

AUSTRALIA'S WAR ON CHRISTIAN KIDS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue explains why Cardinal George Pell will not be able to secure a fair trial in October:

If it weren't for Cardinal George Pell, it would not matter a whole lot to the Catholic League if a free nation like Australia decided to emulate the totalitarian regime in North Korea. But he does matter, and that is why we are concerned. He has been the target of character assassins for a very long time, and will appear in a Melbourne court on October 6. Judging from recent events, it seems near impossible for him to get a fair trial.

Queensland, Australia's second largest state, declared war on Christian children last week: they have been told to stop talking about Jesus in the school yard. Christmas cards that refer to the birth of Jesus have been banned, as have creating Christmas tree decorations. Beaded bracelets that share "the good news about Jesus" have also been prohibited.

"Christians, prepare for persecution." That is the conclusion of Australian journalist Andrew Bolt. "I am not a Christian," he says, "but am amazed that your bishops and ministers are not warning you of what is already breaking over your heads." Bolt is correct. Cowardice in the face of oppression never works, yet this lesson has not been learned by many Catholic and Protestant leaders.

Anti-Christian bigotry in Australia is widespread. Bolt notes that just last week "two Christian preachers were summoned to Tasmania's Anti-Discrimination Tribunal for preaching their faith's stand on traditional marriage and homosexuality." Two years ago, Hobart Archbishop Julian Porteous, Australia's most

outspoken Catholic defender of the faith, was ordered to explain to the authorities “by what right he spoke against same-sex marriage.”

Australian journalist Bill Muehlenberg has written a splendid column, “The Ongoing War on Christianity in Australia,” that details the extent of censorship being enforced throughout the nation. He references an article that he wrote in 2015 about the crackdown on religious speech in the Australian state of Victoria, home to Cardinal Pell’s trial. Those policies went after the kids, banning the singing of Christmas hymns.

As usual, the gag orders are motivated by a libertine conception of freedom. Pro-life demonstrators have had their rights abridged, and all discourse that is not deemed gay friendly is subject to censorship.

If this were simply an anti-Christian phobia, it might not matter too much. But it is much more than that. It is cultural fascism sponsored by the state.

In 2012, the late Chicago archbishop, Cardinal Francis George, noted the increasingly hostile milieu for Christian expression in America. He said that while he expected to die in bed, “my successor will die in prison and his successor will die a martyr in the public square.”

Looks like Cardinal George’s prediction is proceeding at a gallop pace in Australia. It does not bode well for Cardinal Pell—the cultural climate is poisonous to Catholics.

CATHOLIC LEFT GOES MUTE ON PAUL SHANLEY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the release of former priest Paul Shanley from prison:

Paul Shanley was thrown out of the priesthood in 2004, and convicted of sexual assault in 2005. Now, after serving 12 years, he is free.

Boston-area media outlets such as CBS, NBC, Fox 5, New England Cable, and WHDH have all labeled him a pedophile. This is inaccurate: he had sex with children, adolescents, and adults. There was one proviso—they had to be male. Not to even mention his homosexuality is a cover-up.

Shanley is a creature of the Catholic Left. They helped to shape him ideologically and support him organizationally. Now they have gone mute.

Known as the “hippie priest,” the left-wing Shanley argued in the 1970s that “homosexuality is a gift from God and should be celebrated.” He certainly celebrated his homosexuality. But he didn’t stop there. In October 1977, he contended that “not even incest or bestiality” could cause psychic damage.

Shanley was at the formative meeting of the North American Man/Boy Love Association in 1978, an organization dedicated to child rape. He eventually became its pastor.

The Catholic Left has long pushed the Church to relax its teachings on sexuality. This idea was fermented in the 1960s and took root in the 1970s. In other words, Shanley is their boy. Indeed, he served as chaplain to Dignity, the dissident Catholic left-wing organization. As I once told a leader of Dignity, Shanley would never be chosen as chaplain to the Catholic League, but he was a good fit for his group.

In 1970, the Archdiocese of Boston followed the thinking of the Catholic Left when Humberto Cardinal Medeiros named Shanley his “representative for sexual minorities.” This was three years after accusations against Shanley were reported to the archdiocese. By the way, Shanley believed there were 34 sexual minorities.

One of Shanley’s best friends is the left-wing nun, Sister Jeannine Gramick. In 2005, her denunciation of his offenses was overridden by her sympathy for him. “At the same time,” she wrote, “my heart grieved for this man I had not seen in almost 20 years, but whose principles and whose advocacy for the downtrodden I had applauded for three decades.” When Shanley refused to sign papers to laicize him, she exclaimed, “Good!”

What kind of person would embrace a man who in 1977 said that when an adult has sex with a child, “the adult is not the seducer—the kid is the seducer”? What kind of person would speak with passion about her pervert soulmate but never elect to speak to one of his victims? Thanks to reporter Maureen Orth, who wrote a splendid piece about this in *Vanity Fair*, we know that the good sister never sought out his victims.

To be fair, Shanley himself has been treated unjustly. Though there is a mountain of evidence showing that he was a practicing homosexual and abuser, his conviction was based on an accusation citing “repressed memory.” This is a fiction: as many prominent psychologists and psychiatrists have shown, the more serious the offense, the less likely it is to be repressed.

Here is one more example of unfairness. In the *New York Times* story on Shanley’s release, it begins by mentioning how John Harris was raped by Shanley when he was 21. Males that age are not raped unless they are in prison or in some other captive condition. Why didn’t Harris clock him? How many other “rapes” were consensual homosexual affairs? This has application way beyond Shanley.

We hope Shanley finally makes peace with God. We also hope that the Catholic Left stops saying that the Church's "sexual repression" caused men like Shanley to do what he did. No, it is precisely the abandonment of restraint—advocated by the Catholic Left—that brought about the *homosexual* abuse scandal in the Catholic Church.

TRUMP IS RIGHT ABOUT "TRANSGENDERS"

Catholic League president Bill Donohue digs beneath the issue of so-called transgender persons serving in the military:

President Trump's decision to ban so-called transgender persons from the military makes perfect sense: the armed forces exist to win wars—they are not a laboratory for social or sexual engineers. There is an underlying issue, however, that is much more serious. It's time for some straight talk.

No one doubts that there are men who have, and want to, transition to the other sex, and vice versa, but it is not generally understood that transgender persons are a fiction—they do not exist. These people are more properly known as transsexuals—they are attempting to change their sex. I say *attempting* because they cannot succeed. To wit: Bruce Jenner will never be able to menstruate.

Gender refers to socially learned roles that are appropriate for the sexes, for males and females. Those roles are universally the same in every society in the history of the world: women are nurturers and men are warriors. Why? Because women give birth and men do not. Moreover, men have more testosterone than women, making them more aggressive. Neither

sex is better than the other; rather, as the Catholic Church informs, they complement each other.

This is what biology and anthropology affirm, and what the Catholic Church teaches. In other words, gender roles take their cues from nature, and ultimately from nature's God, which explains why the LGBT segment of the population—it is not a "community"—is railing against it. They find support, of course, among cultural elites, many of whom deny the reality of nature and nature's God.

Trans persons should not be bullied, or subjected to what the Catholic Church calls "unjust discrimination." But there are plenty of good reasons, especially for the military, to practice just discrimination against any person or group of persons who may logically compromise winning in the battlefield.

To cite one example, the reason why Type 1 diabetics are barred from the military is because of their need for regular injections; accommodating them is not practical. Trans persons need regular injections as well. So if anything, allowing trans persons to serve, but not Type 1 diabetics, is not fair—it is an expression of unjust discrimination. The answer is not to allow these diabetics to serve, but to ban both groups.

When I was undergoing a physical at a military base in Brooklyn during the Vietnam war—it was part of the filtering program of prospective airmen—the fellow in front of me was rejected for being underweight, and the guy behind me was rejected for being overweight. I was declared to be just right.

That's life—inequality exists. But it is important to concede that not all manifestations of it are inequitable. Hence, the difference between just discrimination and unjust discrimination.

NYC CHEESE SHOP APOLOGIZES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the Bedford Cheese Shop issue ended ([see the previous news releases](#)):

After insulting Catholics with an obscene assault on Mother Teresa, the Bedford Cheese Shop—responding to a flood of emails protesting its vile stunt—pulled the offensive statement. I contacted the store saying I was happy with that decision, and asked for an apology.

Less than an hour after my email request was sent, the store sent out a barrage of emails to complainants saying the following:

“We have received your email regarding the cheese description. Please be aware that the sign was taken down. We sincerely apologize for any hurt or anger, none of which was intentional. We hope you have a blessed day.”

This is a lie—it was intentional. No matter, they got the message. Their decision not to send me the statement of apology was purely political: they did not want to appear as if they lost. But they did, and everyone knows it, including them.

Thanks to all who contacted the bigots. Your input is invaluable.

NYC STORE REMOVES VILE REMARK

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the response by the Bedford Cheese Shop to our protest over an [obscene statement made about Mother Teresa](#):

At exactly 3:16 p.m., I emailed the Bedford Cheese Shop saying, "What you have done to Mother Teresa is vile. Please remove and apologize to Catholics."

At exactly 3:16 p.m., we received the following email from the store: "We have received your email regarding the cheese description. Please be aware that the sign was taken down. Have a blessed day."

Our missives must have crossed in the mail. Only half of what I requested has been honored. An apology is still needed.

It is important they hear from you.

Contact: info@bedfordcheeseshop.com

NYC STORE DEFILES MOTHER TERESA

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Bedford Cheese Shop, a store with locations in Brooklyn and Manhattan:

If the Bedford Cheese Shop did this to some other religious figure, the owner would be in serious trouble. But she chose to defile Mother Teresa, which is why there will be no physical retaliation. They should nonetheless be punished by everyone, not just Catholics: a boycott is in order.

At the Manhattan store, [the card display](#) of Brebirsousse D'argental cheese says, "The texture is as close to heaven that we have found here on earth. Kinda like going down on mother [sic] Teresa herself, divine."

The store, which is owned by Charlotte Kamin, is ignoring complaints. Perhaps she would like to hear from you.

Contact: info@bedfordcheeseshop.com

MEDIA CAST WIDE NET IN PELL CASE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Cardinal George Pell's day in court and the media's treatment of it:

In the United States it would be unheard of for someone to be summoned to court to face a judge without knowing what the charges are and who the accusers are. But not in Australia.

Cardinal George Pell was summoned to travel from Rome to Melbourne to appear in court today. He did. The proceedings, which were nothing more than a filing, lasted six minutes. Pell said nothing. Moreover, his lawyer did not enter a plea. That's because the mystery continues—Pell has not been told what he is being charged with or who his accusers are. All we learned is that he must appear again on October 6.

If this isn't bizarre enough, the prosecutor threatened the press with contempt of court if they dared to *speculate* on the case. Here is what Andrew Tinney said to the media: "Any publication of material speculating about the strength or otherwise of the case, the prospect of a fair trial or trials

being had, whether the accused should or should not have been charged, the likelihood of conviction or acquittal, or any other such matters would be in contempt of court.”

If the Australian media had any guts, they would collectively violate this gag order and bring it before the courts. This kind of censorship is what we would expect from a Third World dictatorship, not a Western-style democracy.

The media sported their real colors again today. The *New York Times* posted a web story saying, “The case will test the credibility of Francis’ efforts to foster greater accountability after abuse scandals have shaken the church around the world.” Similarly, the Associated Press said, “For Francis, they are a threat to his credibility, given he famously promised a ‘zero tolerance’ policy for sex abuse in the church.”

Cardinal Pell has never been convicted of covering up or abusing anyone, yet unspecified accusations made by anonymous accusers are enough to test the credibility of his boss for not holding him accountable? Accountable for what?

“Zero tolerance” is known as the “one-strike-and-you’re-out” rule. There are no strikes—no convictions—against Cardinal Pell. Therefore, it is a moot issue. To say that the pope’s credibility is on the line is to suggest that he should act now to discipline a man who is presumed innocent. The contempt for civil liberties could not be more clear.

What is even more sickening is the duplicity of the *New York Times*. On April 2, 2011, it ran an editorial blasting American bishops for not enforcing its “zero tolerance” policy. Yet on November 11, 2009, it ran an editorial, “What’s Wrong with ‘Zero Tolerance’”, calling “zero tolerance” a “failure.” How can this be? Because the 2009 editorial was about “the failed zero tolerance policy” in the public schools.

I might add that supporting the newspaper’s condemnation of

“zero tolerance” in the schools was the executive director of the New York Civil Liberties Union, Donna Lieberman.

So if “zero tolerance” policies are flawed for the public schools, why are they suitable for the Catholic Church? More relevant, why are the media trying to pressure the pope to invoke this admittedly flawed policy against a man for whom it does not apply?

And the media wonder why the public questions its credibility.

FOES OF CARDINAL PELL IN HIGH GEAR

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the foes of Cardinal George Pell:

The hoopla over Cardinal George Pell’s first day in court, July 26, rivals the media hysteria over OJ. There is one important difference: unlike OJ, the hyperventilation over Pell is confined to select quarters.

At the Melbourne courthouse there will be dozens of professional victims, men and women—mostly men—who claim to have been molested decades ago. Though Pell has never been found guilty of anything—and God knows rapacious lawyers have tried to nail him several times—he is being treated by victims’ advocates as if he were Jack the Ripper. Journalists are having a field day.

One reporter who is basking in the limelight is Barney Zwartz. The Australian journalist has a piece in the *National Catholic Reporter*, a media outlet that rejects the Church’s teachings

on sexuality, that smacks of bias.

“Even if he [Pell] is exonerated,” writes Zwartz, “mutterings from Rome suggest the 76-year-old will not return to his secretariat post. His credibility seems destroyed—largely self-inflicted in a series of appearances before official inquiries into how the church handled child sexual abuse.”

In other words, in the circles that Zwartz runs in, Pell is damaged goods, undone by his own behavior. But if Pell is finished, Zwartz needs to explain why he is the third highest cleric in the Vatican, a close confidant of Pope Francis. Moreover, it is not Pell’s credibility that is shot—it is Zwartz’s.

Proof: In 2002, Zwartz wrote that “an independent investigation by a retired non-Catholic judge cleared him [Pell],” yet in 2013, he wrote that Pell’s name has never been cleared. His duplicity undermines his credibility.

One more thing. It is inaccurate to say that the Church has been embroiled in a “child sexual abuse” scandal. In Australia, as I recently pointed out (click [here](#)), as in the United States, 8 in 10 of the victims were postpubescent males, meaning that the Church experienced a homosexual-driven scandal. It’s been homosexuality, not pedophilia, that accounts for the problem in both nations.

We will closely monitor the proceedings against Cardinal Pell, correcting the record when necessary.

DONOHUE DEFENDS DAWKINS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on radio station KPFA's decision to cancel an interview with English atheist Richard Dawkins:

Whenever I write about Richard Dawkins, it is to criticize some anti-Catholic remark he has made. I have written a fair amount about him.

Today, I am on his side. He is being denied the opportunity to express his views on KPFA: the radio station has reneged on its invitation to interview him.

Here is how the radio station explained its ruling. "KPFA does not endorse hateful speech. While KPFA emphatically supports serious free speech, we do not support abusive speech." It objected to Dawkins calling Islam the "most evil" of world religions.

KPFA is a public radio station that features left-wing hosts and left-wing guests, and is owned by the left-wing Pacifica Foundation, based in the left-wing city of Berkeley, California.

To prove its left-wing status, it supports censorship. To be fair, it does not censor hate speech against Catholics—it is quite tolerant of anti-Catholic bigotry. That is why it hosted the late Christopher Hitchens, a proud Catholic basher.

Dawkins is different. He is critical of Islam, and that is not something KPFA will tolerate. That's because it only supports "serious" free speech, not speech of a less-than-serious kind. So when Dawkins mocks the Eucharist, KPFA applauds, noting the seriousness of his speech.

Dawkins has been burned by the Left. It's what they do. He spoke the truth when he said of the decision to muzzle his

free speech that “I am known as a frequent critic of Christianity and have never been de-platformed for that.” He never will be.

Dawkins also asks the right questions. “Why do you give Islam a free pass? Why is it fine to criticize Christianity but not Islam?” He deserves an answer.

Islam is given a free pass by the Left because the activists supports every effort to sabotage the West, beginning with the disabling of America. It’s just that simple and just that pernicious.

Contact William Crosier, executive director of Pacifica Radio Network: ed@pacifica.org

THE WAR AGAINST CARDINAL PELL

To read Catholic League president Bill Donohue’s account of the controversy over Australian Cardinal George Pell, click [here](#).