

NYC MAYOR RAISES KEY SEXUAL MISCONDUCT ISSUE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks recently made by New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio on sexual misconduct:

New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio has irked some of his supporters by saying that accusations of sexual harassment made by employees of the Department of Education (DOE) are often false. Though he tried to walk back his comments—the teachers union came down his throat—what he initially said needs to be taken seriously.

De Blasio maintains that this phenomenon is more common among educators than it is among other city employees. Is he right? And if so, what are the implications for assessing sexual misconduct claims made by educators, in general?

No one disputes the data. Between July 2013 and the end of 2017, 471 complaints of sexual harassment were made by the DOE, but only seven, or 1.5 percent, were substantiated.

Responding to the data, Mayor de Blasio said, “On many fronts, we get a certain number of complaints that are not real.” He’s right. This is obviously true of accusations made against priests as well, though anyone who voices this concern is stigmatized for doing so.

De Blasio continued, asserting that “it is a known fact that unfortunately there’s been a bit of a hyper-complaint dynamic sometimes for the wrong reason. So I think that has inflated the numbers.” Right again. Ditto for priests. How many times have we seen false accusations that are purely expressions of vindictiveness?

“I can’t give you the sociological reason,” the mayor said,

but, he reasoned, "it far transcends any one type of infraction or complaint. It is a generalized culture we have to address where people use the complaint process for reasons other than a legitimate complaint." He is thrice right. To anyone who has honestly tracked the issue of priestly sexual abuse, this sounds awfully familiar.

The mayor then said we need to address "something that's different at DOE than at a lot of other places. And it's a pretty well-known thing in the education world. Some people inappropriately make complaints for other reasons, not just—I'm not even sure it's ever about sexual harassment. But it is unfortunately part of the culture." Grand slam.

De Blasio is on to something real. It may be that educators, given their inflated egos (as compared to sanitation workers, bus drivers, cops, et al.) are more likely to seek revenge against their superiors, or colleagues, if they sense they have been treated unjustly in the workplace. After spending 20 years teaching, ranging from the 2nd grade through graduate school, I can vouch for the plausibility of this observation.

If false accusations in education circles are not an anomaly in real time, they are less an irregularity when considering allegations that took place decades ago. This is the problem with the "look-back" provision of the Child Victims Act that is before the New York State legislature; it allows a one-year window to bring suit against an offender no matter when it occurred. How can we honestly assess past claims, especially given the very real possibility that they are grounded in revenge?

Importantly, the "look-back" provision does not entail young students making claims against an adult teacher: it involves adults making accusations against adults (many of whom are deceased). Regrettably, as we have often seen, old charges made by alleged victims of priests are often fueled by anger against the Catholic Church (usually because of its teachings

on marriage and the family), having little or nothing to do with the accused.

This speaks to the merit of de Blasio's remarks. He is arguing that in too many instances, charges of sexual misconduct are a foil for something more sinister, such as settling old scores. In the case of the Catholic Church, the "pay-back" phenomenon—frequently driven by rapacious lawyers—is all too real.

If the Child Victims Act were to focus exclusively on prospective offenses, few would complain. It is the "look back" provision that is fraught with injustice. It should be excised from the bill being debated in Albany.

CAN A PRIEST BE HOUSE CHAPLAIN AGAIN?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the controversy over the House Chaplain:

The resignation of Father Pat Conroy as House Chaplain came after he met with Rep. Paul Ryan, a Catholic Republican, two weeks ago; the priest says Ryan asked him to resign. It appears that Ryan felt Father Conroy was getting too political in his job. According to Rep. Gerry Connolly, a Catholic Democrat, "For a lot of members, the outrage is personal, and it's not about Catholicism."

That being the case, I saw no role for the Catholic League: anti-Catholicism had nothing to do with this controversy. But now things have changed.

Rep. Mark Walker, an ordained Baptist minister and a Republican, said he hopes the new House Chaplain will be somebody who "has adult children" who can "connect with the bulk of the body here." That obviously would preclude most Catholic priests since only a few are married. The congressman is now walking back his remark, saying he meant to say that whoever fills this post should "have experience in dealing with family issues."

This would not be a big issue if there were no history of anti-Catholicism among some Protestant congressmen. But there is.

In 1999-2000, I got into a protracted fight with House Republicans when Father Timothy O'Brien, who was being considered for the post of House Chaplain, became the victim of a vicious smear campaign launched by some evangelicals; he would have been the first Catholic to assume the duties as House Chaplain. He was rejected by the House leadership though the issue remained unresolved.

The bullying of the Catholic League by some Republicans, led by House Speaker Dennis Hastert and House Majority Leader Dick Armey, was relentless. But we fought back and they lost. On March 23, 2000, Father Daniel P. Coughlin was named the first Catholic to become House Chaplain.

Rep. Connolly is rightly upset with Rep. Walker's remark, branding it "anti-Catholic," but the former seminarian carries his own baggage into this debate.

In 2008, when Connolly was running for a congressional seat in Virginia, which he ultimately won, he was opposed by Keith Fimian, a Republican. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee (DCCC) accused Fimian of "rolling back women's rights." It cited as evidence that Fimian was a member of Legatus, an organization of Catholic CEOs.

This was a hit job. Legatus is an excellent Catholic

organization founded and run by Tom Monaghan, who started Domino's Pizza. It has plenty of women members and zero history of misogyny.

When this unseemly attack on Fimian occurred, I said that although Connolly was not responsible for the DCCC smear, he was the clear beneficiary of it, and should therefore "tell the DCCC to cease and desist with the Catholic bashing immediately." He never did.

There is no role for anti-Catholicism in politics. This means that no priest should ever be disqualified for the House Chaplain position because he is celibate. It must also be said that there is no role for hypocrisy in dealing with such matters.

TIME TO ACT ON NOMINEE TO FEDERAL BENCH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the status of a nominee to the federal bench:

Over four months ago, President Trump nominated Wisconsin attorney Gordon Giampietro to a seat on the federal district court. It is being held up because Wisconsin Senator Tammy Baldwin has failed to turn in her blue slip on his nomination. Giampietro has unfairly come under fire for simply voicing the Catholic understanding of marriage and the family.

I am asking Senator Chuck Grassley, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to begin hearings on Giampietro's nomination. He does not have to wait until Baldwin acts (that is because the requirement that the Trump administration

consult with both home senators has been met.)

To read my letter to the senator, click [here](#).

Contact Grassley's communications director:
michael_zona@grassley.senate.gov

ARE RELIGIOUS GAYS SUICIDAL?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue, who holds a Ph.D. in sociology, comments on an article on gays, religion, and suicide:

Four researchers with Ph.D.s have published an article in the *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* titled, "Association of Religiosity With Sexual Minority Suicide Ideation and Attempt." It seeks to determine the effects of religion on suicidal ideas and attempts at suicide.

The data were culled from a larger study, one taken in 2011 by the University of Texas at Austin's Research Consortium; it collected data on over 21,000 college students aged 18-30.

Consistent with other studies, this one concluded that lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and those who are questioning their sexual identity, have a higher rate of suicidal ideas and attempts at suicide than heterosexuals. But it breaks with most other studies on an important point: it asserts that gays who take their religion seriously are more likely to have suicidal thoughts, and are more likely to attempt suicide, than those who are not religious.

Most studies show an inverse relationship between how religious a person is and the likelihood of being suicidal. In one of the most impressive research undertakings to date,

cited by the authors, it was found that “adults who attended religious worship at least once a month had lower odds of attempting suicide over the next 10 years compared with those who did not attend, and individuals who sought spiritual comfort had lower odds of suicide ideation for 10 years compared to people who were not spiritual.”

Similarly, in Austria, a noted study found that lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) individuals “with a religious affiliation had lower odds of attempting suicide than LGB adults who were not affiliated, and those who felt a greater sense of belongingness to their religious organization were less likely to endorse suicide ideation.”

Even more important, “LGB individuals who left their religion to resolve the conflict between their sexual orientation and religious affiliation had greater odds of attempting suicide than those with unresolved conflict.”

Unfortunately, the authors fail to probe how seriously this undercuts the popular notion that once a gay person “liberates” himself from religious strictures, he will be at peace with himself. Just the opposite appears to be true, at least from this study. Falling back on oneself, especially during times of adversity, can be stressful, if not dangerous.

The most controversial finding by the four university researchers, as already indicated, reveals that gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and questioning individuals “do not experience the benefits of religiosity’s protective association against suicide ideation and attempt.”

From this conclusion, the researchers contend that faith-based organizations “may not be appropriate for LGBTQ individuals in distress, especially when religion may be a contributing element in distress for LGBTQ individuals.” But their data, as the authors readily concede, are contradicted by other studies (in Austria those who left their religion experienced worse

problems). It is thus quite a leap to conclude that faith-based organizations do more harm than good.

The undercurrent of bias that is evident in this study is affirmed when the researchers maintain that “two of the world’s most common religions, Christianity and Islam, largely condemn homosexuality as a sin,” and are therefore a large part of the problem.

Astonishingly, they do not cite Judaism, which was the first world religion to condemn homosexuality, and from which Christianity and Islam drew upon copiously in crafting their teachings on marriage and the family.

More bias can be detected by considering a remark made by John R. Blosnich, one of the four authors. He spoke to the Huffington Post about the problem facing religious-minded gays, commenting, “It can be very scary to be caught in a space where your religion tells you that you are a ‘sinner’ just for being who you are.”

He should identify which religion he is talking about. It is certainly not true of Catholicism: homosexuals are regarded as children of God, the same way heterosexuals are. Why this needs to be said at all is troubling as this teaching is not new. But to those who want to put a negative tag on Christianity, it makes sense to distort the truth.

If a heterosexual commits adultery, he is no more condemned for being straight than a homosexual who practices homosexuality is for being gay. It is the behavior—adultery and homosexuality—that counts as a sin, not sexual orientation.

One of the findings that the researchers uncovered deserves more attention than they allow. They found that “questioning individuals had the highest prevalence of recent suicide ideation (16.4%) and bisexual students had the highest prevalence of lifetime attempts (20.3%).”

The authors do not speculate why this is so. But if there is one thing that those who question their sexual identity have in common with bisexuals—and this is not true of gay men and lesbians—it is their tentative status. Who are they?

Living with this kind of indeterminacy may explain their desperate condition. It may also suggest that programs that encourage young people to experiment—to find out whether they are straight or gay—may actually be creating a kind of sexual dissonance that is harmful to their wellbeing. Regrettably, this is currently going on in some schools, the effect of which is to promote a serious identity crisis.

Those who question their sexual identity deserve our compassion, as well as our assistance. What they don't need is further experimentation. The fact that so many young people are caught up in this quandary today is a tribute to the postmodernist belief that denies the existence of nature.

Fatuously, they hold that all human behavior is a social construction. This is not only unscientific—it is an ideological contention—it leads to many wrongheaded policies. It is also the driving force behind the problems incurred by boys who think they are girls, and vice versa.

Of course, the central problem remains, and it is independent of religious practice and affiliation: Why are gays more suicidal than heterosexuals? There are plausible explanations, none of which comport with the ideological leanings of the authors of this study.

Is there a link between promiscuity and suicide, and are gays more promiscuous than heterosexuals? The answer to both questions is an unqualified yes.

In a 2004 article published in the same journal as the study by the four authors, it found that girls who are sexually active are almost three times more likely to attempt suicide than girls who abstain. For boys, those who are sexually

active are eight times more likely to attempt suicide. A more recent study published in the *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* established a strong correlation between casual sex and depression among teenagers.

According to practicing psychotherapist Zev Ballen, "The correlation between sexual promiscuity, depression, and suicide is very clear. Multitudes of people are attempting to fill up with sex—this breeds guilt, self-hatred, emptiness and shame." Yet one strains to find researchers and educators who are willing to admit that promiscuity is a gateway to self-destructive behaviors.

The problem of promiscuity in the gay community is particularly acute. In a brutally honest article last year in the Huffington Post, journalist Michael Hobbes wrote that "Gay people are now, depending on the study, between 2 and 10 times more likely than straight people to take their own lives. We're twice as likely to have a major depressive episode." It is for reasons such as this that gay activist Larry Kramer once said there is no such thing as a gay lifestyle—it's a deathstyle.

"In a survey of gay men who recently arrived in New York City," Hobbes says, "*three-quarters* suffered from anxiety or depression, abused drugs or alcohol or were having risky sex—or some combination of the three." (His italics.) Which begs the question: Why are most gay men who move to New York City unable to live a normal life? Heterosexuals seem to have little problem making the adjustment. Hobbes provides an answer, and it is one that needs to be taken seriously.

Hobbes maintains that "Despite all the talk of our 'chosen families,' gay men have fewer close friends than straight people or gay women." This speaks volumes about the lonely lifestyle that so many gay men experience, calling into serious question their ability to form long-lasting bonds.

Consider what one young man, Adam, cited by Hobbes, said about his coming out. "I went to West Hollywood because I thought that's where my people were. But it was really horrifying. It's made by gay adults, and it's not welcoming for gay kids. You go from your mom's house to a gay club where a lot of people are on drugs and it's like, this is my community? It's like a f***ing jungle."

Adam has touched on something real: real communities don't act this way. What he is describing is a constellation of fully atomized individuals, not a community where social bonds thrive. This matter needs to be studied more fully, but for political reasons it will not be.

How can it be that at a time of growing acceptance of gay rights so many gays are unhappy? The conventional wisdom, one widely shared by the media and in the schools, is that the legalization of gay marriage, and its acceptance by the public, would lead to an overall increase in the wellbeing of gays. It may sound plausible, but there is no evidence to support this outcome.

Indeed, as Hobbes shows, "In the Netherlands, where gay marriage has been legal since 2001, gay men remain three times more likely to suffer from a mood disorder than straight men, and 10 times more likely to engage in 'suicidal self-harm.'" It's no different in Sweden, the sexual Shangri-La of elites. The Swedes have had civil unions since 1965, and gay marriage since 2009, but "men married to men have triple the suicide rate of men married to women."

Were gays better off in the closet than out? As Hobbes points out, "A study published in 2015 found that rates of anxiety and depression were higher in men who had recently come out than in men who were still closeted." This is not a brief to force gays back into the closet, but it is a wake-up call to those who think that the decline in stigma redounds to better psychological health for gays.

It must be stressed that promiscuity, while endemic among gay men in more recent times, was not always so. Kinsey found that homosexuals were less promiscuous than heterosexuals. Even as late as 1960, researchers were finding that homosexuals were relatively sexually inactive. But once the sexual revolution hit stride in the 1960s, sexual experimentation increased among men and women, straight and gay. So did STDs.

It is promiscuity that is the biggest threat to those who practice it, not social stigma or religious strictures. But many elites in the health profession and higher education are in a state of denial over this verity, and those who know better are too often intimidated from speaking the truth. Until this changes, there will be little or no progress in reversing the experience of many gay men.

CARDINAL PELL'S HEARINGS WERE AN EYE-OPENER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on what happened at the recent judicial hearings of Cardinal George Pell:

One week from today, Australian Magistrate Belinda Wallington will decide whether the case against Cardinal George Pell merits a jury trial. She is already on record noting the inconsistencies in the testimony of his accusers, about which the prosecutor readily admits to as well. But both have indicated that any discrepancies could be sorted out in a trial, which suggests that the process will go forward.

However, if there is an honest rendering of what happened at the recent hearings (March 5-March 29), that would bode well

for Cardinal Pell.

The following summary of the hearings was prepared by Rick Hinshaw, the league's director of communications. To read it click [here](#).

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AGAIN UNDER ATTACK IN CALIF.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest assault on religious freedom in California:

California State Assembly lawmakers are at it again.

No legislative session is complete, it seems, without some radical lawmakers launching an attack on the First Amendment rights of religious institutions and people of faith.

This year's version, AB 2943— the Consumer Legal Remedies Act—was passed by the Assembly April 19, and now goes to the Senate. The bill ostensibly targets “conversion therapy” in treating those with same-sex attraction. But it is written so broadly, notes the California Catholic Conference, that it “leaves even simple religious speech on same-sex attraction or activities open to legal action and impinges on the basic human right of freedom of religion.”

It could be used against licensed counselors treating consenting adults, as well as clergy and religious organizations that teach that homosexuality is wrong, and that marriage is between one woman and one man. It could even be used, as some constitutional attorneys have pointed out, to target bookstores that sell publications challenging gender

identity ideology.

Lest anyone doubt the anti-religious nature of this bill, consider the history of its sponsor, Assembly member Evan Low. Chair of the legislature's LGBT Caucus, in 2016 he sponsored a bill to deny state funds for colleges that do not comply with state policies regarding LGBT students. With utter contempt for religious freedom, he called schools that seek a religious exemption from these policies "the worst of the worst in terms of institutions that discriminate."

Now he is advancing a bill that the Pacific Justice Institute calls "a diabolical attempt to stifle real debate and limit personal choices."

We stand with the California Catholic Conference, and with all true friends of religious liberty, in urging its defeat.

LIBERALS KILLED E.R.A., NOT "RELIGIOUS RIGHT"

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today's *New York Times*:

The April 20 editorial in the *New York Times* on the Equal Rights Amendment (E.R.A.) is flawed in several ways. It is not the "religious right" that is responsible for the failure of this amendment, it is liberals. The editorial demonizes the "religious right" for "fearmongering," when, in fact, it was liberal women who fought the E.R.A. for decades.

If the E.R.A. wins the support of two more states, it will have the 38 needed for ratification (the male-dominated

Congress overwhelmingly passed it in 1972), though it may not survive a legal challenge: when advocates of the E.R.A. failed to muster 38 states in 1972, Congress extended the deadline for seven years, and then again for another three.

The clock has long run out, so it is debatable whether getting the needed three-fourths of the states to approve will count 36 years after the measure failed for the third time. Moreover, five of the states that voted for it later rescinded their vote, thus complicating matters even further.

Legalities aside, the *Times* editorial fails to tell the truth about the evolution of the E.R.A. Proof of the following account is detailed in my 1985 book, *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union*, published by Transaction Press.

The idea that women should have the identical rights afforded men was first broached in 1916, and in 1923 the E.R.A. was proposed by the National Women's Party. Working against it were feminists who objected to identical rights, led by Eleanor Roosevelt. She said women needed special protection against hazardous and "demeaning" occupations, jobs that only men should have to do. Her opposition proved to be successful, though the measure would later resurface.

When the E.R.A. was defeated in the Senate in July 1946, the ACLU was delighted: mission accomplished. The ACLU member who worked the hardest to defeat it was Dorothy Kenyon, known as a "radical" judge; she chaired the ACLU's Committee on Women's Rights.

In the 1950s, the ACLU pulled out all the stops to defeat what it called the "so-called 'equal rights amendment' (for women)." The ACLU opposed it because of "the danger that it would destroy the power to enact differential legislation granting equality in fact (as distinguished from mathematical identity)." The amendment was opposed by most of the trade

unions (both women's and men's) as well as the League of Women Voters. Even the American Association of University Women was opposed to the "liberating" amendment.

The ACLU acknowledged at the time that there was some residue of discrimination against women, but "only the remnants of feudalism remain," making moot the need for an amendment. "Even the practice of unequal pay for equal work, a world-wide phenomenon extremely interesting in its psychological motivations," the ACLU said, "is nothing but a universally bad habit." Even Phyllis Schlafly, who fought the E.R.A. in the 1970s, never went that far.

All through the 1960s, while the ACLU was demanding equal rights for blacks, Indians, Hispanics, migrant farm workers, the poor, students, the mentally ill, draft dodgers, the Klan, Nazis, the mentally ill, and prisoners, it fought the E.R.A. In fact, Kenyon argued that the 14th Amendment was sufficient for women. Then, like a lightning bolt out of the sky, Kenyon switched positions, leading the ACLU to support the E.R.A. in September 1970.

Schlafly mobilized conservatives to oppose the E.R.A. in the 1970s, but it was not conservatives who voted against it in New York and New Jersey. When the measure was put to a vote in 1975, after the male-dominated lawmakers in the two states voted for it, the measure was soundly defeated. Linda Greenhouse of the *New York Times* wrote that it was women, not men, who were responsible for the outcome.

The role that feminists played in killing the E.R.A. is not something that liberals want to talk about. They would rather demonize the "religious right."

The *Times* looks even more hypocritical when it says that while there are laws granting equal rights to women, "The E.R.A. would add an extra layer of legal protection for women—and men—against discrimination." Yet when it comes to laws

offering a new round of legal protection for the unborn, or for white men victimized by affirmative action, the same *New York Times* says we have enough laws on the books for them.

If we are to have an honest discussion on the E.R.A., we will have to turn to sources other than the *New York Times* and the ACLU.

MoMA GIVEN “DUNG ON VIRGIN MARY” ART

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a gift to the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA):

Hedge fund tycoon Steve Cohen no longer wants to keep his famous anti-Catholic art, “The Holy Virgin Mary,” so he gave it to MoMA. That was a predictable choice: the museum likes to insult Catholics. This masterpiece, by Chris Ofili, features elephant dung smeared on his portrait of Our Blessed Mother, along with pictures of vaginas and anuses. The media almost never mention the porn.

During Holy Week in 2009, MoMA featured the film, “The Pope’s Toilet,” a movie by two Uruguayans. It was more stupid than vile, though the *New York Times* was delighted to report that it was an “oblique dig” at the Catholic Church (it prefers more direct hits). We checked at the time to see if Muslims were treated to anti-Islamic fare at MoMA during Ramadan, or if Jews were treated to anti-Jewish art on Yom Kippur, but, alas, we came up empty.

In 2011, MoMA acquired a video, “A Fire in My Belly,” showing large ants crawling all over Jesus on the Cross. The

Smithsonian Institution, which first hosted this gem, withdrew it following a protest by the Catholic League.

The “dung on the Virgin Mary” classic set off a furor when it was shown at the Brooklyn Museum of Art in 1999; it was part of the “Sensation” exhibit. The protest was launched by the Catholic League, and supported by New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani. I led a demonstration in front of the museum, handing out “Vomit Bags” to those waiting in line. I was responding to a museum official who said the exhibition could make someone sick. I agreed, noting that puke can be slippery.

The media, which is opposed to bigotry, save for anti-Catholic expressions of it, took the side of the museum. Some tried to justify Ofili’s work by saying that Nigerians consider it honorific to use elephant dung in their artwork. But he was not a Nigerian (his parents were): he was a Brit. Moreover, when I asked a well-educated Nigerian about this alleged tradition, he got indignant, saying those who make such statements are racists. I didn’t dare ask him about the Nigerian meaning of the vaginas and anuses adorning works of art.

The Catholic League objected to the Brooklyn Museum of Art hosting this event for the same reason it objected to the Smithsonian exhibit years later: Catholic taxpayers were forced to underwrite it. On the “Today” show, I said of the former exhibit, “There are a lot of fat cat bigots who don’t like Catholics in this country—let them sponsor it. But if the government cannot sponsor my religion, and it shouldn’t, it shouldn’t be in the business of allowing people to bash my religion.”

MoMA not only disgraces itself by showcasing the “dung on the Virgin Mary,” it looks more like a third-class storefront in a seedy neighborhood, one that wallows in snuff art.

If MoMA wants to put it anywhere, I would advise erecting it

in one of the restrooms. That way the vomit can be flushed down the toilet.

Contact: pressoffice@moma.org

CHRISTOPHOBES ATTACK CHICK-FIL-A

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest example of Christophobia:

It is the fastest growing phobia in the nation. Christophobia. To be sure, the fear of Christians is not overcoming America, but it has unquestionably overcome a large swath of non-believers, or those who profess no religious belief. Within this segment of the population, there are the indifferent at one end, and the haters at the other end.

If there is any doubt that the haters are growing, consider the overheated reaction by the *New Yorker* to a company that sells chicken sandwiches. Journalist Dan Piepenbring accuses Chick-fil-A of “carpet bombing” New York City. What did it do to merit such an accusation? It opened its fourth store in the Big Apple.

Why the ballistic response? The company is owned by practicing Christians. For instance, they believe marriage should be between a man and a woman. What else? That’s about it.

What few acknowledge is that Chick-fil-A practices what it preaches in ways that have nothing to do with politics. Before Christmas 2017, thousands were stranded in Atlanta on a Sunday evening because of a massive power outage. Chick-fil-A, which

observes Sunday by closing, quickly reopened to feed travelers. After the shootings at a gay club in Orlando, Pulse, the "gay-hating" franchise opened on a Sunday to feed those waiting in line to give blood. And on a regular basis, it donates a ton of food to the homeless.

But none of this matters to the Bill de Blasio of the world. Indeed, the New York City mayor called for a boycott of Chick-fil-A when it opened in New York in 2016. Ironically, the Christian company that he hates winds up feeding the increasing number of homeless that his policies create.

What is driving the hatred of Chick-fil-A is the fear that its traditional moral values may prove inspiring.

The Left has only one God: power. That is what defines it. To the extent that Chick-fil-A inspires people to adopt its values, it is a threat to radical secularists. Moreover, survey data have repeatedly shown that a very large portion of the "nones," those who answer "none" when asked about their religious affiliation, are on the Left. They see Christian activists as a threat. Jews are too secular to begin with, and Muslims are too small to matter. So they focus on Christians.

Last year, a survey from Baylor University found that 31 percent of the "nones" identified Christians as a "danger to our safety." Less than half that number said the same about Muslims. Obviously, there has been no rash of Christians assaulting the "nones," or anyone else, so the fear is not based in reality. But it is a perfect example of Christophobia, which is spreading like a disease among a large segment of secularists.

What the "nones" need is conversion therapy. This is not about converting them to Christianity, although that would be an ideal outcome, it is about getting them to stop with their irrational fear of Christians. What makes their fear so patently irrational is the fact that Christians, as evidenced

by Chick-fil-A, are more likely to help them than hurt them.

CARDINAL PELL'S ORDEAL CONTINUES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest court proceedings against Cardinal George Pell:

On April 17, Magistrate Belinda Wallington listened to the prosecutor and defense attorney make their final statements on allegations against Cardinal George Pell; the case against him involves the sexual abuse of minors, all of which allegedly occurred decades ago. To read our analysis of the charges, click [here](#).

Pell's attorney, Robert Richter, argued that his client, the third-highest ranking Vatican official, is being targeted as the fall guy for crimes that other priests have committed. He attacked Pell's accusers, saying, "Whether they are the product of fantasy or mental problems...or just pure invention...it's in order to punish the representative of the Catholic Church in this country [Australia] for not stopping abuse by others."

Richter said of the accusers that "Their complaints ought to be regarded as impossible and ought to be discharged without batting an eyelid." He also stressed to the judge that Pell did not seek diplomatic immunity in the Holy See, and answered every question that the police asked.

No one in the courtroom doubts that many of the accusations made against Pell are riddled with inconsistencies, some so incredulous that no fair-minded person would ever believe.

Both the prosecutor and the judge seemed to acknowledge as much by saying that these were matters for a jury to decide.

Magistrate Wallington said that unless the credibility and reliability of complainants and witnesses were "annihilated," a jury was warranted. Richter replied, "Or close enough to annihilation to say it would be a waste of public time, effort and money to put the man on trial."

Thus, the ordeal of Cardinal Pell continues. On May 1, Wallington will announce whether there will be a trial.