

.004% OF CLERGY GUILTY OF ABUSE

Bill Donohue comments on the 2016 Annual Report on clergy sexual abuse in the Catholic Church:

The latest audit of the Catholic clergy involved in the sexual abuse of minors shows that there were two new substantiated cases made during the period of July 1, 2015 through June 30, 2016 against 52,238 priests and deacons. That comes to .004 percent of the clergy.

Though the report does not mention it, 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.

There was a total of twenty-five new allegations made by minors during this one-year time period. Of that number, two were substantiated; eight were still being investigated; eleven were unsubstantiated or unable to be proven; two were referred to a religious order; one was referred to a diocese; and one investigation had to be postponed.

Overall, a total of 728 allegations were made in the year of the study, almost all from previous years. Most of the alleged offenders—80 percent of them—are either dead, already removed from ministry, or missing.

As always, almost 8 in 10 of the victims were male (78%), and the vast majority (85%) were postpubescent.

This report, as well as all previous reports, fails to draw the obvious conclusion: The sex abuse scandal in the Catholic Church has been driven largely by homosexuals (though over the past year thirteen of the alleged new victims were male, and twelve were female). The reasons for not facing up to this

fact cannot be justified on the basis of science.

The report mentions that sixteen priests or deacons were returned to ministry over the year the audit was conducted. We need to know more about them. Were there sixteen different lawyers who sued them, or did a few lawyers do most of the suing? What happened, if anything, to the accusers? Are some of them recidivists, accusers from previous years? Most important, how are these maligned priests doing now that they have been returned to ministry?

These questions are never asked, never mind answered. True victims of sexual abuse deserve our compassion and aid, but so do priests and deacons who have had their reputations damaged, if not ruined, by false claims.

PHONY REACTION TO MAHER'S BIGOTRY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the way critics are reacting to Bill Maher's "N-word" remark:

Bill Maher has apologized for using a racial slur on his Friday night HBO show, and all of a sudden TV critics are trotting out his previous "controversial" remarks. Not one cited his filthy remarks about popes, priests, and the sacraments, though we have [listed](#) over 60 such examples.

The problem goes way beyond Maher: it's the phonies in the media who are horrified by some expressions of bigotry, but are perfectly fine with his anti-Catholic material.

Here's an example of the headlines on Maher's apology:

- “Don’t Be Shocked, Bill Maher Has a History of Bigoted Comments” (Huffington Post)
- “Five Times Bill Maher Said Something Controversial” (MSN.com)
- “Bill Maher Is No Stranger to Controversial Statements” (New York *Daily News*)

Here’s what upsets these critics: anti-black remarks; anti-Muslim remarks; making light of 9/11; making fun of Hillary Clinton; “legitimizing” Ann Coulter; “normalizing” Milo Yiannopoulos; using the word “retarded”; defending statutory rape; stereotyping St. Patrick’s Day; and implying that President Trump and his daughter had an incestuous relationship.

No one beats Wesley Morris of the *New York Times*. He says what Maher said is inexcusable. “He’s a 61-year-old white man who would never get a pass for jesting about slavery or the N-word.”

Others, however, can get away with it—Morris cites Louis C.K. and Sarah Silverman. That’s because these two foul-mouthed bigots are “white comedians who have really grappled with what it means to flirt with racially inflammatory language and ideas, what it means for the flirtation to fail.” In other words, Maher’s problem is that he hasn’t “really grappled” with his bigotry.

What about Jay Z? He hasn’t grappled with his hate speech at all. A few days before the election he was dancing up a storm with Hillary, using the dreaded “N-word” mixed in with misogynistic cracks and a slew of “F-bombs.” Hillary thought it was cute. Does Jay Z get a pass too?

Just trying to figure out the logic. One thing is for sure: No entertainer will ever pay a price for his anti-Catholic bigotry. They don’t even have to grapple with it to get a pass.

FORMER PENN STATE PRESIDENT JAILED

Bill Donohue comments on the sentencing of former Penn State president Graham Spanier:

Graham Spanier got off easy—two months in jail followed by several months of house arrest. It is indisputable that he did nothing to stop the predatory behavior of child molester Jerry Sandusky. But as I learned long ago, Spanier is not a man who gets upset about patently offensive behavior.

In 1997, I contacted him about a female student who created a huge bloody vagina with real human hair, constructed in the shape of a grotto, with a statue of the Mother of Jesus placed inside it. Her “artwork” was placed on the grounds of the campus. I asked for disciplinary action, and Spanier got back to me saying that steps had been taken “to educate and sensitize” the offending student. I brought this issue to national attention on CNN’s “Crossfire.”

Spanier obviously didn’t take my complaint seriously. Within a few months, the same student struck again. Her new “artwork” consisted of a five-by-five matrix of panties with a cross stitched to the crotch. It was defended by the Director of Visual Arts and left on display at the campus art gallery.

Spanier’s judgment, and his tolerance for intolerance, has finally caught up with him. Had he acted like a man, much damage on his campus could have been avoided.

AP COVERS UP FOR ISLAMIST FANATIC

Bill Donohue comments on how the Associated Press reported on Linda Sarsour's commencement speech at the City University of New York's Graduate School of Public Health and Health Policy on June 1:

AP says that some of Linda Sarsour's critics "have spread false internet reports claiming she supports Islamic State militants and Sharia law." In fact, she is guilty as charged. I made such an accusation on [May 22](#), and I stand by it.

At this year's Women's March on Washington, Sarsour stood proudly with her friend, Rasmia Yousef Odeh, a terrorist who was convicted in 1970 for her part in two bombings; two Israeli students were killed while shopping for groceries.

Sarsour was one of four women who invited the convicted Muslim terrorist to join with them. Why did she welcome her if she does not support "Islamic State militants"?

On February 10, 2015, Sarsour was interviewed by Rachel Maddow on MSNBC. The Palestinian activist expressed concerns over the treatment of Muslims in the United States, specifically complaining about the "twenty-two states with anti-Sharia bills."

Sharia law is modern-day slavery encoded into law. It is cited by Islamic terrorists to justify oppression. Muslims who love freedom hate Sharia law, so why does Sarsour object when it is outlawed?

AP needs to correct the record. Stop covering up for Islamist fanatics.

Contact AP Managing Editor Brian Carovillano:

GUTTING THE HHS MANDATE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the draft of the Trump administration's revision of the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate affecting abortion, contraception, and sterilization:

The Trump administration is poised to upend the anti-religious rights provision of the HHS mandate written by the Obama administration. It promises to be better than what President Trump initially spoke about when he was running for office.

Not only will the revised plan allow religious individuals and groups the right not to be complicit in providing for morally objectionable services, it will extend this right to non-religious persons and organizations. The reasoning of the Trump administration is both logical and equitable.

For example, if conscientious objector status applies to agnostics and atheists who morally object to military service, why should such persons who share the same objections as the Little Sisters of the Poor be denied an exemption? To be sure, conscience rights are at the heart of religious liberty, but they are not exclusive to the faithful. Many atheists also believe that abortion-inducing drugs are immoral.

In 2015, U.S. District Judge Richard Leon ruled that the March for Life should be given the same exemption from the HHS mandate as granted to religious groups. He said that if the religious exemption was designed "to respect the anti-abortion tenets of an employment relationship, then it makes no rational sense—indeed no sense whatsoever—to deny

March [for] Life that same respect.”

It is important to recognize that the HHS mandate should not properly be called the “contraceptive” mandate. The “HHS Guidelines for Health Insurance Coverage” as outlined by the Obama administration covered “all Food and Drug Administration approved contraceptive methods.” Included in this list are such drugs as the “morning after pill,” which were designed to induce an abortion. They not only prevent fertilization, they may act to prevent implantation of the embryo.

As a general rule, the government should presumptively grant exemptions to individuals and organizations—independent of whether they are religiously affiliated or not—from cooperating with morally illicit behaviors, and this is especially true of life and death issues. While all presumptive rights are rebuttable, the government must have a compelling interest to deny exemptions.

This is one more sign that President Trump is religion-friendly, quite unlike his predecessor. Indeed, he is also showing respect for the conscience rights of non-believers.

SILVERMAN IS AS BAD AS GRIFFIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Sarah Silverman’s Netflix film *A Speck of Dust*, which was released this week:

Kathy Griffin was not fired from CNN for simulating oral sex on Anderson Cooper, but for depicting the president beheaded. Conclusion: Violence upsets cultural elites but not

obscenities. If we add anti-Christian bigotry to the list of offensive fares that elites find acceptable, we know why Silverman will get away with her latest assault.

Netflix labels *A Speck of Dust* “irreverent.” Is it merely “irreverent” to ask audience members if they would allow God to ejaculate in their mouth? What would it take for Netflix to brand this as obscene? Would Silverman have to substitute Muhammad for God—or choose Obama instead—before they objected?

God bothers Silverman. In 2007, she was depicted on her Comedy Central show having sex with God. Jesus really gets to her. In 2014, in a YouTube video, she objected to pro-life Christians, blaming the Son of God for inspiring them. That is why she called him “Jesus F***ing Christ.” She also depicted Jesus masturbating her.

Silverman is obsessed with abortion. In her Netflix movie, she screams, “Abortion does kill—your whole day.” Burying babies who have been killed by an abortionist upsets her, but not because of the violence: In the movie she quips, “I want to speak at those funerals.”

In 2007, Silverman joked about her three abortions. But in 2014, she told Bill Maher that she lied. “And the truth is, and I don’t like to admit this, I’ve never had an abortion and I don’t know if I would.” Too bad she didn’t explain why.

Griffin gets canned for crossing the line, but Silverman’s obscenities and bigotry are perfectly acceptable. No wonder a recent Gallup poll said that only 1% of Americans rated our moral values “excellent,” and 77% said they are “getting worse.” Silverman and Netflix are two reasons why.

Contact: megm@netflix.com