

# RELIGIOUS LIBERTY TASK FORCE SCARES THE LEFT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the left-wing's reaction to a religious liberty task force

Attorney General Jeff Sessions announces the creation of a Religious Liberty Task Force at the Department of Justice and left-wing activists explode. Nothing he said was incendiary or bigoted, but the remarks of his critics certainly were.

The ACLU, which never recognized the First Amendment's right to religious liberty when it was founded by atheist Roger Baldwin in 1920, accused the Trump administration of "licensing discrimination against LGBT people, women, and religious minorities."

Americans United for Separation of Church and State, which was founded after World War II as an expressly anti-Catholic organization (it was called Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State), said the task force is "designed to advance the Trump administration's twisted and dangerous view of religious freedom, one that uses religion to discriminate and harm others."

GLAAD, the world's largest gay organization that has a history of Catholic bashing, said the task force was "yet another example of the Trump administration's anti-LGBTQ [the "Q" is for Queer, an obvious redundancy] agenda as they seek to weave protections for those seeking anti-LGBTQ religious exemptions into the government."

The Human Rights Campaign, a gay entity co-founded by a child rapist, accused the Trump administration of engaging in a "brazen campaign to erode and limit the rights of LGBTQ people in the name of religion."

NARAL, which was founded in the 1960s to assault the moral authority of the Catholic Church in service to abortion rights, said, "The Trump administration is out to refuse abortion care, birth control access, and LGBTQ-inclusive care to the American people."

Planned Parenthood, founded by a racist, eugenicist and anti-Catholic bigot, called the task force "another license to discriminate against women, LGBTQ people, immigrants, communities of color, and so many more."

What is driving this delirium is the First Amendment: it safeguards religious liberty. The pro-abortion and pro-gay groups have no interest in that right, other than to curtail it.

They stand against the scientific community in insisting that life does not begin at conception, and they stand against nature, and nature's God, in holding that two people of the same sex can marry. Worse, they seek to force their perverse agenda down the throats of the faithful. Which is why we need the Department of Justice's Religious Task Force.

We stand with Archbishop Joseph Kurtz, chairman of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishop's Religious Liberty Committee, in commending the Trump administration for its efforts in securing the constitutional rights of Catholics, and the rights of all the faithful.

---

## **ASSOCIATED PRESS CLAIMS NUNS**

# ARE ABUSED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an AP story on nuns victimized by priests:

They made it sound like a tidal wave. Radio news reports were all agog over angry nuns, inspired by the #MeToo movement, turning on abusive priests. As it turned out, there were just a few.

The hysteria was the work of the Associated Press. It ran a story on nuns who have allegedly been abused by priests; it was picked up by many media outlets across the nation. The reporters, Nicole Winfield and Rodney Muhumuza, made several provocative remarks, and in doing so they went well beyond mere reportage: they editorialized.

They began by citing one nun who claimed that a priest in Italy forced himself on her while hearing her confession. They never identified the alleged victim, nor did they explain why her confession took place in a university classroom. We do know that the alleged offense is not new—it happened nearly 20 years ago.

From this unverifiable anecdote we learn that this nun is “one of a handful worldwide to come forward recently” about this issue. We later learn that “about a half dozen sisters” in Chile have stepped forward with their stories. Such a small number would give most journalists pause, but not these ones.

The AP reporters say that their “examination” of nuns being abused by priests extends to Europe, Africa, South America, and Asia. What investigation? When did it start and when did it finish? There are approximately 700,000 nuns worldwide. How many did these reporters interview? How did they decide whom to interview? Or did they simply Google some old news stories? They never say.

Why did they choose to investigate nuns, and no one else? They cite recent news stories about Cardinal Theodore McCarrick as having brought the Catholic Church back into the news on this subject. Can we expect a similar “investigation” of Bollywood females working in Mumbai now that Les Moonves is all over the news?

The sophomoric nature of this “investigation” is one thing; it is quite another when journalists make the jump from reporting to editorializing. They argue that the problem of nuns being abused by priests is “global and pervasive, thanks to the universal tradition of sisters’ second class status in the Catholic Church and their ingrained subservience to the men who run it.”

If Winfield and Muhumuza want to become op-ed writers, they should resign as reporters and do so. But to inject their own bias into their news stories is indefensible. It is also hypocritical.

Just last December, the *Washington Post* ran a story headlined, “No One Should be Surprised by Journalism’s Sexual Harassment Problem.” The subtitle is particularly apropos: “Women in the Industry Have Long Been Treated as Second-Class Citizens.”

Are the women who work at AP second-class citizens as well, or just the nuns they “investigate”? One thing is for sure: AP has a history of sexual misconduct among its employees. Indeed, in the same article just mentioned, AP is cited as a company where women who work there have filed sexual abuse complaints with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Conveniently, they settled out of court in the 1970s. Do they still settle out of court?

The AP story on the nuns mentions two previous studies on this subject. In 1994, Sr. Maura O’Donohue found that some degree of sexual abuse of nuns by priests occurred in many nations, especially Africa. The Vatican said it was aware of the

African problem, noting that it is “restricted to a certain geographical area.”

More recently, the AP reporters say that a 2013 book, *The Nuns of Sant’ Ambrogio*, is the “most sensational account” ever offered. They say the book is based on “the archives of the Vatican’s 1860s Inquisition trial of abuse, embezzlement, murder and ‘false holiness’ inside a Roman convent.”

That’s true. What the reporters don’t tell the reader is that the book is not about priests abusing nuns. It’s about lesbian nuns. It focuses on Sr. Maria Luisa, who was known as a “sociopath, embezzler, false saint, sexual predator, pathological liar and murderer.” She coerced young nuns into lesbian initiation rites. Not exactly the narrative pushed by the AP reporters.

Many journalists love to report on dirt in the Catholic Church, but who reports on dirt in their own house? No one.

Last December, the *Columbia Journalism Review* mailed surveys to 149 newsrooms asking about their policies governing sexual misconduct. It was sent to human resources directors, senior editors, communications directors, and press officers. The number who responded? Zero.

There is a game being played, and it is scurrilous. The AP has done major stories on sexual abuse in the schools (2007); sexual misconduct in law enforcement (2015); sexual assault by fellow students (2017); sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers (2017); sexual misconduct by state lawmakers (2018); and sexual assault by doctors (2018).

Not until the AP turns its cameras and notepads on journalists, including their own colleagues, will they have any real credibility.

---

# WHO CARES ABOUT STORMY DANIELS?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on public reaction to the relationship between Stormy Daniels and President Trump:

Who cares about Stormy Daniels? The media care. Indeed, they are obsessed with the story. They are also angry: they are angry that the public doesn't care. Nor does the public care about the tapes that President Trump's former lawyer has about Trump's alleged sexual encounter with a former Playboy model.

How to account for this disparate reaction?

The elite media, as Stanley Rothman, S. Robert Lichter and Linda S. Lichter demonstrated, are much more liberal than most Americans. The Smith College political scientist and the Columbia University researchers co-authored the 1986 book, *The Media Elite*, showing how little the media titans have in common with the average person. The book laid the groundwork for future scholarship on this subject. Every study done on the media since that time has confirmed their conclusion.

The media elite take a particularly more liberal perspective on sexual matters than is true nationwide. Which begs the question: Why are they the ones exercised about Stormy, and not the public?

The media elite's fixation on Stormy, led by CNN, is easy to understand: they hate Trump. Anything he does well, they either underreport or seek to discredit. When he screws up, they highlight it. What is less easy to understand is the nonchalant attitude that the public has for Stormy and Trump.

It is not as though the American people don't like a sexy story. After all, 22 million tuned in to see the "60 Minutes" interview with Stormy in early April. The problem for the media is that this issue never caught. Indeed, the show was more like a one-night stand. Proof: Two weeks after the interview, a Quinnipiac poll showed that the alleged affair was considered an important issue by 23% of American voters; 73% didn't care.

The media keep trying, but the results are the same. For example, the *New York Times Magazine* recently ran a big spread on Stormy's lawyer, Michael Avenatti. According to Brent Bozell and Tim Graham of the Media Research Center, Avenatti has appeared on over 200 TV news shows and late-night talk shows. Again, this is a shot in the arm for voyeur-like entertainment, but the story still has no legs.

Why the public yawn? Ironically, the very ones who are going ballistic over this story—the media elite—helped to create the culture that accounts for the public's indifference.

Beginning in the 1960s, many institutions embraced the tenets of moral relativism. The elementary and secondary schools adopted situation ethics. The colleges and universities promoted the moral equivalence ethos of multiculturalism—all cultures are equal. The mainline Protestant denominations abandoned traditional teachings on sexuality, and the Catholic Church let its guard down as well.

The media went from "My Three Sons" to "Three's Company" to "Will and Grace" and "Modern Family." Movies that once received an "R" rating for salacious fare now merit a PG or PG-13 score. Groping while dancing was never seen on Dick Clark's "American Bandstand," now it is boldly featured on MTV and BET.

No one ever used foul language on TV—now it is commonplace. From the Oscars to White House Correspondents' dinners,

obscenities are the rule. Feminist comedians invoke the “c-word” against women they loathe, and those who object are scolded for doing so. A man who thinks he is a woman is seen as a hero, while those who think he’s nuts are branded bigots.

If there was one cultural vehicle that softened up the public to accept what had only yesterday been seen as taboo, it was the Phil Donahue show. For more than a quarter century nationwide, beginning in 1970, he introduced America to one sexual deviant after another, always maintaining that his guests were very much like the rest of us. Those who objected were told how close-minded, moralistic, and judgmental they were. Over time, with the help of many other cultural elites, it seeped in.

The result? The only moral judgment the dominant culture allows is when an act is nonconsensual. This amoral conception of liberty—what may be called the BDSM approach to morality—is now part of our collective conscience, firmly rooted in the public’s mind. It explains our moral passivity.

After working so hard to craft this culture of moral indifference, the media elite are now angry at the public for not sharing their angst over Stormy and Trump. They need to check their notes.

Was Stormy a victim? No. End of story. Be careful what you wish for.

---

## **PENNSYLVANIA AG’S DECEITFUL**



# NOTE TO POPE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a letter sent by the Pennsylvania Attorney General to Pope Francis:

On July 25, Pennsylvania Attorney General Josh Shapiro sent a letter to Pope Francis that smacks of deceit.

“A comprehensive investigation by the Office of Attorney General found widespread sexual abuse of children and a systemic coverup by leaders of the Catholic Church,” Shapiro said. He was referring to the six dioceses in Pennsylvania that were the subject of a grand jury investigation.

Shapiro then takes aim at his critics, whom he accuses of trying to “silence the victims.” He even accuses two unnamed “leaders in the Catholic Church in Pennsylvania...[who] are behind these efforts to silence the victims and avoid accountability.”

Shapiro’s account is scurrilous.

There was no “comprehensive investigation.” If there were, then all the parties to the probe would have been given the opportunity to respond. But they have not. Indeed, this is why many in the clergy are protesting the release of the grand jury report.

No evidentiary hearings of the priests named in the report have occurred. Accusations made against them are clearly rebuttable, but Shapiro has shown no interest in allowing the priests the opportunity to do so. Moreover, there are many unchallenged accusations, some of which are patently false.

Is Shapiro aware that the Pennsylvania Constitution includes guarantees for the protection of one’s reputation? Is he ready to defend himself?

For the record, there has been no attempt to silence alleged

victims, but there certainly has been a well-orchestrated attempt, led by Shapiro, to silence his critics. In fact, that is what his letter is designed to do. Does he really think the Holy Father is going to accept his unsubstantiated criticisms of Pennsylvania priests and bishops?

Shapiro clearly has an animus toward the Catholic Church, one that is easy to prove.

Why has he singled out the Catholic Church for past instances of sexual abuse, and no one else? Why hasn't he investigated the public schools—no institution in the nation has had a bigger problem with the sexual abuse of minors than the public schools. In fact, Pennsylvania has a particularly bad record.

Why hasn't Shapiro investigated coaches? Why hasn't he investigated psychologists and psychiatrists? Why hasn't he investigated therapists and counselors? Why hasn't he investigated camp officials?

Why hasn't Shapiro investigated rabbis? Why hasn't he investigated ministers? Why hasn't he investigated imams?

Why has Shapiro only investigated Catholic clergymen? This is where he is in big trouble: doing so is a clear violation of the First Amendment.

Just recently, the United States Supreme Court ruled in favor of a baker who refused to customize a wedding cake for two men on the grounds that his First Amendment rights were violated by the Colorado Civil Rights Commission. "The commission's hostility was inconsistent with the First Amendment's guarantee that our laws be applied in a manner that is neutral toward religion," said Justice Anthony Kennedy for the majority.

There is nothing neutral about Shapiro's approach to Catholicism. Indeed, he is no friend of the Catholic Church. He previously declared war on the Little Sisters of the Poor,

trying to force them to pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plans. And now he is warring on priests.

Shapiro says in his letter to Pope Francis that he had the opportunity to welcome him to St. Charles Borromeo Seminary in 2015. Well, I had a chance to meet the pope as well, in Washington, D.C. I am confident the Holy Father will now welcome my letter to him checkmating Shapiro's deceitful ploy.

---

## **POPEYES PULLS AD FROM SAMANTHA BEE'S SHOW**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on last night's sponsors of "Full Frontal":

Samantha Bee's July 25th show, "Full Frontal," lost a sponsor from last week's episode: Popeyes. Every week we choose one sponsor to lobby, asking the company to discontinue advertising on her show.

On July 19th, I wrote to Alexandre Santoro, president of Popeyes Louisiana Kitchen, asking him not to advertise on her show. On the same day, we provided those on our news release list the email contact information for Popeyes, asking them to do the same.

Popeyes now joins Verizon, Procter and Gamble, Wendy's, Ashley HomeStore, and the Wonderful Company, as corporations that have discontinued advertising on Bee's show.

It was her assault on Catholicism, and on the president's daughter—she called Ivanka Trump the "c-word"—that ignited our response.

This week we have chosen to target Burger King. I will be writing to the CEO today. It is imperative that you contact him as well.

Contact Burger King CEO Daniel Schwartz: [dschwartz@whopper.com](mailto:dschwartz@whopper.com)

---

## MORE SURVEY LIES ABOUT ABORTION

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest survey purporting to show public support for *Roe v. Wade*:

An NBC/Wall Street Journal poll released July 23 says that 71% of American voters believe that the 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade* legalizing abortion should not be overturned. It follows a Gallup poll of July 12 that found that 64% say *Roe* should not be overturned.

Both surveys are deceitful: the “yes/no” simplified choices that respondents had to pick from fail to tap the extent to which the public really approves of the Supreme Court decision. That ruling permits abortion-on-demand, meaning it sets no restrictions on *when or why* abortion should be legal.

When respondents are asked whether abortion should be legal or illegal, in all likelihood the first thing that comes to mind are worst case scenarios. If it is illegal in every instance, that would mean that in cases involving rape, incest, or the death of the mother—however rare they are—abortion would not be permitted. This is what tugs at the conscience of respondents, and what explains their answer. Nevertheless, it is not an accurate picture of what this issue entails.

As I pointed out July 13, there was a Gallup poll released on June 11 that was more detailed, and therefore honest, on this subject. It asked whether abortion should be legal in all circumstances, just a few circumstances, or not at all. It found that 53% said abortion should be legal in only a few circumstances or in no circumstances. Therefore, a majority of the American people oppose *Roe*. But neither the survey company nor the media reported this fact.

What makes this particularly galling is that NBC/Wall Street Journal researchers know better. Here's the proof.

An NBC/Wall Street Journal poll released in 2013 found that seven in ten Americans believe *Roe* should stand (the same as today). However, when respondents were asked whether there should be any exceptions, here is what the survey found:

Always Legal:	31%
Legal Most of the Time:	23%
Illegal, With Exceptions:	35%
Illegal, No Exceptions:	9%

Those last three figures add up to 67% (2% were undecided).

The *why* question has been answered. Two out of every three Americans reject the unbounded reasons why abortion should be allowed, putting them squarely at odds with *Roe*. But the Wall Street Journal article on this survey (January 22, 2013) never mentioned this fact.

Now to the question of *when*. A Gallup poll released June 13, 2018 asked when abortion should be legal. Here is what it found (the numbers are rounded up):

Should be Legal in First Three Months of Pregnancy:	60%
Should be Legal in the Second Three Months:	28%
Should be Legal in the Final Three Months:	

13%

In other words, support for abortion at any time during pregnancy, which is what *Roe* allows, is very thin.

Put together, the reasons *why* and *when* abortion should be allowed are at odds with the Supreme Court ruling in *Roe*.

It is no wonder that a Gallup poll released in 2015 found that only 34% of Americans were “satisfied” with current abortion policies; 48% were dissatisfied. That’s a pretty big indictment of *Roe*.

Those seeking to make the case that Supreme Court nominee Brett Kavanaugh had better heed the public’s support for *Roe v. Wade* need to stop misrepresenting the truth. Most Americans are conflicted on this subject. Most important, most do not accept what *Roe* permits.

---

## MOTHER TERESA’S ORDER UNDER FIRE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on news stories about the Missionaries of Charity in Kolkata (previously referred to as Calcutta), India:

Mother Teresa’s order, the Missionaries of Charity, has come under fire for allegedly being involved in a baby selling racket in Kolkata. There is little doubt that four babies were sold by a lay woman working with the nuns. But attempts to pin the blame on the nuns are specious.

This story unfolded on June 29 when government officials from social welfare and child protection agencies showed up at

Nirmal Hriday (Tender Hearts), a home for the dispossessed run by the sisters in Ranchi. The proximate cause of their visit was a report that a woman had given birth there on May 1. The mother quickly decided to surrender the boy to the Child Welfare Committee (CWC).

A ward helper at the home, Anima Indwar, and the mother, said they would surrender him to CWC. But this never happened. Instead, Indwar contacted a couple looking to adopt and offered to sell the baby. The biological mother did not want her child, and on May 15 he was given to the couple without registering the adoption.

When an official from CWC began asking questions, Indwar asked the couple to return the child, temporarily, saying she was simply dealing with some "formalities." Indwar then gave the boy back to his mother, without informing the adopted parents. The parents wanted the child back and filed a formal complaint with CWC. This is what triggered the inquiry.

Were the nuns in on this scheme? Indwar reported to Sister Concelia, the nun in charge of the unwed mothers section at Nirmal Hriday. It is alleged that Sister Concelia was complicit in the transaction. But was she?

There is a statement from Indwar saying that Sister Concelia was not present when the baby was given to the adopting couple. Moreover, Indwar admits that she sold the four babies.

In a video statement, Sister Concelia said the following: "I came to know that a baby, delivered in May, was missing when the Child Welfare Committee came to check. We found that the baby had been sold by a staffer." She confronted Indwar.

"When I initially asked the staffer about the baby," Sister Concelia said, "she did not want to tell me anything. It was only when I kept pressing for details that they told me the baby had been sold." Allegedly, some of the money went to a guard, and some to "a sister," though Indwar did not keep any

of it.

Now ask yourself: Why would Sister Concelia press Indwar about the details of the sale of the baby if she were in on the deal? Moreover, Indwar herself admitted that the nun was not present at the time. None of this seemed to matter to the authorities.

When Sister Concelia was questioned by the police, she was not provided with counsel. Reportedly, she admitted playing a role in the transaction. She subsequently acquired a lawyer.

Her attorney says she was set up. Sister Concelia told him she “was forced by the police to give her statement.” Bishop Theodore Mascarenhas, a local auxiliary bishop, went further, saying the police are “treating the whole of Mother Teresa’s organization as a criminal gang.”

Sister Mary Prema Pierick, the head of the Missionaries of Charity, says she is cooperating with the authorities. But she is livid over what she says are the “many myths being spread, information distorted and false news being diffused and baseless innuendos being thrown about regarding the Mother Teresa Sisters.”

Sister Prema is particularly incensed about the police raids on their homes. On July 4, the police seized records and 11 unwed mothers from Nirmal Hriday, and two days later they took 22 children, including a one-month-old baby, from the Shishu Bhawan Home in Hinoo.

What makes these raids so outrageous is that just two weeks prior the CWC described the homes as providing an “excellent environment for the care of children.” However, this matters little to anti-Catholics, the most prominent to emerge so far being author Taslima Nasreen.

Nasreen took the opportunity to indict the entire Missionaries of Charity, and its founder, Mother Teresa. “Mother Teresa



charity home sells babies, it is nothing new. Mother Teresa was involved with many illegal, inhumane, immoral, unethical, unprincipled, wicked, fraudulent, barbaric acts.”

This is a lie. In my 2016 book, *Unmasking Mother Teresa's Critics*, published by Sophia Institute Press, I explored all of these accusations, and more, and found them to be wholly unfair and inaccurate. Those making such charges are uniformly Catholic bashers, most of whom are atheists. Christopher Hitchens was the most famous, and the most discredited, of them all. He never laid a glove on her.

It comes as no surprise that Nasreen is a Catholic basher and an atheist. When asked in 2015 if there is anything wrong about celebrating Christmas, she tweeted, “Yes. I can't celebrate lies. Jesus's mom was not a virgin for sure. And he was no God's son either.” She admitted in 1994 that she was an atheist. Not surprisingly, she was honored three years ago by the Catholic-hating atheists at the Freedom From Religion Foundation.

Among the Indian defenders of the sisters is Mamata Banerjee, Chief Minister of West Bengal and a member of the All India Trinamool Congress. She condemned the “malicious attempts to malign their name.” She blames the Hindu nationalist ruling party, the Bharatiya Janata Party, for targeting the nuns.

Bululai Marandi, founder of the Jharkhand Vikas Morcha party, has accused the government of orchestrating a “media trial.” And most important, the Catholic Bishops Conference of India has condemned the government for pressuring Sister Concelia to give a statement.

Those seeking to indict the Missionaries of Charity have failed to produce the unqualified evidence that has surfaced regarding the culpability of Anima Indwar. Trying to rope the sisters into this scandal is the real scandal.

---

# GAY ROLE IN ABUSE SCANDAL ACKNOWLEDGED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article about gay priests and sexual abuse:

Any honest observer of the priestly sexual abuse scandal knows that the lion's share of the molestation was committed by homosexuals, not pedophiles. Now an online *Washington Post* article by Robert Mickens acknowledges this verity. This is virtually breaking news: the liberal media and pundits have ritualistically called this a pedophile problem.

The most exhaustive study on this issue was done by researchers at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, and they concluded that less than five percent of the predators were pedophiles. Indeed, 81% of the victims were male, and 78% were post-pubescent, meaning that homosexuality—not heterosexuality or pedophilia—was in play.

Mickens writes about the case of Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, the former Archbishop of Washington who allegedly preyed on seminarians. He begins his piece by coming clean on what has been going on all along: "It is the fact that almost all of them concern males—whether they are adolescents, post-pubescent teens or young men."

He then seeks an explanation. His first observation is undeniable: "psychologically healthy gay men do not rape boys or force themselves on other men over whom they wield some measure of power or authority." But then he falls back on the old saw about homophobia causing gay men to become predators.

He blames the Church for adopting policies that "actually

punish seminarians and priests who seek to deal openly, honestly and healthily with their sexual orientation.” What is driving the problem, he says, is “homophobia,” the result of which “keeps gay men in the closet.” His logic is deeply flawed and does not square with the evidence.

Everyone agrees that the heyday of traditionalism in the Catholic Church was the 1950s. Everyone also agrees that traditionalism came under severe attack in the late 1960s, peaking in the 1970s.

The sexual abuse of minors was infinitesimal in the 1950s and exploded in the 1970s. In other words, when gay priests were mostly in the closet, the abuse problem was not an issue. It became one when the Church let down its guard in the 1970s, particularly in the seminaries.

The timeline of the abuse, when most of the problem took place, is not in doubt—the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s. This is the period of the sexual revolution: libertine cultural currents hit every institution in society, including the Catholic Church. To put it differently, this is when “homophobia” came under attack!

This is not a plea for punishing homosexual priests. It is a plea to abide by the policy adopted by Pope Benedict XVI: men with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” should not be welcomed in the seminaries. That stricture has served the Church well since it was adopted in 2005: the decline in new cases of sexual abuse has been dramatic, and is almost non-existent in the United States today.

Two months ago, Pope Francis picked up on this discussion, strongly backing the position of his predecessor. “These tendencies, when they are ‘deeply rooted,’ and the practice of homosexual acts, can compromise the life of the seminary beyond that of the young man himself and his eventual future priesthood.” Well said.

Blaming “homophobia” is a dodge. It is employed as justification for recreating the very milieu that created the problem in the first place. We should never want to return to a time when good heterosexual men left the seminaries because they were surrounded by gay men acting out with impunity.

---

## 25 YEARS AND COUNTING

July 1st marked my 25th anniversary as president and CEO of the Catholic League. It’s been a great run, and I am not about to pack it in. On July 18, I turned 71. Fortunately, God gave me pretty good health and a whole lot of energy.

When I took over in 1993, the league was in financial and organizational ruin. I told the board of directors to give me plenty of rope—don’t try to micromanage me—and if I didn’t produce, then they should yank me. Fortunately, they granted me the authority, and matters quickly turned around.

Why don’t I retire? After all, most of my friends are retired. I stay for one reason: I love what I am doing. I love fighting for justice, and to make right that which is wrong. I also love winning. While we don’t win them all, our track record is clearly better than any comparable organization.

What are we fighting for? Respect. A fair hearing. An equal playing field. That’s about it. What I want is a reasonable opportunity for the Church’s voice to be heard. We don’t have that. Instead, we have to endure a culture that is increasingly secular, irrational, and hateful.

The de-Christianization of Western civilization has not worked out for anyone. To make a fast comparison, consider such social ills as crime, delinquency, divorce, out-of-wedlock

births, drug abuse, suicide, school shootings, homelessness, sexually transmitted diseases, and abortion. Now think about the most Catholic decade in American history—the 1950s—and make the comparison with today. The secularization of America has been an unmitigated disaster.

We have also become an increasingly irrational society. The sad fact is that the most educated persons in our society are also the most irrational. Most of them are white, and the worst among them have postgraduate degrees.

They are the ones who believe that a pregnant woman is not carrying another human life. They are the ones who believe that two men can get married. They are the ones who believe that a male who thinks he is a female is a female. It's all a fiction. If they were independent thinkers, they would be able to think straight. But they are not—they are the victims of indoctrination.

Our society has also become increasingly hateful. It's not enough to disagree anymore—it's important to silence opposing views. It's not enough to speak passionately about issues—it's important to engage in obscene attacks. It's not enough to win on the issues—it's important to personally destroy the opposition.

This is the environment the Catholic Church finds itself in. To be sure, the Church has made some serious mistakes along the way. But if some of our teachers, i.e., the clergy, have failed us, our teachings have not.

The trio of maladies that I mentioned—secularism, irrationality, and hatred—are reflections of what is at bottom a breakdown in community and common sense.

Western civilization has witnessed radical individualism run amuck, destroying the prospect for community, or a collective sense of oneness. That's why America is so divided: our nation is coming apart at the seams, owing in large part to the loss

of social glue that binds us together. As every Catholic should know, it's easy to think of ourselves first if we don't have time for Him.

Common sense is now a rarity, especially among the cultural elite and other big-sky thinkers. Their idea of helping the poor is not to empower them, but to drag the successful down. They work tirelessly to tell us of the harm that smoking does and then inform us in same breath of the need to legalize pot; Marijuana, Si, Marlboro, No. They defend the most pornographic material on TV, the screen, and the Internet, and then condemn the Miss America pageant for the bathing suit competition. They invite the homeless to camp out in coffee shops and are then shocked to learn they destroy the place.

By contrast, Catholicism embraces community and possesses common sense. That alone merits a defense of the Catholic Church. To be exact, it is the job of the Catholic League to help make the Church's voice ascendant again. Somebody has to stand up to the roar of madness that surrounds us, and no entity is better equipped to do so than the Catholic Church.

The founder of the Catholic League, Father Virgil Blum, believed too many Catholics were complacent. That was true when he started in 1973 and it is true today, though it is certainly not true of Catholic League members. You are the ones who energize me.

The Church has weathered many storms before. It's been beleaguered and besieged. It's been subjected to vitriol and violence. Yet it always rebounds. It will again.

There are those who counsel retreat, advising practicing Christians to carve out small enclaves to repair to, essentially withdrawing from the center of the dominant culture. That's a fool's errand.

This is not a time to quit the fight—it's a time to redouble our efforts. Anyone who thinks that things can't get any worse

knows nothing about history.

Count me in. Hope you're in as well.

---

## **POPEYES RUNS ADS ON SAMANTHA BEE'S SHOW**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on last night's TBS show, "Full Frontal":

After airing reruns for three consecutive weeks, "Full Frontal" returned last night with a new episode.

No one will forget what Samantha Bee did on May 30 when she lashed out at the president's daughter, calling her the "c-word." And Catholics will never forget her relentless vile assaults on their faith.

The good news is that the last corporate sponsor we asked to discontinue advertising on Bee's show, The Wonderful Company, which sells Wonderful Pistachios, did not run an ad on Bee's first show back on July 18; it did advertise on her show of June 20, before her hiatus.

In doing so, The Wonderful Company joins several other corporate sponsors that have honored our request: Verizon, Procter and Gamble, Wendy's, and Ashley HomeStore.

On last night's episode, Bee picked up some new sponsors, including Popeyes, the fast food company that was founded in Louisiana. I have written to the president of Popeyes, Alexandre Santoro, asking him to discontinue advertising on her show.

We are asking you to contact Popeyes making the same request.

Contact: [mediainquiries@popeyes.com](mailto:mediainquiries@popeyes.com)