

ANTI-KAVANAUGH EDITORIALS ARE DISHONEST

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on newspapers opposed to Brett Kavanaugh:

The *Los Angeles Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *New York Times* ran editorials today opposing Brett Kavanaugh to be the next U.S. Supreme Court Justice. This is hardly surprising. What is most disturbing about them is their dishonesty: they fail to mention their real reason for opposing him—abortion.

The *Los Angeles Times* says that “We oppose Kavanaugh’s nomination not because of his judicial philosophy,” but because of “lingering doubts” about the allegations and his “evasive and intemperate testimony.”

The *Washington Post* says that when Kavanaugh was chosen by President Trump, he “seemed to be...an accomplished judge whom any conservative president might have picked,” but “given Republicans’ refusal to properly vet Mr. Kavanaugh, and given what we have learned about him during the process, we now believe it would be a serious blow to the court and the nation if he were confirmed.”

The *New York Times* says that “President Trump has no shortage of highly qualified very conservative candidates to choose from, if he will look beyond this first, deeply compromised choice.”

None of the editorials mentioned a word about *Roe v. Wade*, “reproductive rights,” a “woman’s right to choose,” or abortion. Yet it was this issue that galvanized them to oppose Kavanaugh on July 10, the day after Trump chose him to be his nominee. Here is what they said.

“We worry about the future of reproductive freedom” is how the

Los Angeles Times put it. The editorial in the *Washington Post* objected to Kavanaugh's "narrow view of what constitutes an undue burden on a woman's right to end her pregnancy." The *New York Times* left no one wondering what it thought: it ran four op-ed articles bemoaning Kavanaugh's views on abortion.

What makes this so nauseating is the fact that these same papers insist that the Catholic Church is hung up on sex. Nonsense. It is not the Church that is obsessed with sex—it's the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Washington Post*, and, most especially, the *New York Times*. Their refusal to admit why they really oppose Kavanaugh only adds to their deceitfulness.

OPEN LETTER TO MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue is imploring Michigan Attorney General Bill Schuette to launch a grand jury investigation into every elementary and secondary public school in the state

To read his letter, click [here](#).

"SOUTH PARK" CREATORS ARE COWARDS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on last night's episode of Comedy Central's "South Park":

The October 3rd episode of "South Park," titled "A Boy and a Priest," portrayed molesting priests as pedophiles. This is factually inaccurate: almost all the molesters—8 in 10—have been homosexuals. Therefore, the cartoon-victim characters should have been depicted as adolescents, not kids.

In Hollywood, the creators of "South Park," Trey Parker and Matt Stone, are seen as courageous. They are really cowards. It takes courage to tell the truth.

Contact: Steve Albani, Comedy Central's senior VP, Communications: steve.albani@cc.com

PEW POLL ON POPE HAS SOME GOOD NEWS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new poll by the Pew Research Center on Pope Francis:

The pope's popularity has taken a major hit in the U.S., and it is directly traceable to the way he has handled clergy sexual abuse. By a margin of two-to-one, Catholics give Pope Francis negative marks on this issue.

Over the last four years, those who rate the pope's handling of sexual abuse as "excellent" or "good" has dropped from 54% to 31%; 62% now rate his performance as either "fair" or "poor." Only 13% today believe he deserves an "excellent" rating, as compared to 36% who say he deserves a "poor" one.

Even among church-going Catholics, the pope does not fare well: the share who give him positive marks has been cut in half in just three years, dropping from 67% in 2015 to 34% in

2018. His rating among men and women is about the same.

This is not good news for Pope Francis. Surely his refusal to accede to the request by U.S. bishops—strongly supported by Catholics across the spectrum—to investigate how Theodore McCarrick was able to ascend the ranks of the hierarchy—is driving much of the negative perception. Unless the dossier that Rome has on McCarrick (it is said to be thick) is open to scrutiny, the optics are not likely to change.

There is one glimmer of positive news in the survey that is sure to be overlooked in many quarters. The pope's positive rating on the issue of "standing up for traditional values" slipped dramatically from 81% among all Catholics in 2014 to 55% today; his negative numbers jumped from 15% to 35%.

What's so good about that? It suggests that the pope's failure to do a good job handling clergy sexual abuse is seen by Catholics as a reflection of his declining support for traditional moral values.

This matters because dissident Catholics—the ones who want the Church to change its teachings on sexuality in a more liberal fashion—find little support for their agenda among most Catholics. To put it differently, the perception that the pope is not standing up for traditional moral values (the way he is expected to) accounts for the dramatic decrease in his favorability ratings.

The logic is sound. Most homosexual priests (they are responsible for 80% of the problem) practiced restraint in the 1950s, but when the Church relaxed its guard in the 1960s and 1970s, they were given a green light to act out. Add to this the influx of homosexual seminarians during this time—driving good heterosexual men to leave—and the makings of a scandal were all but assured.

Respect for traditional moral values needs the support of

everyone in the Church. Then we will see the progress that Catholics want.

STICKING THEIR NOSES IN CHURCH AFFAIRS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on outside forces trying to manipulate the Catholic Church:

There is a long history of organizations that have nothing to do with the Catholic Church which nonetheless persist in sticking their noses into its internal affairs.

In the last century, the Communist party in the United States sought to infiltrate the Church with apostate homosexual priests. In more recent times, wealthy left-wing activists and foundations have attempted to derail the Church by promoting propaganda campaigns against Church teachings, typically centered on sexuality issues. For instance, the pro-abortion movement was launched by Catholic Church-hating activists who sought to destroy its moral authority.

The most recent manifestation of this invidious effort comes from a constellation of forces called Equal Future. It has taken direct aim at the Synod of Bishops on Young People, the Faith and the Discernment of Vocations, which is meeting in Rome, October 3-28.

According to the director of Equal Future, Tiernan Brady, the purpose of his outfit is “to highlight the damage being done to children and young people” by Church teachings. Brady, who directed the referenda campaigns on gay marriage in Australia and Ireland, is using this opportunity to pressure the Church

to change its teachings on sexuality.

Equal Future consists of many lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) groups. The estimates range from 29 to more than 100 such entities. It includes some of the most prominent LGBT organizations, such as the Human Rights Campaign and the Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD).

More important, it is comprised of gay groups which claim to be Catholic: New Ways Ministry, DignityUSA, and We Are Church are among the best known. They are all dissident groups in rebellion against the Catholic Church, and have practically zero support among Catholics. They wouldn't exist were it not for funding from anti-Catholic organizations such as the Arcus Foundation, an institution that works closely with atheist billionaire and Church hater, George Soros.

In the last ten years, DignityUSA has received well over \$700,000 from the Arcus Foundation. Last year, it gave New Ways Ministry a grant of \$35,000 "to connect the work of pro-LGBT Catholic organizations in every region of the world." In 2009, it gave them almost \$100,000.

It also funds the Women's Alliance for Theology Ethics and Ritual (WATER). Arcus gave it a boatload of cash to "create a cadre of Catholic, lesbian, bisexual and transgender women and their allies that would assume a leadership role within the Catholic community." Earlier in this decade it gave WATER \$70,000. Naturally, Arcus provides grants to Catholics for Choice, the pro-abortion and anti-Catholic entity that receives the bulk of its money from the Ford Foundation.

Arcus has made inroads in Catholic universities as well. It receives its most cooperation from Jesuit institutions such as Fordham University and Fairfield University. For example, Arcus funded a conference series, "More Than a Monologue," that deliberately promoted dissident voices seeking to undermine Catholic teachings on sexuality. Pledges to area

bishops that they would not do so were not honored.

According to a report by the Cardinal Newman Society, this conference sponsored several speakers who questioned Catholic teaching on homosexuality. They argued that the Vatican's "official repression" of gay priests needs to end, and that "the Catholic Church would be much better off if all its priests were having sex with each other." To top things off, they "disputed the necessity of priests for consecration of the Eucharist at Catholic Mass."

The idea that gay priests are repressed is nonsense. Just the opposite is true: Gay-active seminarians and priests have driven more heterosexual men out of the seminaries and the priesthood than anyone can fathom. Moreover, it is diabolical to assert that priests would be better off if they practiced sodomy with each other. Even more pernicious is the assault on the Eucharist. That is what these activists want—a total annihilation of the Catholic Church. It was not always this way.

When Dr. Bernard Nathanson, the famed abortionist who co-founded the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL), started his effort to legalize abortion in 1969, he devised a plan to attack the Catholic Church. Why? He had to. The Church, he readily conceded, was the greatest defender of life. This meant that his pro-abortion agenda could not be realized without discrediting its voice.

Nathanson quickly embarked on a lengthy propaganda campaign that was riddled with lies about Catholicism. We know this to be true because of his conversion: after witnessing pictures of unborn babies—the sonogram had just been invented—he became pro-life. Then he converted to Catholicism. The key point is this: even in his most radical days, Nathanson never sought to assault the Church's sacraments. That's what we are faced with today. It is just that vicious.

There is no justification for any outside organization seeking to subvert the teachings and practices of any world religion. That some of these busy-bodies are tax-exempt foundations, which purport to serve the common good, makes it all the more perverse.

DANA NESSEL'S ANTI-CATHOLICISM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the anti-Catholicism of a candidate in Michigan:

Dana Nessel, a candidate for Attorney General of Michigan, is an activist attorney who has a dangerous record of attacking religious liberty and trashing the religious beliefs of those who disagree with her.

Catholics have been among Nessel's favorite targets. In 2015, the Michigan legislature passed a bill to protect the religious freedom of faith-based foster care and adoption agencies, assuring that they wouldn't be forced to choose between their values and their mission to find homes for children. The bill was supported by the Michigan Catholic Conference.

"If you are a proponent of this type of bill," Nessel fumed, "you honestly have to concede that you just dislike gay people more than you care about the needs of foster care kids." When the bill passed, she declared it "a victory for the hate mongers."

Now, Nessel is promising that if she becomes Michigan's Attorney General she will refuse to defend this religious

freedom law against a pending challenge by the ACLU. She will, in short, place her own ideological biases ahead of the will of Michigan's duly elected state representatives.

Nessel has also attacked the right of Catholic institutions, such as Catholic schools, to require that employees be faithful to Catholic teaching. "If the definition is 'violating Catholic precepts' then you better be consistent about it," she said, "and it has to remain within the confines of federal and state law." In other words, let the government dictate the Catholic Church's employment policies.

Back in 2014, before the U.S. Supreme Court mandated that all states legalize gay marriage, a coalition of religious groups in Michigan—including the Michigan Catholic Conference—filed legal briefs supporting the state's voter-approved ban on same-sex marriage. Nessel trashed all these people of faith as "a radical fringe" engaged in "the demagoguery of hate."

There is indeed a hatred and bigotry evident here. But it is not emanating from Catholics or other religious believers. It is coming from Dana Nessel, who in her ideological extremism smears the Catholic Church and people of faith, and works to deny them their First Amendment right to religious freedom.

LAS VEGAS KILLING STILL STUMPS MEDIA

Catholic League president Bill Donohue discusses the one-year anniversary of the Las Vegas tragedy:

One year after Stephen Paddock went on his rampage, killing 58 people and injuring more than 800, at a Las Vegas concert, the

media are still in a fog trying to explain what happened. Here is how I analyzed it last year, adding a few updated comments.

Pundits on both the right and the left cannot understand why there is no apparent political or religious motive involved in the Las Vegas killings. There doesn't have to be: Paddock was socially ill, a loner whose boredom was relieved by taking risks—flying single-engine planes and engaging in high-stakes gambling. Consistent to the end, his life ended in a blaze of excitement.

The media have a hard time thinking outside the box. So when politics and religion are taken off the table, one of the few things left for them to chew on is race. Take the Associated Press story, "Terrorism, Race, Religion: Defining the Las Vegas Shooting."

The AP is impressed that Paddock was "a white gunman" who attacked "a mostly-white country music crowd." So what? Blacks kill each other in the streets of Chicago all the time. If AP has something it wants to impute to Paddock's race, it should say so. But it chose not to, and that's because there is nothing there. However, that didn't stop it from looking at this story through a political lens.

For example, the AP story mentions the role of Islamic extremists in acts of terror, which is undeniable, but then it tries to "balance" the piece by noting Norwegian mass killer Anders Breivik; he is described as a "neo-Nazi" who gunned down 77 people in 2011.

Breivik was never a neo-Nazi. In fact, as Norwegian social scientist Lars Gule said, he was a "national conservative, not a Nazi." Nor was he a Christian, as some said he was: he put his faith in Odinism. In terms of his politics, the *Jerusalem Post* called him out for his "far-right Zionism." So what was he? He was a deranged man who was high on drugs when he struck.

The problem with Breivik, like Paddock, was his persona, not his politics. He was initially diagnosed as having paranoid schizophrenia, and shortly thereafter he became increasingly isolated and withdrawn. He was subsequently declared criminally insane.

A second round of psychiatric evaluations said his problem was best understood as an antisocial personality disorder, not a mental illness; he was also diagnosed as having a narcissistic personality disorder.

Those conditions are clearly reflected in the life of Stephen Paddock (click [here](#) to read my account). And just as Paddock had a severely dysfunctional upbringing, so did Breivik. His parents divorced when he was a year old, and his mother brutalized him: she “sexualized” him, beat him, and told him that she “wished that he were dead.”

Obviously, most people raised in a lousy family do not turn out to be mass killers. But when a background like the one Breivik, and Paddock, endured is coupled with other psychological and social factors, it makes a lot more sense to probe these personal experiences than it does to look exclusively at external matters.

There is a whole world out there besides politics, religion, race, sex, and sexual orientation, though this escapes most pundits these days. Unfortunately, those looking to blame anyone or anything but the culprit—“the guns did it”—are totally blind to this reality.

Just as it is important not to simplify complex issues, the temptation to over-analyze must also be resisted. Sometimes the answer is right before our eyes.

REP. ROZZI'S CONFLICT OF INTEREST?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Pennsylvania State Rep. Mark Rozzi:

Pennsylvania State Rep. Mark Rozzi should recuse himself or abstain from voting on any future bills that would amend the statute of limitations on the sexual abuse of minors.

Rozzi claims he was sexually abused by a priest, now deceased (whom he never reported or told anyone about at the time) when he was 13. If Pennsylvania law is revised to allow a two-year lookback so that alleged victims can resurrect old claims, Rozzi would be in a position to reap a substantial paycheck.

Now it may be that Rozzi's motives are pure and his efforts at amending the law have nothing to do with ingratiating himself. Still, there is the appearance of impropriety, and that alone demands that he not participate in any more of these proceedings.