

# POPE NEVER “JOINED” HITLER YOUTH



Bill Donohue comments on scurrilous media coverage of the pope:

The following persons and media outlets erroneously said that Pope Benedict XVI “joined” the Hitler Youth, without ever noting that it was compulsory:

## ***U.S.***

AP Planner; John Patrick Shanley, *New York Times* blog; Huffington Post; *Philadelphia Daily News*; Regional News Network (it said his “defenders” argue he was drafted, implying that it is a rebuttable presumption); *Sun-Sentinel*; thepeoplesvoice.org; timminspress.com; *Washington Post*.

## ***Canada***

*The Globe and Mail*

## ***England***

BBC; *The Guardian*; *The Independent*; *Metro*; politics.co.uk

## ***Ireland***

*Daily Mirror*; *Irish Independent*

Here are the facts. Like all teenage boys in Nazi Germany, Joseph Ratzinger was forced to join the Hitler Youth. Unlike many others, he did not attend meetings and deserted when he was drafted into the German army. His refusal to attend meetings brought economic hardship to his family—it meant no discounts for school tuition. German left-wing intellectuals

like Günter Grass and Jürgen Habermas also were conscripted into the Hitler Youth, yet no one ever accused them of voluntarily joining.

Rabbi David Rosen, director of interreligious affairs for the American Jewish Committee, said it is “rubbish” to suggest that the pope willfully joined the Hitler Youth. Following a complaint by us, even Bill Maher apologized in 2008 for making this pernicious accusation. In short, it is despicable for these journalists to smear the pope as a Nazi sympathizer.

---

## HITCHENS IS BACK FROM THE DEAD



Bill Donohue takes note of the resurrection of Christopher Hitchens:

Hitchens has been brought back from the dead by Slate and Andrew Sullivan, but it won't do them any good. Yesterday, they republished a hit piece by the atheist from 2010 that was vintage Hitchens: the man was a great polemicist but a third-class scholar. Facts never mattered to him.

Hitchens said the scandal “has only just begun.” Wrong. It began in the mid-60s and ended in the mid-80s. Current reports are almost all about old cases.

Hitchens said Munich Archbishop Joseph Ratzinger (the pope) transferred an offending cleric to another parish. Wrong.

Ratzinger's deputy placed the priest in a new parish after he received therapy (the tonic loved by those pushing rehabilitation), and even the *New York Times* admitted there was no evidence that Ratzinger knew about it. By the way, there were 1,717 priests serving under him at the time.

Hitchens said Ratzinger wrote a 2001 letter to the bishops telling them it was a crime to report sexual abuse. Wrong. The letter dealt with desecrating the Eucharist, and the sexual solicitation by a priest in the confessional (the letter cited a 1962 document detailing harsh sanctions).

Hitchens said Ratzinger was obstructing justice when he crafted new norms on sexual abuse in 2001. Wrong. He actually added new sanctions and extended the statute of limitations for such offenses.

Hitchens says Ratzinger ignored accusations against Father Marcial Maciel. Wrong. It was Benedict who got him removed from ministry (he was too infirm to put on trial) and put his religious order in receivership.

In short, Hitchens' hatred of Catholicism allowed him to swing wildly. That he should be resurrected by Slate and Andrew Sullivan makes them all look incompetent, as well as vicious.

---

## POPE'S LEGACY IS SECURE



Bill Donohue offers seven good reasons why the pope's legacy is secure:

- Religion for Pope Benedict XVI is as much a public issue as it is a private one. In 2008, he warned American bishops against "the subtle influence of secularism," holding that "any tendency to treat religion as a private matter must be resisted."
- The pope made it clear that religious freedom was not only a God-given right, it was "the path to peace."
- He knew religion could be abused, leading even to violence. His much misunderstood 2006 Regensburg University lecture was really about the uncoupling of religion from reason (reason not united to faith also leads to violence).
- The pope reached out to dissidents on the right and the left, seeking to bring them to communion. Not all his efforts succeeded, but his attempts were noble.
- No one did more to successfully address the problem of priestly sexual abuse than Joseph Ratzinger. Just weeks before he was chosen to be the new pope, he spoke bluntly about this issue: "How much filth there is in the Church, and even among those who, in the priesthood, ought to belong entirely to Him!"
- Addressing those who still blame Jews for the death of Christ, the pope settled the issue with authority by pointing out that *no one* should be blamed since, as he argued, the crucifixion was necessary for God's plan of universal redemption.
- The pope's many references to what he called "the dictatorship of relativism" were a constant reminder that one of the greatest threats to freedom today is the abandonment of the search for truth.

Pope Benedict XVI's willingness to step aside comes as a surprise this Monday morning. What is not surprising is his humility. Indeed, it is one of his most defining

characteristics, one that separates him from today's ego-centric public figures.

---

# NEW JERSEY PAPERS TARGET PRIEST

*The Star-Ledger*

*The Record*  
North Jersey's Trusted Source

Bill Donohue comments on editorials in the Newark *Star-Ledger* and *The Record* (Bergen County) that appeared this week; both concern the appointment by Newark Archbishop John J. Myers

of Rev. Michael Fugee as co-director of the Office of Continuing Education and Ongoing Formation of Priests (a post he assumed last October):

Just this week it was reported that an ex-priest who allegedly admitted having a sexual relationship with a minor was picked up by the Los Angeles Unified School District for more than a decade. The school district was told many times that Joseph Pina had a record of sexual abuse, but they did nothing about it. No one in journalism has said a thing about it, nor will they. But if a priest was once accused, even though later found not guilty, he should still be punished.

In 2001, Father Fugee was charged with groping a teenager while wrestling. He initially said he touched the boy's crotch, but later recanted. He was initially found guilty, but later had the verdict thrown out by an appellate panel of judges. He was subsequently investigated by the archdiocesan review board and was also cleared of wrongdoing. Over the past 12 years, there have been no allegations against him.

None of this matters to the *Star-Ledger* which says that Father Fugee's promotions "insult all victims of clergy abuse." Similarly, *The Record* says the priest "should not be in active ministry." What is even more appalling is for these outsiders to instruct Archbishop Myers on how to interpret the meaning of a charter drawn up by the bishops to handle these matters.

Both newspapers are a disgrace. If it had been anyone other than a priest who was ultimately cleared of all charges, they would be the first to demand that he be treated as innocent. But because he was once accused—even though found not guilty—they want to treat him like a convicted criminal. Their vindictiveness is palpable, their anti-Catholic bias is obscene, and their contempt for civil liberties is pernicious.

---

## BISHOPS RESPOND TO NEW HHS RULES



Bill Donohue comments on the response by the bishops to the revised Health and Human Services (HHS) rules that were released last Friday:

Today's statement by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), and the remarks made by its president, Cardinal Timothy Dolan, make plain their interest in pursuing the on-going conversation with Obama administration officials on the HHS mandate. Their goal, as expressed by Cardinal Dolan, is to reach "an acceptable solution" to this issue.

The Catholic hierarchy wants to broaden the understanding of

what constitutes a religious ministry. Cardinal Dolan also addressed funding for abortion-inducing drugs, sterilization, and contraception, saying “there remains the possibility that ministries may yet be forced to fund and facilitate such morally illicit activities.” The third issue of concern is the right of those who own a business in the private-sector not to fund such activities.

In my statement of February 1, I made it clear that “many aspects of the new [HHS] proposal need to be examined before a final conclusion can be rendered.” Because I did not slam the Obama administration, some took my words to mean that I was celebrating the new rules. If that is what I meant, I would have said so. They also objected to my comment that we welcome “the goodwill by the Obama administration.” I stand by that remark, noting that in the first sentence of today’s statement by the USCCB, the bishops credit the new rules with “some improvement by the Administration but falls short of addressing the bishops’ concerns.”

There are plenty of players on both sides of this issue. Make no mistake about it, the interest of the Catholic League is to advance the interests of the Catholic community; it is ably led by Cardinal Dolan and his brother bishops. We are not here to exploit this issue for fundraising purposes, or to help the Republican Party. And while some may prefer to settle this matter in court, settling it out of court is hardly unsatisfactory. What matters is that the right results be achieved.

---

# NEW YORK TIMES GETS MALICIOUS



Bill Donohue comments on an op-ed piece in today's *New York Times*:

The decision to publish the op-ed by Daniel A. Olivas was malicious. Here's why.

Olivas says he once knew a Latino priest in southern California who was a molester (the priest, who is dead, was suspended from ministry in the 1990s). Okay, I got it: Olivas is angry. Every time I read about another homosexual priest who molested someone (less than 5 percent of abusive priests were pedophiles), I get angry, too. But what was the purpose of publishing this article? And why the obscene drawing of a priest whose head resembles a creature from Hell? [To see it click [here](#).]

There is almost no sexual abuse being committed by priests in the U.S. today. When reports surface, in almost every instance we are hearing about old cases. But now, given the latest round of documents gathered by the authorities involving the Archdiocese of Los Angeles under Cardinal Roger Mahony, we are being treated to more stories.

The Orthodox Jewish community in Brooklyn is ablaze with stories of rabbis who rape young people. Even more pernicious is the way those who cooperate with the authorities are being treated. Indeed, the punitive actions taken against innocent persons are shocking—there is no analogue in the Catholic community.

So what has the *New York Times* said about all of this? *In the past year*, the *Times* ran 11 news stories and one editorial on



sexual abuse by Orthodox Jewish rabbis; there were no op-ed articles. *In the past two weeks*, the *Times* has run 7 news stories, one editorial and three op-eds on the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Most of the cases in the Jewish community involve current or recent instances of abuse; none of the cases in Los Angeles do. Moreover, there has never been a depiction of a rabbi with his head resembling a creature from Hell.

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

---

## BOY SCOUTS AUTONOMY IS THE ISSUE



Bill Donohue comments on the expected decision today by the Boy Scouts of America to rescind its ban on homosexuals:

The issue of allowing homosexuals to join the Boy Scouts is second only to the most important issue: the autonomy of the organization to craft its own strictures absent outside pressure. Unfortunately, outside pressure is what forced the need for a vote.

Edmund Burke called them "the little platoons." Tocqueville called them "voluntary associations." Political scientists speak of "civil society." Sociologists refer to them as "mediating institutions." They all mean the same thing: the critical role played by social institutions that intervene between the state and the individual; it is in these nooks and

crannies that freedom is born.

Regrettably, the intermediate strata are today in jeopardy, the worst culprit being the federal government. Indeed, even on this issue, the president of the United States has unwisely decided to interject himself. And there is also the role of well-funded gay groups seeking to pressure the board members of the Boy Scouts. None of this is acceptable.

The Boy Scouts have already won the constitutional issue. Whether they now want to change their rules is their business. It is not our business. Which is why the Catholic League takes no stand on this matter.

---

## ANDREW SULLIVAN SHOULD NOT THROW STONES



Bill Donohue comments on recent blogs by Andrew Sullivan:

Yesterday, Andrew Sullivan said Pope Benedict XVI “enabled and abetted the rape of children.” Today, with regard to the revelations of old cases of priestly sexual abuse in Los Angeles, he asks, “How much did the Pope know? And who did he allow to rape and rape again.”

Sullivan may not know anything about rape, but he sure knows about prostitution and lethal sex acts. In 2001, he was outed for selling his body on the Internet (click [here](#)). Hiding

under the name RawMuscleGlutes, Sullivan posted his interest in having sex with men *who did not wear condoms*. That's right, his preference was to practice oral and anal sex with "bare back" men (guys who hate "safe sex"). It was ever so kind of him to disclose that he was HIV-positive.

Sullivan is a sexual acrobat who loves to practice "diversity." Consider that he posted two pictures of himself on the Internet that showed only his torso, saying he wanted "bi-scenes, one-on-ones, three-ways, groups, parties, orgies and gang bangs." Whew! But those who say he is not discerning are wrong: he explicitly ruled out "fats and fems." Good choice. We know all this because some of his gay partners recognized Mr. Headless when the pictures of his torso surfaced (how these fellows are able to do this is positively amazing).

To be sure, Mr. Headless will no doubt protest that his sick behavior was "consensual"—the favorite moral cop-out invoked by every sexual deviant who has ever walked the face of the earth. What we need to know is whether he ever had sex with an unsuspecting man, i.e., with some poor soul who had no idea that Mr. Headless was HIV-positive. And we need to know it now, before he takes another obscene shot at the pope.

---

**FRANK BRUNI IS THE REAL  
HYPOCRITE**



Bill Donohue comments on today's article (click [here](#)) by Frank Bruni in the *New York Times*:

Last week, Frank Bruni told us he really doesn't hate priests, he just hates the Catholic Church and its "appointed caretakers" (a.k.a. the bishops). Today the angry ex-Catholic homosexual is ripping about a lot of things Catholic, one of which was a boneheaded decision by lawyers for a Colorado Catholic hospital who invoked state law to shield the facility from damages: they argued that because a fetus is not defined as a person, the facility could not be sued in a "wrongful death" suit involving unborn children. The Colorado bishops obviously disagreed with these damage-control attorneys, branding their decision "morally wrong." End of story? Not for Bruni. He sees hypocrisy.

Just as he did last week, Bruni seizes on documents indicating that former Los Angeles Archbishop Roger Mahony failed to report cases of suspected sexual abuse. But Bruni's anger is selectively employed against the Catholic Church. For example, at the end of last year when it was reported that Mark Thompson was leaving the top post at the BBC to become the new president of the *New York Times* Company, it was revealed that he pleaded innocent to knowing *anything* about BBC icon and child rapist Jimmy Savile. This despite clear and convincing evidence that he lied. And what did Bruni say? Nothing. Nor did he question the finding that Thompson was innocent, even though it was the result of a BBC internal investigation. Yet he wants the government to go after Mahony, and would mock the very idea of an internal probe.

Bruni is a deeply conflicted man. In 1997 he wrote an article

about the sexual abuse of minors that was *amazingly sympathetic to the abusers* (click [here](#)). He quotes “experts” who say we need to get away from “ironclad roles of villain and victim,” and who say the victim should be told “that somebody cared about you and loved you but *didn’t do it in the right way*” (my italics). Not only is the compassion twisted, it shows that the real hypocrite is Frank Bruni.

Contact Bruni: [bruni@nytimes.com](mailto:bruni@nytimes.com)

---

## ALEX GIBNEY LIBELS THE POPE



HB0 will air Alex Gibney’s movie, “Mea Maxima Culpa,” tonight. Bill Donohue accuses him of libel:

It’s too bad Pope Benedict XVI doesn’t sue Alex Gibney for libel. In an interview posted today on The Daily Beast, he calls the pope “a criminal.” He is accusing Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (now the pope) of covering up the deeds of Father Lawrence Murphy, a priest who molested deaf boys in Milwaukee in the 1950s. Indeed, today’s *New York Times* advertises the HB0 show by saying there was a “cover-up from rural America to the Vatican.”

The charge that Ratzinger was involved in a cover up is libelous. The fact of the matter is that no one contacted the civil authorities about Murphy until the mid-1970s (following a probe, the case was dropped), and it wasn’t until 1996 that the Vatican was contacted. Instead of dropping an investigation—the statute of limitations had long expired—the

Vatican ordered a trial. Not only was Cardinal Ratzinger not at the trial, his name was never even mentioned. We know this because of the presiding judge's testimony. Moreover, it wasn't until 2001 that Pope John Paul II asked Cardinal Ratzinger to police these matters, and when he did, he moved expeditiously and fairly. An honest rendering of these events would conclude that *no one at the Vatican* has ever taken these cases with greater seriousness than Joseph Ratzinger.

Gibney says he was inspired to do the film after reading an article by Laurie Goodstein in the *New York Times*. That being the case, Gibney should tell us where in Goodstein's reporting she said that "Vatican delegates" (whatever that means) were aware of Murphy's abuse "as early as 1958." That's what the film says, and it is pure bunk.

The mark of a Catholic hater is to take dirty laundry and then add to it by offering a conspiratorial account. That's what Gibney has done.

Contact Gibney: [pag@jigsawprods.com](mailto:pag@jigsawprods.com)