They did more than walk the streets nude—they beat each other with whips. The leather/fetish homosexuals led each other around like dogs with metal collars; they set up booths where visitors could get flogged; they sold hard-core pornography; they promoted BDSM (bondage, domination, sadism and masochism); they mutilated their bodies with metal spikes. And after promoting lethal sex acts—the kind that causes AIDS—they raised money for AIDS.

As always, the homosexuals mocked the Catholic clergy and religious. They dressed as cardinals, bishops, and nuns. There was even a group that disparaged the Jesuits, the “Society of Janus”; their specialty is BDSM. The anti-Catholic aspects of this grand exhibition of moral destitution are not hard to understand: the participants are in a constant state of rebellion against truth. It must also be said that they never mock any of the Protestant mainline denominations—what’s there to rebel against?

This is Nancy Pelosi’s district. It would have been great if the media had covered this event and then asked her to respond. They refused to do so.

In the Diocese of Kansas City-St. Joseph, it is considered a “boundary violation” for adults to sit too close to a child. But in San Francisco, the only “boundary violation” that counts is sitting naked at Friendly’s without a towel beneath one’s behind; it’s called the “skid mark law.” I’m not making this up [click [here](#)].

It has been evident for some time that this country suffers from an acute case of cultural schizophrenia: we endorse libertine norms and values while decrying their effects. It’s time we grew up.

---

# **“PISS CHRIST” PRESS CONFERENCE**

Who: Catholic League Staff

When: Thursday, September 27, 5:30 p.m.

Where: Outside Edward Tyler Nahem Gallery, 37 W. 57th St., New York City

Why: To protest Andres Serrano Exhibit featuring “Piss Christ”

---

## **“PISS CHRIST” COMING TO NYC**



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

On September 27, the Edward Tyler Nahem gallery in mid-town Manhattan will host an exhibit, "Body and Spirit: Andres Serrano 1987-2012," that features Serrano's "Piss Christ" piece; it shows a crucifix submerged in a jar of his own urine. The exhibit ends October 26.

Serrano has said that "Piss Christ" was "meant to question the whole notion of what is acceptable and unacceptable." There is not much to question: decent people know it is unacceptable. But in elite cultural circles, anti-Christian art is not only acceptable, it is laudatory. Just don't offend Muslims. To wit: this week a disrespectful French cartoon of Muhammad was not shown on any of the network or cable TV news shows.

In 2006, when the Danish cartoons that angered Muslims appeared, not only were they not shown on the networks or cable, newspapers all across the nation refused to do so. In fact, the leading newspapers echoed the position of the *New York Times*: it said it was wrong to publish "gratuitous assaults on religious grounds." Yet this same newspaper, in *the same article* about the Danish cartoons, reproduced the "dung on the Virgin Mary" artwork that was shown at the Brooklyn Museum of Art's "Sensation" exhibition in 1999! To show how acceptable anti-Christian art is, three days after "Sensation" opened, Christie's sponsored a "Piss Christ" print exhibit.

"Piss Christ," which dates back to the late 1980s, wouldn't matter as much to Christians in 2012 if it weren't for the supine statements offered by the Obama administration in the wake of an anti-Islamic video. Never before have Americans learned how deeply offended our elites are by anti-religious



fare. If only we could believe them. When have they ever condemned anti-Christian movies or art?

I will be there on Thursday with a contingent from the Catholic League. Details to follow next week.

---

## NEW YORK TIMES' SELECTIVE OUTRAGE



Bill Donohue comments on today's editorial in the *New York Times* taking a New York City Catholic priest to task:

A priest puts a letter written by six former U.S. ambassadors to the Vatican in a church bulletin supporting Romney and the alarms go off. But it was not the parishioners who sounded the alarm: it was a coalition of George Soros-funded groups and the *New York Times*. The Soros-funded groups (they are behind a petition drive) are Catholics United, Faith in Public Life, and Faithful America. Here are a few local examples of real church and state violations that the *Times* showed no interest in addressing:

- In 2000, Al Gore was endorsed by Rev. Floyd Flake in his church
- In 2000, Rick Lazio and Hillary Clinton campaigned in synagogues in the Hamptons
- In 2000, the Black Ministers Council of NJ endorsed John



Corzine

- In 2010, Rev. Clinton M. Miller asked his Baptist congregation to vote for Andrew Cuomo for governor (this was reported in the *Times* though there was no editorial)

In African American neighborhoods, both the African Methodist Episcopal (AME) churches, as well as Baptist ones, have been getting away with political endorsements for years. Indeed, in 1988 Rev. Jesse Jackson took up collections in Chicago churches. No alarms went off.

In April, President Obama called on African Americans to go “to your faith community” and organize “congregation captains” on his behalf. No alarms went off. In June, Michelle Obama told a Nashville AME congregation that there is “no better place” to talk about political issues than in church. No alarms went off.

So why did the alarms go off now? Because a Catholic priest is involved? Also, why can’t white liberals call out black ministers for blatant and consistent violations? *Two* expressions of prejudice are operative.

Contact NYT editorial page editor Andrew Rosenthal:  
[andy@nytimes.com](mailto:andy@nytimes.com)

---

## BOGUS PETITION DRIVE



Bill Donohue comments on a petition drive against a New York City Catholic priest accused of promoting Mitt Romney for president:

Two weeks ago, in the weekly bulletin of an Upper East side Catholic church, there was a letter by six former U.S. ambassadors to the Vatican stating their support for Romney. The priest responsible for including the letter is now the subject of a petition asking New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan to do something about it.

The petition drive is a staged event. Indeed, it is the product of two left-wing groups that are wholly unconnected to the parish: Catholics United and Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

Catholics United is a left-wing group funded by atheist billionaire George Soros; it has virtually no support in the Catholic community. A rabid ally of the urban anarchist coalition, "Occupy Wall Street," it continually misrepresents Catholic teachings while working against the religious liberty rights of Catholics. Americans United was founded in the 1940s as an expressly anti-Catholic organization (it was known as Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State), and was responsible for fomenting hatred against Catholics at the time. It has since worked relentlessly to diminish religious liberty.

Assisting them in this effort is Jim Dwyer of the *New York Times*. He wants everyone to know that the priest in question allegedly ran afoul of IRS strictures on politics and religion (Americans United filed a complaint). Dwyer quotes the priest as saying in the bulletin, "I am aware that I and no church

authority may endorse candidates for political office.” Then Dwyer writes, “You could practically see him winking.”

I have news for Dwyer: when black ministers, all over the U.S., start campaigning from the pulpit for Obama next month, there will be no winking—just smiles. They will smile knowing that no white liberal activist group or journalist will start a petition drive, contact the IRS or write a snotty piece about them.

---

## INVENTING JESUS' WIFE



Bill Donohue comments on the contention by Harvard professor Karen King that Jesus once remarked, “My wife”:

The evidence that Jesus had a wife can be ascertained by using a magnifying glass to read a 3.8 x 7.6 centimeter inscription made on a scrap of papyrus. We know nothing about when the scrap was discovered. We know nothing about where it was discovered. We know nothing about how it was discovered. We know nothing about the context in which the words were written. And we know nothing about the owner.

What we do know is that two of the three scholars who first examined the scrap questioned its authenticity; they are now unsure whether it is real or a fraud. The third scholar went right to the heart of the matter questioning its grammar, translation and interpretation. Not much left after that.

The reigning dogma in the academy is that words can have multiple meanings. For King, however, the words, "My wife," are so clear that they "can mean nothing else." Yet according to some biblical scholars, "sister-wives," as they are called, were not uncommon in the early centuries: these were women who performed domestic duties but did not have sexual relations. And since we know nothing of the context in which the words were allegedly said, King's confidence is unwarranted.

King is known for her fertile imagination. For example, she previously claimed that Mary Magdalene was one of the apostles. Even better, in the book in which she made this extraordinary claim, she "rejects his [Jesus'] suffering and death as the path to eternal life." Not much left after that.

In the 1990s, King sent her German mentor a book she wrote on feminine images in the gospels. She later learned that he "had utterly no interest" in it and quickly pawned it off on his wife, unread.

So after first inventing an apostle for Jesus—who the *divinity* professor says is not the Savior—King has now invented a wife for him. Her generosity, if not her scholarship, is beyond dispute.