

Kudos to Evangelicals

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a statement issued by evangelical leaders August 29:

The Catholic League has a long history of mutual cooperation with evangelical Christians on a host of cultural issues. In that spirit, we condemn the unfair attacks against the statement on marriage, family and sexuality that was signed by more than 150 evangelical leaders following their conference in Nashville last week.

“Hateful,” “homophobic,” “anti-LGBT” are among the hysterical condemnations of the statement flying around print, broadcast and social media. But the statement is none of those things.

While restating long-held Christian teaching that marriage is ordained by God as the “lifelong union of one man and one woman,” and that differences between male and female are “divinely ordained” and unchangeable, the statement does not single out homosexual or transgender persons. It emphasizes that *all* human beings are called to “chastity outside of marriage and fidelity within marriage,” reiterating the immorality of heterosexual intercourse “before or outside marriage” as well.

Nor can the statement accurately be termed “hateful.” Quite the contrary. It affirms God’s “merciful” love and forgiveness. It rejects the idea that “divinely ordained differences between male and female” somehow “render them unequal in dignity or worth.” It refutes the notion that same-sex attraction “puts a person outside the hope of the gospel.” And it calls on Christians to “speak the truth in love at all times” and to never “speak in such ways that dishonor God’s design.”

In short, the statement is a loving, faith-filled affirmation of timeless Christian teachings on marriage, family and human

sexuality. In these tumultuous times, we continue to stand with our evangelical brothers and sisters in defending these traditional moral values.

CALIF. BILL THREATENS RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue today sent the following letter to all members of the California State Senate:

Dear Senator:

I write to express the Catholic League's opposition to Assembly Bill 569.

Under the guise of "anti-discrimination," this bill is a blatant assault on religious freedom. It would bar religious organizations from establishing faith-based codes of conduct for their employees. So, for example, a Catholic school could not require that its teachers adhere to public and workplace rules of conduct that would model the principles of the Catholic faith to Catholic schoolchildren.

This bill specifically targets codes of conduct involving employees' "reproductive health care decisions." That, and its full-throated endorsement by groups such as NARAL Pro-Choice California, make clear the bill's true intent: to undermine Catholic teaching on the sanctity of human life, by forcing the Church to employ people who publicly reject that teaching. It is a thinly disguised attempt to impose radical pro-abortion policies on religious organizations.

I urge you to defend religious liberty by voting against AB 569.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

USA TODAY ARTICLE DISTORTS CHURCH'S RECORD ON ABUSE

Bill Donohue comments on a story in today's *USA Today*:

"Parishes Across Nation Under Shadow Of Abuse," blares a headline in today's *USA Today*. The subhead is even more misleading: "Latest revelations are sign that the church's problems with its priests are not over."

The implication is obvious: the crisis of sexual abuse of minors by Catholic priests is still ongoing, and the Church is still failing to protect children. And that is the message that comes across to the casual reader of the almost 2,500 word article.

A more careful reading, however, contradicts that conclusion. For while the article highlights recent reports of abuse, and current or recent court cases and settlements in dioceses around the country, we see that the vast majority of actual or alleged incidents are from decades ago, some even "dating back to the 1950s."

This affirms what we know: that the Catholic Church has responded forcefully and effectively to the crisis of clergy sexual abuse, to the point that today, virtually every

allegation made against a priest is from years earlier. The 2016 Annual Report on clergy sexual abuse in the Catholic Church found only two new substantiated cases from July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016. That comes to .004 percent of the 52,238 Catholic priests and deacons in the United States.

We know of no other institution in the United States, secular or religious, which has a better record than the Catholic Church today when it comes to the sexual abuse of minors by adult employees. Yet the *USA Today* headline, and the tone of the whole piece, would lead one to think that nothing has changed.

WASHINGTON POST PIECE RIPS BISHOPS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article posted on the website of the *Washington Post* on August 23rd:

Standards continue to collapse in elite circles, the latest example being a wholly inaccurate article posted on the website of the *Washington Post* by an Ivy League professor.

Anthea Butler is an African American professor at the University of Pennsylvania, someone who has a long history of bashing the Catholic Church.

“The modern-day American Catholic church seems to be finally waking up to racial issues.” She cites the decision by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops this week to empanel a committee on racism; it was done in response to the events in Charlottesville. This is the first time since 1979, she writes, that the bishops have addressed this subject.

Butler is wrong. Here is a quick look at some of the bishops' efforts since 1979:

- 1987: The sixth National Black Catholic Congress was held in Washington, D.C.
- 1989: The first Sunday in February (Black History Month) was designated as a National Day of Prayer for the African American Family.
- 1990: The National Black Catholic Clergy Caucus designated November as Black Catholic History Month.
- 2000: Mother Josephine Bakhita becomes the first African woman to be canonized by the Roman Catholic Church in the new millennium.
- 2001: The first Gathering of Black Catholic Woman was organized by the National Black Sisters Conference.
- 2001: Most Reverend Wilton D. Gregory was elected President of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.
- 2003: The National Black Catechetical Network was founded.
- 2004: "A Research Report Commemorating the 25th Anniversary of *Brothers and Sisters to Us*" was published in recognition of the 1979 statement on racism.
- 2004: The Bishops' Committee on African American Catholics gave an address at the bishops' conference titled, "The Success, Impact and Varied Roles of the Offices of Black Ministry in the Church Today."
- 2014: Archbishop Joseph E. Kurtz, president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, issued a *Statement on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of the Civil Rights Act*.

These are just some of the efforts made by the bishops since 1979 that Butler does not mention. This list obviously does not include events and campaigns organized by dioceses, parishes, schools, universities, and voluntary associations—all across the nation—to promote racial harmony.

It is not clear whether Butler's refusal to cite any of these matters is a function of her incompetence or ideological convictions. Regarding the latter, she wrote in the aftermath of the death of Trayvon Martin that God is "a white racist."

Anyone who thinks that God is "a white racist" is clearly not capable of fairly assessing anything the Catholic Church does to combat racism. But the *Washington Post* and the University of Pennsylvania do not agree—they love her "scholarship."

IS MALIA IN A DORM NAMED AFTER A SLAVEOWNER?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wants to know if Malia Obama is living in a dorm named after a slaveowner:

On August 22, former President Barack Obama and his wife Michelle helped their daughter, Malia, move into a dorm at Harvard University. One of the twelve undergraduate dorms is Mather House, named after Increase Mather. He was president of Harvard between 1692 and 1701.

[Mather](#) was a slaveowner *while he was president of Harvard*. In fact, he used his slave to help run the business of Harvard, running errands for the trustees. Mather wrote in his diary that he sent his "Negro" to do various jobs for the institution.

Is Malia living in Mather House?

Whether Malia is living in Mather House or not, it is not fair to pressure her—she is not an activist—to lobby Harvard administrators to change the name of the slaveowner's dorm.

But it would be instructive to learn if Barack Obama wants to take up this campaign.

PUBLIC PANS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a Gallup survey comparing public schools to its alternatives:

When the public is asked to rate public schools as excellent or good, it captures the vote of 44 percent. But 71 percent rate independent private schools as excellent or good. The figure for parochial or church-related schools is 63 percent; for charter schools it is 55 percent; and for home schooling, it is 46 percent.

When it comes to rating private schools, the difference between Republicans and Democrats is not large: 76 percent of Republicans and 68 percent of Democrats rate them excellent or good. But when it comes to the other three alternatives, the margins widen.

Parochial and church-related schools capture an excellent or good rating of 71 percent of Republicans, but only 56 percent of Democrats. The figure for charter schools is 62 percent for Republicans and 48 percent for Democrats. Home schooling earns a rating of 55 percent for Republicans and 38 percent for Democrats.

Only 39 percent of Republicans and 48 percent of Democrats rate public schools as excellent or good.

Regarding Democrats, their secular leanings account for their comparatively weak approval of parochial and church-related schools. Charter schools and home schooling are seen by

Democrats as a direct threat to the public schools, and for that reason alone they are not looked upon favorably, even though most Democrats are not exactly enamored by the performance of the public schools.

The reason why Democrats hold private schools in high regard can be explained by the affluent among them who enroll their children in such schools. This raises a thorny issue. If the Democrats care about the poor—that is what they say—why don't they support alternatives to public schools, which they pan, other than the private ones that they prefer and can afford?

As we have seen over and over again, many poor minority parents would like to send their children to a parochial or church-related school. Moreover, they are highly overrepresented among parents who would like to send their children to a charter school. Who is fighting against them? The ones who say they are on their side—the Democrats.

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio boasts that he is the champion of the poor. He is also the biggest foe of school choice, whether it be in the form of vouchers for parochial schools or funds for charter schools.

This is a game. It needs to end. The time is long past when public officials can say that the public schools are not good enough for their children, but they are nonetheless worthy of everyone's support. They need to buck up.

If the public schools aren't good enough for the kids of rich Democrats, just whose kids are they good for?

VILE JESUS SEX SCENE ON AMC

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the August 21 episode of the AMC show "Preacher":

NewsBusters deserves the credit for addressing this obscene episode of "Preacher," so I will simply direct everyone to its site to read about it (click [here](#)). Depicting Jesus in a grotesque sex scene is an assault on the sensibilities of all Christians, as well as people of good will who are not Christians.

We have been treated to this kind of fare from some pay-per-view channels, but we are not accustomed to AMC getting into the mud. If this is a signal of what it aspires to become, we will rally Christians against it.

Contact Josh Sapan, president and CEO:
josh.sapan@amcnetworks.com

SAINT SERRA STATUE DEFACED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the defacement of a statue of Saint Junípero Serra:

"Murder" was written on a statue of Saint Junípero Serra. His hands were painted red and a swastika was depicted on the statue of the child standing next to him. The defacement took place near the San Fernando Mission, outside of Los Angeles. Fortunately, everything was quickly cleaned up.

Pope Francis canonized Father Serra in 2015. The 18th century priest personally founded six missions, baptizing more than 6,000 Indians. He did more to defend the natural rights of

Indians against Spanish conquistadors than any other leader at the time, secular or religious.

Gregory Orfalea and James A. Sandos have offered two of the most authoritative accounts of the work of Saint Serra. "To the Indian," writes Orfalea, "he [Serra] was loving, enthusiastic, and spiritually and physically devoted." To the accusation that the missionaries destroyed Indian culture, Sandos says, "Although many historians once thought that Indian culture had been eradicated, anthropologists and other observers have provided evidence to the contrary."

To read my booklet on Father Serra's life and heroics, click [here](#).

The assault on this revered priest comes on the heels of many attacks on historical figures, all stemming from the Charlottesville tragedy. As with those episodes, the persons involved in this barbarism have accepted the hate-filled propaganda of extremists, misrepresenting history to serve a radical agenda. Indeed, I told the Catholic League staff last week that the missionaries would be next.

We are involved in a frontal assault on Western civilization. This is cultural cleansing, and the fanatics will not stop until they remake America to fit their warped vision of reality. They are stuck in the time warp of the 1960s, and still refer to the U.S. as AmeriKKKa. We need to resist this campaign at every step of the way.

WHO IS THE REAL MINISTER OF

HATE?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue compares Tony Perkins to Al Sharpton:

Who is the real Minister of Hate? Tony Perkins or Al Sharpton? Both are ordained ministers—Sharpton was ordained at the age of 9—and both have addressed the controversy over Charlottesville.

Perkins wants both sides to take a pause, and recommends a Day of Prayer. Sharpton wants all public funds to stop paying for the Jefferson Memorial, saying “you’re asking me to subsidize the insult to my family.”

The media would have us believe that Perkins is the Minister of Hate. They cite the organization that he directs, the Family Research Council, as a hate group. The evidence? It is so listed by the Southern Poverty Law Center. Its evidence? The Family Research Council supports marriage, properly understood, and opposes gay marriage. That puts Perkins in the same boat with the Klan.

I know of no hateful comments ever made by Perkins, but there is a long list of hateful speech, well documented, made by Sharpton.

Sharpton cut his teeth on hate. In 1987, he took up the cause of Tawana Brawley, a teenage girl who said she was raped by white boys. She said they forced her to perform oral sex on them, urinated into her mouth, smeared feces on her, and covered her chest with racial slurs. It was all a lie. A grand jury heard exhaustive evidence, and concluded that Brawley’s account was a hoax.

Sharpton not only defended Brawley, he accused an assistant district attorney, Stephen Pagones, of being one of her assailants. Pagones sued Sharpton for defamation, and a court

agreed with the attorney, ordering Sharpton to pay him \$345,000 in a settlement. To this day, Sharpton has never apologized.

In 1991, Sharpton attacked Hasidic Jews in Brooklyn, calling them "diamond merchants." What occasioned this anti-Semitic outburst was the tragic death of a young black boy by a Hasidic rabbi's motorcade. Sharpton responded with vitriol, saying "if the Jews want to get it on, tell them to put their yarmulkes back and come over to my house." A few days later an innocent Hasidic Jew visiting from Australia was beaten by a black mob and stabbed to death.

In 1995, a large black landlord in Harlem, the United House of Prayer, raised the rent on a store, Freddy's Fashion Mart, owned by a Jew. The owner, in turn, raised the rent on his subtenant, which was a black-run record store. Sharpton whipped up a crowd of protesters saying, "We will not stand by and allow them to move this brother so that some white interloper can expand his business." Freddy's was subsequently torched, killing seven employees, most of whom were Hispanic.

In 1998, Sharpton embraced Khalid Abdul Muhammad, a former aide to Louis Farrakhan. Sharpton's hero hated Catholics and Jews, and was said to be planning a rally in Harlem, even though he did not have a permit. I joined Jews, and others, in a counter rally, held at Sylvia's restaurant in Harlem. I denounced the bigot as "a gangster" and the "Imperial Wizard" of the black community. Sharpton stood by this maniac, even though Farrakhan did not.

In 2007, Sharpton attacked the religion of presidential candidate Mitt Romney. "As for the Mormon running for office" he said, "those who really believe in God will defeat him anyways, so don't worry about that; that's a temporary situation."

Nothing that Tony Perkins has ever said or done comes close to

Sharpton's legacy of hate, yet in the eyes of the media—which takes its left-wing cues from the Southern Poverty Law Center—Perkins is the problem, not Sharpton.

One more thing. Sharpton is not subsidizing the Jefferson Memorial, or anything else: he owes millions of dollars in back taxes, something he has been able to get away with for decades. Anyone else would have been thrown in jail a long time ago, but he is the darling of the media, especially MSNBC. They make sure that the real Minister of Hate is given a pass.

BOSTON GLOBE'S NEW ATTACK ON PRIESTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the *Boston Globe's* selective concern about fatherless children:

The *Boston Globe's* "Spotlight" team is out with another attack on the Catholic priesthood: this one a two-part series on "Children of Catholic priests" who "live with secrets and sorrow."

Using a few highly publicized cases, and several anecdotal stories, reporter Michael Rezendes concludes that by "any reasonable measure, there are thousands" of children around the world "who have strong evidence that they are the sons and daughters of Catholic priests." Yet as he acknowledges, with over 400,000 priests worldwide, even if the unsubstantiated "thousands" estimate is accepted, that could amount to as little as one percent or less of priests having fathered a child. And as he further acknowledges, some of these priests "took their responsibility seriously."

So the question arises: Is the phenomenon of priests fathering children, then neglecting or abandoning them—while clearly sinful and morally wrong—so singularly egregious as to warrant such an exclusive exposé?

How do these speculative numbers and percentages compare with Protestant, Jewish or Muslim clergy illegitimately fathering children, then neglecting or abandoning them? We don't know, because Rezendes and the *Globe* show no inclination to investigate any clergy other than Catholic priests. To do so might undermine what is clearly part of the agenda here: to attack the Catholic Church's rule on priestly celibacy. Neglected children of priests, Rezendes writes, "are the unfortunate victims of a church that has, for nearly 900 years, forbidden priests to marry...."

And what of our secular culture? Citing the U.S. Census Bureau, the National Fatherhood Initiative reported recently that "24 million children, 1 out of 3, live without their biological father in the home." And "millions more," notes the National Center for Fathering, "have dads who are physically present, but emotionally absent."

"If it were classified as a disease," the National Center for Fathering observes, "fatherlessness would be an epidemic worthy of attention as a national emergency."

But that is apparently *not* worthy of the attention of the *Boston Globe's* "Spotlight" team. They would rather focus on the apparently tiny minority of Catholic priests worldwide who have fathered and neglected their children, than on the epidemic in our own country that has left fully one-third of American children growing up without fathers.