

CONFUSION OVER SYNOD REPORT MOUNTS

Bill Donohue comments on growing confusion over the Synod of Bishops Interim Report:



Catholics from all walks of life have contacted us seeking clarity over the proceedings of the Synod of Bishops. Here are some key points.

- Media coverage has focused heavily on remarks made about homosexuals, though in the daily Vatican briefings that preceded the release of the report on Monday there was almost no mention of gays. Indeed, there was only one major speech on this subject out of a total of 265.
- The interim report was not approved by the synod or the pope.
- Almost none of the bishops were even asked to approve the report.
- The report was leaked to the media behind the back of the bishops.
- Three of the 191 synod fathers, or 1.6 percent of the entire body, were mostly responsible for the report. Six new members have since been added to prepare the final report.
- As soon as the report was leaked, it was criticized by 41 bishops.
- Criticisms focused on the failure to support traditional Church teachings, the heightened set of false

expectations, and the moral confusion the interim report has engendered.

- On October 16, the ten working groups of bishops will present their amendments to the report.
- The final report of this synod will be issued October 18.
- That report will be the basis of discussion over the next year when the synod meets again in October 2015.
- Following next year's meeting, the pope will present his thoughts on the completed document.

Reality Check: No matter what happens, most Catholics who long ago decided to bolt are not sitting on deck waiting to suit up again. It is nonetheless amusing to witness how many angry Rosie O'Donnell Catholics are acting out these days.

IS “BLUE BLOODS” COMMITTING SUICIDE?



Bill Donohue comments on the October 10 episode of “Blue Bloods”; it stars Tom Selleck as police commissioner Frank Reagan:

We’ve been impressed with the underlying positive message of “Blue Bloods” over the years, as well as its welcome treatment of Catholicism. But after last Friday’s show, we’re now wondering whether CBS is turning on its audience. We’ve been bombarded with complaints following the last episode.

Police Commissioner Reagan cannot defend the Church's teachings on homosexuality, so when Catholicism is branded an "anti-gay faith," he replies, "Well, I do believe the Church is a little behind the times on this." Indeed, he goes so far as to say, "I do believe the Church is backwards on this. And of all the stands to hold onto. In the midst of the scandals of the past decade." Viewers also meet a conflicted Cardinal Brennan, and a proud lesbian, Sister Mary.

The Bible is "anti-gay." That is the logical conclusion that unfolds in this episode. The show also misrepresents the sexual abuse scandal: almost all the molesting priests were practicing homosexuals. Moreover, the scandal ended in the mid-1980s, thus showing how far behind the times the show's writers are. As for the wavering cardinal and the wayward nun—it is what we would expect from writers who have decided to pivot.

Is CBS committing suicide? The audience for "Blue Bloods" has been carefully cultivated, so the price tag for alienating its base is high. Time will tell.

Contact Amy Miller at CBS: amy.miller@cbs.com

SYNOD INTERIM REPORT STIRS CONTROVERSY



Bill Donohue comments on the interim report by the Synod of Bishops:

This is an interim report, and even when it is completed next week, it will not be definitive. That will not happen until next year when the synod meets. Still, this report has elicited much controversy, with more to come.

The midterm report tries to walk a delicate line between embracing the Church's traditional teachings on marriage while at the same time extending a welcoming hand to those in irregular relationships.

For example, it speaks of "the value and consistency of natural marriage," maintaining that "unions between people of the same sex cannot be considered on the same footing as matrimony between man and woman." This affirms the traditional understanding of marriage and leaves no wiggle room for change.

On other hand, it says "Homosexuals have gifts and qualities to offer to the Christian community," and that the Church needs to recognize "the positive reality of civil weddings and...cohabitation." It is not clear what "gifts" homosexuals, or heterosexuals for that matter, bring, and to whom. The data on civil unions are scarce, but not so for cohabitation: in most instances, the data show that couples that cohabit before marriage have a higher divorce rate than those who do not. So we need to know why "shacking up" may be a plus.

The vector of change indicates a more pastoral stance toward

those involved in non-traditional partnerships without substantively changing the Church's commitment to marriage as the union between a man and a woman. How this will play out is uncertain. What is lacking in the interim report is clarity; this is the key source of the controversy.

It should be noted that the Catholic League exists to defend the right of the Church's voice to be heard. Whatever the teaching body of the Church decides, the Magisterium (the pope in communion with the bishops), is what we defend.

APOLOGISTS FOR MUSLIM VIOLENCE



Bill Donohue comments on apologists for Muslim violence:

In the wake of an enfeebled attempt by Ben Affleck, Rosie O'Donnell, and Whoopi Goldberg—all Catholic bashers—rising to the defense of Muslims accused of barbarism, we now have the spectacle of Nicholas Kristof, a relentless Catholic critic, saying in the *New York Times* that Muslims had nothing to do with any bloodbaths in the 20th century.

During and after World War I, Muslims murdered 1.5 million Christian Armenians out of a total population of 2 million. In 1971, 2.5 million Hindus were murdered by Muslims in E. Pakistan. Don't these 4 million innocent men, women, and

children count, Mr. Kristof?

These two genocides, along with the genocides committed by atheist regimes in Hitler's Germany, Stalin's Soviet Union, Mao's China, and Pol Pot's Cambodia, are far and away the most violent demonstrations of purist ideologies in the 20th century. Not to acknowledge this is criminal.

These apologists have no problem insulting, mocking, deriding, and bashing Catholic priests because a tiny minority were molesters: one out of 100,000 priests in the last half century (a total of 149) accounted for over a quarter of all alleged clergy abuse. Yet when large swaths of Muslims—all over the world—justify murdering Christians, Jews, converts, and *women* adulterers, these same Catholic haters rush to defend the blind followers of Muhammad. And while we properly condemn Holocaust deniers, we still tolerate 9/11 deniers, a disproportionate segment of whom are Muslims.

Affleck, O'Donnell, and Goldberg are lightweights who know nothing of what they speak, but Kristof knows better. Which is why his column, "The Diversity of Islam," is all the more despicable. Sadly, when it comes to endorsing sharia law, which is a religious expression of totalitarianism, there is more that unites Muslims than separates them.

Contact Kristof: kristof@nytimes.com

ANAL SEX THRILLS "MINDY"

Last night's episode of "The Mindy Project," a Fox show, opened with an implied sex scene involving Dr. Mindy Lahiri (played by Mindy Kaling) and Danny Castellano (played by Chris Messina); it was titled, "I Slipped!" The room is dark and there is moaning. Here is how the script unfurls:



Mindy: "Oh my God, Danny, this is heaven. Wait! Danny, Danny, that doesn't go there!"

Danny: "I slipped!"

After the title sequence, the two characters are shown in an office arguing about the sexual encounter from the night before. Mindy is upset with what Danny did. Danny insists it was a mistake. It is implied that Danny attempted anal sex.

Mindy: "Okay, so you're innocent? You had no intent?"

Danny: "Of course no intent. I'm Catholic. Even if I think about that..."

Mindy: "They promote you to Cardinal?"

Danny: "Hey! Hey! That is all over. It's over. Pope Frank is on the case."

Danny: "Can we please just go talk about this in your office, please?"

Mindy: "I don't know, Danny, because my office only has one entrance and I don't know if that's enough for you anymore."

Bill Donohue offers his thoughts on this episode:

Binge drinking, like anal sex, is potentially lethal, but Hollywood only has an interest in promoting the latter. That's

because of the large number of homosexual writers who work there. Catholics would appreciate it, however, if they would keep their dark secrets in the closet, where they belong.

Contact Tracey Raftery, PR director: Tracey.Raftery@fox.com

TREATING FR. GROESCHEL FAIRLY



Bill Donohue comments on the death of Fr. Benedict Groeschel:

Fr. Groeschel was one of the most courageous and honorable priests I ever met. His passing is a great loss.

His death has not occasioned the plaudits he deserves. No doubt it has much to do with his much misunderstood statements from 2012 where he commented on males aged 14, 16 or 18 who might conceivably take sexual advantage of a priest. His critics saw this as a defense of the abusive priest. Nonsense. He clearly *hypothesized* that this could happen to a priest who was having a “*nervous breakdown*.” In this same interview, he explicitly said that priests who are sexual abusers “have to leave.” Moreover, for decades he put his Columbia Ph.D. in psychology to good use working with troubled seminarians and priests in the New York Archdiocese; this is not the kind of thing apologists are wont to do.

If we are looking for real apologists, we don't have to look too far. Last year atheist superstar Richard Dawkins defended what he called the "mild pedophilia" of a teacher who "pulled me on his knee [at a boarding school] and put his hand inside my shorts." He added, "I don't think he did any of us lasting harm." Two years earlier at a B4U-ACT conference, mental health experts said such things as "Assuming children are unable to consent lends itself to criminalization and stigmatization." Not surprisingly does B4U-ACT talk incessantly about "minor-attracted" adults.

Then there is Irish author Colm Toibin who looked back at his youth remarking, "Boys like me, aged 15—if one of them [priests] had...yeah, it would have been absolutely no problem for me aged 15." *New York Times* columnist Frank Bruni is on record approving of an "expert" for saying that the proper response to a kid who has been violated is to inform him "that somebody cared about you and loved you but didn't do it in the right way." Speaking of the *Times*, it published an op-ed today on why we need to stop criminalizing pedophilia.

Fr. Groeschel combated sexual abuse—he did not defend it.

Tell the Franciscan Friars of the Renewal how you feel about Fr. Groeschel: franciscanfriarsnyc@gmail.com

BEN AFFLECK DISCOVERS BIGOTRY



Bill Donohue comments on remarks made by Ben Affleck on the October 3rd episode of “Real Time with Bill Maher,” an HBO show:

Last month, Bill Maher had to educate Charlie Rose about the lethal differences between Islam and Christianity, and on Friday he had to educate Ben Affleck. A debate ensued between atheist author Sam Harris and Affleck over the number of Muslims who embrace jihad, prompting Affleck to opine, “You are saying that Islamophobia is not a real thing. It’s just an ugly thing to say. It’s gross. It’s racist. It’s like saying, ‘Oh you shifty Jew.’”

Affleck is such a phony. Since when does he object to bigotry? In 1999, he starred in Kevin Smith’s anti-Catholic flick, “Dogma.” The plot maintains that Mary and Joseph had sexual relations, and that Mary gave birth to a daughter who works in an abortion clinic. God, who was played by Alanis Morissette, and the apostles (a foul-mouthed 13th apostle was introduced) were also subjected to Smith’s low-class brand of humor.

When asked about his role in “Dogma,” Affleck bragged, “The film is definitely meant to push buttons.” Catholic buttons, that is. Can anyone believe that he would star in a Muslim-bashing film? Not on your life.

It’s not just Affleck who entertains this double standard—Hollywood is loaded with such people. Indeed, it goes well beyond Hollywood to encompass the cultural elite in art, journalism, education, and publishing. It all comes down to whose buttons are being pushed, not any principled opposition to bigotry, per se.

FAWNING OVER MUSLIMS



To read Bill Donohue's latest Newsmax article, "Political Correctness Leaves Christians Out," about the recent controversy over prayer on the football field, click [here](#).

NEW YORK TIMES AND RELIGIOUS PROFILING



Bill Donohue accuses the *New York Times* of religious profiling:

The *New York Times* has a story today about the Diocese of Harrisburg's decision to ban high school boys from competing against girls in school wrestling. This is the second day in a row that the *Times* has covered this story, and there is nothing new of any substance in today's piece.

Today's news story on the Pennsylvania Catholic high school wrestling policy merited 978 words. By contrast, today's *New York Times* ran a story on Oslo withdrawing from a bid to host

the 2022 winter Olympics that totaled 406 words. A story on Derek Jeter starting his own web forum was a mere 599 words. Even the Major League Baseball playoff game between the Pirates and Giants didn't out do the Catholic high school story—it was 897 words. If we add yesterday's story on the wrestling policy to today's (it was 401 words), the total figure is 1,379.

No newspaper in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh reported on this story, and outside of *The Sentinel* (a Carlisle, Pennsylvania paper), it got almost no coverage; no national wire service or newspaper covered it.

So what's going on? This is more than political correctness at work—we know the *Times* is fixated on matters sexual—it evinces an appetite for religious profiling. But not when it comes to all religions: the *Times* has a special place for the Roman Catholic Church in its portfolio.

The *Times* just dropped 100 people from its newsroom—7.5 percent of its staff. Nice to know that it still has the resources to monitor Catholic high school wrestling policies in Pennsylvania. It all comes down to what is a priority, and when it comes to Catholicism and women, few subjects matter more to those at the top of the *New York Times*.

Perhaps the NYT public editor Margaret Sullivan would like to hear from you. Contact: public@nytimes.com. [Note: She is not unfair]

CATHOLIC SCHOOL ATHLETICS AND

SEXUALITY



Bill Donohue comments on two issues bedeviling Catholic schools:

The divide between Catholic sexual ethics and secular sexual ethics is being played out in Pennsylvania and Minnesota in a dramatic way.

The *New York Times* reports today that the Diocese of Harrisburg has adopted a policy barring boys on high school wrestling teams from competing with girls from other schools; girls in Catholic schools are also barred from football and rugby teams. The policy is not new: the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference Education Department has explicit rules on this subject. Indeed, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia previously dealt with this issue.

The issue in Minnesota involves transgender students. Because the Minnesota State High School League is considering a policy today that was written in part by LGBT activists—boys and girls may even be allowed to shower together—the Minnesota Catholic Conference has gotten out in front of this matter by opposing any policy that commits Catholic schools to support changes in gender identity.

In both instances, “enlightened” critics have assailed the Catholic policies as being “antiquated,” “pathetic,” and “discriminatory.”

The rationale behind the Pennsylvania policy is clear-headed: there are nature-based differences between the sexes that need to be observed. Ergo, sports that involve “substantial and

potentially immodest physical contact” ought to be treated differently. All but the enlightened ones have the cognitive ability to distinguish between wrestling and ping-pong.

The rationale behind the Minnesota policy is also clear-headed: the enlightened ones need to learn that the term gender refers to social roles for the sexes that take their cues from nature. Moreover, gender identity disorder is a mental illness requiring treatment for the afflicted, not the affirmation of social institutions.