

MEDIA ARE UNNERVED OVER “UNPLANNED”

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on media reaction to the movie “Unplanned”:

“Unplanned” is a movie that chronicles the workplace experience of Abby Johnson; she was employed by a Planned Parenthood clinic. One day, after spending eight years on the job, she was asked, as the clinic director, to assist a doctor to perform an abortion by holding the ultrasound probe. That changed her life. She quit.

We could find only one newspaper in the entire United States, the *Washington Post*, that reviewed the movie; the review was mixed.

One person who saw the film and liked it is Kansas City, Kansas Archbishop Joseph Naumann. As the chairman of the bishops’ Committee on Pro-Life Activities, he has emerged as the nation’s leading Catholic voice on life issues. He offered some insights in today’s *Wall Street Journal*.

“‘Unplanned’ got its R rating for ‘violence.’ It is noteworthy for Hollywood to acknowledge that abortion is violent, but the on-screen violence in ‘Unplanned’ isn’t gratuitous; it’s medically accurate.” In a recent interview, Naumann wryly observed, “the great irony is that a 15-year-old girl can’t go to this movie, but she could have an abortion and her parents will never know it.”

Variety was one of the few media outlets to review “Unplanned.” It said it “isn’t a good movie, but it’s effective propaganda.” The film does a “skillful job of using religious piety to conceal its underlying political agenda.” The agenda, of course, is to combat the pro-abortion agenda by telling the truth.

The Guardian, a British outlet, took note of Abby's ultrasound experience. "A fetus presents what could be misinterpreted as fear or pain during the procedure." The verb is revealing. How could anyone interpret what happened to the baby any differently?

Here is an excerpt from the movie. "It [the baby] just moved away from the catheter [that was placed in the girl's cervix in preparation for a suction D&C abortion]," said Abby. The abortionist had a ready answer: "They always move. That's why I do it this way!"

"They always move." They sure do. That's what happens when human beings are pierced—they flinch.

Abortion unnerves everyone, on all sides of this issue. Those who are honest and admit that abortion kills an innocent human being are unnerved for obvious reasons. But what about those who are pro-abortion? Why are they unnerved? Why are they so unnerved that they refuse to review this movie and don't want anyone to know about it?

Hillary Clinton once said she wanted abortion to be "safe, legal, and rare." She never explained why it should be rare.

PRO-GAY CATHOLIC-BASHING FILM HITS CINCINNATI

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a pro-gay film opening in Cincinnati that attacks the Catholic Church:

Those who teach at Catholic, Jewish, and Muslim elementary and secondary schools are expected to abide by the teachings of

the three respective religions. Moreover, the parents who pay for their children to attend such schools expect that the administrators will discipline dissident teachers.

In normal times, this observation would be seen as self-evident. Sadly, we live in abnormal times.

There are a few teachers who used to work at Cincinnati Catholic schools who protested one part of their employment contract: the part in question concerned public support for the homosexual lifestyle (the language was later amended substituting “advocacy” for “public support”). The dissident teachers lost in their battle with the Archdiocese of Cincinnati and quit.

If only they would go away. Now they have joined an agit-prop assault on the Catholic Church organized by GLSEN Greater Cincinnati (the acronym stands for Gay, Lesbian & Straight Education Network).

On March 29 and 30, a documentary that features these teachers and their supporting students will be shown at the Esquire Theater in Cincinnati. *A Culture of Silence: Being LGBTQ in Catholic Schools* will highlight their experiences—mostly traumatic, we are sure.

What is GLSEN? In 2009, President Obama hired its founder, Kevin Jennings, to a high-level post in the Department of Education dealing with safety and drug issues.

When Jennings was appointed, I noted that he “has a history of promoting homosexual conferences wherein unsafe sex practices are sold to underage kids. He is also a former drug user. As a counselor, he failed to notify the authorities of a sexual encounter between an adult gay man and a high school kid. And not to be outdone, he has a history of bashing Christians.” He was also a member of an urban terrorist group, ACT-UP.

As for the Cincinnati affiliate of GLSEN, it is known for

celebrating legislation that awards rights to the sexually confused. To be exact, it applauded an Obama administration ruling that allowed boys who think they are girls and girls who think they are boys to use the bathrooms and locker rooms of the opposite sex. The affiliate was also banned in 2013 from participating in the city's St. Patrick's Day Parade; it sought to politicize the event, and has not marched since.

Homosexual activists, as well as militants among the sexually confused, have a libertine agenda, one which is predictably anti-Catholic. Now they have gone the extra mile by enlisting Catholic dissidents to rally behind its documentary.

Who will go to this propaganda film? Almost no one.

Normal guys and gals will be watching NCAA basketball on Friday night at 7:00 p.m., not heading off to the Esquire Theater. The other showing is Saturday at 1:00 p.m. That's too early for any movie, and in any event this is the opening weekend of major league baseball. The organizers can't even get this right.

But maybe their target audience doesn't care about basketball and baseball. They may prove me wrong—they could hit double figures yet.

Contact Traci Bayless the chapter chairman of school engagement: tmbayless76@gmail.com

THE POLITICS OF TRANSPARENCY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a blatant double standard:

The media insist that when a priest is suspected of

wrongdoing, Catholic bishops must turn over every last item found in the priest's personnel file. Nothing is to be sealed, and full public disclosure is demanded. But reporters, editorial writers, and pundits don't hold everyone to the same standard.

On January 29, actor Jussie Smollett told the Chicago police that two men attacked him around 2:00 a.m. near a hotel, yelling racial and anti-gay slurs at him. He said he was doused with bleach and had a noose roped around his neck. The men allegedly shouted, "This is MAGA country," a reference to a pro-Trump slogan. The police, however, found that he had staged the event by paying the men to partake in this stunt to advance his career.

Now, out of nowhere, the public learns that Smollett's case has been dismissed. To make matters worse, prosecutors did not alert Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson and Mayor Rahm Emanuel that they were going to drop the case.

According to the *Chicago Tribune*, "Johnson said this decision allowed Smollett to hide behind a secret deal." This is what concerns the Catholic League. Even worse, Smollett's case has been sealed by a judge, without explanation. In other words, the public will never know the evidence.

Morris Dees was recently fired by the organization he co-founded, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC). Complaints of racism and sexual harassment at the far-left organization have been noted internally for some time but only surfaced this year. More important, Dees himself was named as someone who allegedly engaged in misconduct.

A few weeks ago, a spokesman for SPLC said of Dees' misconduct, "We can't comment on the details of individual personnel decisions." Of course he can—he simply chose not to answer. Similarly, in the March 26 edition of the *New York Times*, an SPLC official told an inquiring reporter, "We will

not respond to individual allegations publicly.”

Last week, the *New York Times* ran a story about Kevin O’Brien, a top aide to New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio. He was allowed to exit from his job last year without fanfare, even though the offenses involved sexual harassment. The news story mentioned that there were at least three other cases in recent years where employees of the parks department were pushed out the door for sexually harassing co-workers; all of the cases had been substantiated.

Why were O’Brien and the others allowed to keep their departures a secret? The reporter wrote that “the city agreed to conceal the behavior from future employers who might inquire as part of a reference check.” All of the men agreed to resign “after securing assurances that the city would provide a ‘neutral reference’ to prospective employers seeking information. If asked, city officials would verify only basic details, such as employment dates, job title and description.”

If Smollett were a priest, he would never have been allowed to walk, and his case would never have been sealed. If Dees were a priest, the media would never have allowed his bishop to keep his case confidential. If O’Brien were a priest, he would never have been allowed to quit in secret. But none of them are priests—they are celebrities, activists, and government workers—so the same rules do not apply.

These cases are not an anomaly. Regarding the city employees who were quietly let go, consider what a specialist in city labor cases, Richard Washington, told the *Times* (he represented the three parks department men). He admitted that “neutral reference agreements are ‘something that most attorneys in this field would be requesting,’ adding that they were relatively common in cases where employees agree to resign after accusations of misbehavior.”

There was a time in the last century when some bishops moved a

molesting priest from one parish to another, without notifying the new parish of his offense. In the public schools, this is so common—it is going on right now—that it is called “passing the trash.” This is exactly what this labor law attorney is saying is routine in city government today: the new employer hasn’t a clue he is hiring a sexual abuser.

This is the politics of transparency. It not only shows how unfair the legal system and the media are to priests, it shows how little they really care about sexual misconduct. It’s not the offense that bothers them; it’s the status of the offender.

TREVOR NOAH LIBELS POPE AND ALL PRIESTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks made last night by Trevor Noah on “The Daily Show”:

Trevor Noah has a problem. He is fixated on priests. He hates them. That is why he can’t stop making offensive generalizations about them.

On his March 26 Comedy Central show, Noah once again flashed his bigotry when he commented on a clip of Catholics shown kissing Pope Francis’ ring. After observing that the pope appeared to pull his hand away, he noted that “it’s a nice change of pace to see a priest not want to touch people.”

As a black man from South Africa, we might expect Noah to be repelled by gross generalizations made about any demographic minority. But now that he is living a privileged existence in America, it is evident that his consciousness has warped.

The next time this genius gets the urge to go off the rails speaking about sexual abuse, let him focus on Hollywood. There is plenty of material there for his writers to work with.

Contact: Renata Luczak, VP Communications for the "Daily Show": renata.luczak@cc.com

SUE - HAPPY GAYS TARGET CATHOLIC ENTITIES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest attacks on Catholic organizations:

We were told that once the U.S. Supreme Court affirmed marriage between two people of the same sex that it wouldn't create new problems for religious institutions. It was a lie. In its wake has come a rash of lawsuits aimed at Catholic organizations. To be specific, agenda-ridden homosexuals have joined with the sexually confused to wreak havoc.

Shelly Fitzgerald, a guidance counselor at an Indiana Catholic high school, was dismissed after it was learned that she was "married" to another woman. She then did the media lap, parading her victimhood on Ellen Degeneres' TV show. She took her complaint to the authorities.

Now Fitzgerald has been joined by another "victim" at the same school: Guidance counselor Lynn Starkey has been told her contract will not be renewed because she is "married" to her girlfriend. She plans to sue the Archdiocese of Indiana.

Oliver Knight is a sexually confused woman who thinks she is a man. She was denied a hysterectomy at a California Catholic

hospital after her status was identified. She is now suing five Catholic hospitals because one of them denied her the operation.

Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel, a lesbian activist, has decided to deny state funds to Catholic adoption agencies because they will not place children with same-sex couples. She made this move by reaching a settlement with the ACLU by refusing to enforce a religious liberty law that insulated religious institutions from state encroachment in these matters.

None of these decisions were made by happenstance.

The guidance counselors knew what the house rules were of the Catholic school they worked for yet decided to violate them and then claim victim status. The sexually confused woman knew that Catholic hospitals will not sanction her new status by performing the operation. And Nessel's hostility to religious rights could not be more clear.

Religious rights have indeed been imperiled by the high court recognition of homosexual marriages. The decision has emboldened a new wave of lawsuits by sue-happy gays seeking to deny long-standing religious exemptions to Catholic institutions.

The collision between the First Amendment guarantee of religious liberty and homosexual rights must be addressed by the Supreme Court again. People of faith should not be subject to unnecessary state coercion; their autonomy is paramount.

DANA NESSEL OVERRIDES RELIGIOUS FREEDOM LAW

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel's attack on religious freedom:

Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel is keeping her campaign promise to put her radical agenda ahead of the best interests of children.

In 2015, Michigan's legislature passed a law 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.

Nessel, outspoken in her opposition to the law, promised that as Michigan's top law enforcement official she *would not defend* this state law against a pending legal challenge by the ACLU of Michigan.

Now she has made good on that promise. In a settlement with the ACLU, she has decreed that the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services must end state contracts with faith-based agencies, rather than allow them to make child placement decisions in accord with their religious beliefs.

Once again, Nessel demonstrates her contempt for the First Amendment's guarantee of religious freedom, decreeing that faith-based agencies must check their religious principles at the door before they will be allowed to provide services for children in need.

She also demonstrates her contempt for the democratic process of her home state, arbitrarily overriding a law duly enacted by Michigan's elected representatives.

Worst of all, by excluding faith-based agencies from the state's foster care and adoption program, Nessel shows utter contempt for all the children served by those agencies. As the Michigan Catholic Conference observed, this settlement "does nothing to protect the thousands of children in foster care looking for loving homes."

But that is of little concern to Nessel, an ideological extremist who has repeatedly demonstrated her animus toward the Catholic Church and people of faith. We expect her decision will be challenged in the courts.

Contact Kelly Rossman-McKinney, Nessel's director of communications: rossmanmckinney@mi.gov

ASSESSING THE ABUSE REPORT ON ILLINOIS PRIESTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue assesses a report on alleged sexual abusers in the Illinois dioceses that was released on March 20:

There are many news stories about the 395 priests in Illinois who have been named in a report on clergy sexual abuse, but most of them are incomplete. For starters, not all of those named are priests, not all of them are from Illinois, and most of the listings are unsubstantiated accusations.

I have read the report. I have also read what five of the six dioceses have said about it (one diocese, Belleville, has said nothing). Let's start with the man behind the report, Jeffrey Anderson.

Who is Jeff Anderson?

As a young man, Anderson was a hippie and a college dropout; he finally graduated from the University of Minnesota. He made it to law school, though he wasn't known for his scholarship. However, in his last year at William Mitchell College of Law, he found his stride: He successfully defended a homeless black man who urinated in a church.

Anderson then went on to bigger things. His clients included gay activists who fought bathhouse raids and murderers. A recovering alcoholic, he says his daughter was molested by a therapist.

Anderson has had quite a religious odyssey. He was raised a Lutheran, but that didn't work out too well. So he became a Catholic. Then he became an atheist—he called himself a “dedicated atheist.” Then he flipped again and became “deeply religious.” The last I read about him he was content to call himself an agnostic.

See the pattern. His first gig was to sue people of faith. He claims his daughter was sexually abused. And his own religious beliefs are a mess. In short, he was destined to sue the Catholic Church.

Anderson loves to sue the Church so much that he once boasted that his goal in life is to “sue the s*** out of the Catholic Church.” He has made good on his word. Filthy rich, in one case alone he netted half a billion dollars in a settlement.

His mission in life is not to defend all victims of sexual abuse, just Catholic ones. That's why he recently took out ads in New York City newspapers advertising his willingness to defend *only* victims of Catholic clergy abuse. The 5'4" activist-lawyer also likes to grease professional victims' groups: they give him leads on clients and he gives them big checks. That's quite a tag team. The media, of course, never focus on this collusion.

The Anderson Report

The sexual abuse crisis in the Catholic Church, as experienced in the United States, is long over. This explains why the allegations in the Anderson Report, as it is known, are about old cases. In fact, the report lists accusations going back more than a half-century ago. Of the 395 persons mentioned, 394 are either dead or out of ministry. That leaves one guy.

The report includes deacons, seminarians, brothers, and nuns—not just priests. Some of the priests are from religious orders, and are therefore not under the jurisdiction of a bishop. In other cases, the order priests are not from Illinois, and their alleged offense may not even have taken place there.

How many are truly guilty? No one knows. Even Anderson admits that “in most cases the allegations have not been proved or substantiated in a court of law. Consequently, unless otherwise indicated, all of the allegations should be considered just allegations and should not be considered proven or substantiated in a court of law.”

We did a search of how many news outlets nationwide quoted what Anderson said and found that the overwhelming majority failed to cite his admission. So the public has been duped again.

When it comes to the scandal, duping the public is a common game. How many organizations in the United States, secular or religious, have been subjected to an investigation about sexual misconduct extending back to World War II?

Why is there no appetite for probing ministers, rabbis, public school teachers, psychologists, psychiatrists, guidance counselors, athletic coaches, and the like? Why are the media so lacking in curiosity about this phenomenon? To find out, read the mission statement of the Catholic League on our website.

Anderson's report critically notes that the Illinois Attorney General's Office "determined that the Illinois dioceses had received allegations related to sexual abuse for approximately 690 clergy, but had only publicly identified 185 clergy as being 'credibly' accused of sexual abuse."

So what? There is a profound difference between a mere allegation, an allegation deemed credible, a substantiated allegation, and a conviction in a court of law. Is Anderson suggesting that priests are not entitled to due process? What other institution is expected to post the names of those whose accusations have not been deemed credible, never mind substantiated or found guilty? None.

Response by the Dioceses

Fortunately, this time around the bishops and their spokesmen are fighting back. Mary Jane Doerr, the director of the Chicago Archdiocese's Office for the Protection of Children and Youth, expressed her exasperation with the report. "What's frustrating to me is the lists represent the past. And it was not a good past, but we don't do that anymore. That's not what's going on today."

Anderson says that the purpose of his report "is to disclose the scope of the peril that the Catholic Bishops have chosen not to disclose and keep secret." John O'Malley, the Archdiocese of Chicago's special counsel, isn't buying it. "These names were not secret. There was not an effort to conceal them. They were all reported to the authorities."

O'Malley also takes issue with Anderson for portraying as perpetrators those who have been investigated and cleared. In one particular case, the special counsel said, "Police didn't decide he was a perpetrator. The archdiocese did not. Jeff Anderson did. People are entitled to their reputations until proven otherwise."

Andrew Hansen, a spokesman for the Springfield diocese, aptly

called Anderson's report "an impressive professional marketing brochure, but it does not represent, as Mr. Anderson suggests, a thorough and diligent review of the publicly available facts, and it is highly misleading and irresponsible."

The official statements released by those dioceses which have spoken publicly were not shy in their defense.

The Archdiocese of Chicago, following what O'Malley said, charged that Anderson "conflates people who have been accused, but may be innocent, with those who have substantiated allegations against them, referring to all as perpetrators."

The Diocese of Joliet said, "All of the allegations reflected on Mr. Anderson's list which were made to the Diocese of Joliet have already been reported to law enforcement authorities." Furthermore, the diocese argued that "All credibly accused priests have been removed from ministry."

The Diocese of Peoria maintained that 26 of the 29 priests named in the report have been reported to the authorities, and most of them are dead. The diocese contested the listing of the other three: one never had an accusation made against him; one accusation was never substantiated; and one was immediately placed on administrative leave and reported to the authorities, contrary to what Anderson said.

The Diocese of Rockford said Anderson's list "includes names already disclosed by the Rockford Diocese along with other names previously disclosed publicly but which are not on the Diocese's list of those substantially accused because the accusations either have not been substantiated or are completely without merit."

The Diocese of Springfield said it had already posted the names of 19 priests on its website who were credibly accused, "none of whom are in active ministry, and 13 of whom are deceased."

My Analysis

In some important ways, Anderson's report is consistent with the studies conducted by the John Jay College of Criminal Justice on priestly sexual abuse. For instance, most of the alleged offenses took place in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Significantly, most of the victims were postpubescent males, victimized by homosexual priests. But, of course, the newspapers are not reporting on this, so the gay cover-up continues.

Regarding the listings, it is hard to come to definitive conclusions when the data are not uniform, but there are some entries that deserve to be discussed.

The report loses credibility when it lists people like Brother John W. McMuldren, C.S.C. He was from Alaska, spent one year in Illinois, and in the lone case where charges were made against him (in Alaska), he was found innocent.

A nun, Sr. Norma Giannini, was charged with sexually abusing two teenage boys: one said he was abused more than 100 times and the other said he was molested between 60 and 80 times. Such cases strain credulity.

It would be unfair to cast suspicion on all of the entries. Indeed, there are some that cry out for an explanation.

Why was Fr. Kenneth M. Brigham of the Archdiocese of Chicago able to partake in a "sex-ring with other priests"? Others must have known about this, so why didn't they act?

Ditto for Fr. Victor Stewart. He was another priest from the Chicago archdiocese who participated in a sex club.

Fr. Roger P. Schoenhofen, O.M.I., was a priest in the Diocese of Belleville who participated in a "ring of homosexual priests," sexually abusing young men at St. Henry's Seminary. Others must have known about this, so why didn't they act?

These are the most disturbing stories I read in the report. Bad as they are, we must keep in mind that all but one of the 395 persons mentioned in the report are either dead or are no longer in ministry. This is not an anomaly: this is true across the United States.

Yet Anderson has the gall to say in his report that “The danger of sexual abuse in Illinois is clearly a problem today, not just the past.” He is a liar. He knows the evidence is just the opposite.

Anyone who thinks Anderson is in this game purely for the money is missing the point. He couldn’t possibly spend all the money he has. No, he is in it for the same reason that so many others are in it: The name of the game is to “Get the Catholic Church.” It is not greed that motivates the Church haters, it is ideology.

Contact: Jeff@AndersonAdvocates.com

KUDOS TO DISLOYALTY, ANTI-SEMITISM, AND OBSCENITY

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

A good index of how sick our culture has become can be found in a *New York Times* editorial page column on March 22.

It hails the three most radical members of Congress, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Rep. Ilhan Omar, and Rep. Rashida Tlaib for “dismantling one of the most tiresome and inaccurate stereotypes in politics: that women lawmakers are inherently

more civil, more collaborative, less power-hungry and less personally ambitious than men.” It would be great to know how many Americans think this development is a good thing.

What is most striking about this statement are the three examples it chose to prove its point.

It cited Ocasio-Cortez’s plea for more primary challenges against moderate Democrats: “Long story short, I need you to run for office.”

It cited Omar’s tweet saying American foreign policy is bought by Jews: “It’s all about the Benjamins, baby.”

It (partially) cited Tlaib’s comment about the president: “We’re gonna impeach the [expletive]!” Note: she called Trump a motherf*****.

By celebrating disloyalty, anti-Semitism, and obscenity, the *New York Times* lost whatever moral credibility it had left. We certainly don’t want to read any more editorials or columns lecturing the Catholic Church.

Contact: James Bennet, editorial page editor:
james.bennet@nytimes.com

CRIMINALIZING PRONOUNS IN THE U.K.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on criminalizing speech in the United Kingdom:

A sexually confused teenage English boy, Jackie Green, now 25, decided when he was 15 to “transition” to a girl. Never mind

that this is impossible—Jackie still possesses a Y chromosome and will never menstruate—he is now the subject of a big debate in London.

The reason this bizarre issue is in the news is because a journalist, Caroline Farrow, referred to him as a him and not a she. For this violation, Farrow has now been summoned to appear before the police and could wind up in prison.

This all began last September when Farrow appeared on ITV's "Good Morning Britain" with Susie Green, mother of the sexually confused boy, Jackie. They debated whether it is appropriate to tell the parents of a sexually confused child whether their child has "transitioned." Green is an advocate for the sexually confused and defends keeping the parents in the dark. Farrow disagrees.

After the debate, Farrow wrote a few tweets wherein she referred to Jackie as a him and not a she. Susie Green quickly filed a formal complaint with the police under the Malicious Communications Act, a hate crimes statute.

After a six-month-long investigation, Farrow was notified on March 18 to attend a police interview. If found guilty, she could be sent to the slammer for two years.

Consider the context of this madness. Britain is currently witnessing a knife crime epidemic—thousands of knives were surrendered just today as part of a national amnesty—yet the cops have time to become the language police.

Farrow is a Catholic mother of five. One might think she has a right—this is after all, home to the Magna Carta—to free speech. But that is now debatable.

Farrow and her family have been subjected to incredible abuse, much of it obscene, including published photos of her children. All of this is happening because she referred to a sexually confused boy, who thinks he is a girl, as a boy.

It is just a matter of time before this kind of lunacy hits our shores. The intolerance that marks the radical elements in the LGBT community is stunning, and much of it is aimed at people of faith.

Maybe some journalist will ask the U.S. presidential candidates what they think about criminalizing the speech of practicing Christians, Jews, Muslims, and Mormons. Should they be allowed to voice the correct pronoun when discussing the sexually confused? Or should they be punished for doing so?

ROLLING STONE'S DISHONEST HIT ON CARDINAL PELL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article posted March 17 on the website of *Rolling Stone*:

If there were an award for yellow journalism, *Rolling Stone* would be at the top of the list.

In 2015, the Columbia Graduate School of Journalism demolished a [piece](#) by Sabrina Rubin Erdely about gang rape at the University of Virginia. In 2011, I demolished an [article](#) by the same writer for her hit job on the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. Now *Rolling Stone* is back with a scurrilous story by Nicholas Lord on Australian Cardinal George Pell.

Lord begins his article by citing the recent case where Pell was sentenced for sexual abuse. The author accuses Pell of cornering “two thirteen-year-old choirboys in the sacristy of St. Patrick’s Cathedral” wherein he forced “one boy to perform oral sex while the other flinched away.”

What Lord did not say is that the boy who “flinched away” died of drug abuse, but not before telling his mother on two occasions that Pell never abused him or anyone else. Importantly, over 20 witnesses who marched in a procession with the two boys the morning of the alleged abuse said the boys never left the line of march to be with Pell in the sacristy after Mass. A priest who helped Pell with his vestments in the sacristy that day confirms that no boys were present.

Lord says another boy was molested by Pell at a camp. He leaves out salient facts.

The accusation by a Melbourne man who said he was abused by Pell in 1962, when he was 12-years-old, was thrown out by a judge when nothing could be substantiated. Not a single person who worked at the camp supported the charges, and all of them signed statements that were favorable to Pell.

Moreover, the accuser had been convicted 39 times for offenses ranging from assault to drug use. Indeed, he was a violent drug addict who served four years in prison. He drove drunk, beat people, and took amphetamines. I guess Lord missed all of that.

Lord accuses Pell of doing nothing to stop Australia’s worst sex offender, Gerald Ridsdale, who raped victims in a presbytery in Ballarat where both men resided.

Conveniently, Lord does not mention that the authorities dismissed a case against Pell and he was completely exonerated. Also, Pell was accused of joking about Ridsdale’s crimes at a funeral Mass in Ballarat. But there was no Mass that day and the priest whom Pell was allegedly joking with was living someplace else when the supposed incident took place.

Lord rolls out Lyndon Monument and Damian Dignan, both of whom claim Pell abused them. What a pair they are.

If Lord were not so lazy, or vindictive, he would know that Monument was a big boozier, a drug addict, a drug dealer, and a thug who beat and stalked his girlfriend. An ex-con, he has also been arrested for burglary, assault, and making threats to kill. Damian also has a record of violence, and has been arrested for drunk driving.

Not surprisingly, Monument and Dignan have also made accusations against former teachers. Regarding Pell, they claim he inappropriately touched them while throwing them off his shoulders in a swimming pool in the 1970s.

True to form, Lord is dead wrong about *crimen sollicitationis*. He refers to it as a directive issued by Pope John XXIII which “threatened to excommunicate Catholic officials who reported pedophile priests.”

In fact, the 1962 document, “The Crime of Solicitation,” was about the seal of confession. It allowed for a priest to be thrown out of the priesthood if he engaged in sexual solicitation when hearing confession. It also made it clear that if the penitent were to tell someone what happened in the confessional (perhaps another priest), he or she had 30 days to report the incident to the bishop or face excommunication.

If anything, this showed how serious the Vatican was about the offense—it threatened to punish the penitent for not turning in the guilty priest.

Why did *Rolling Stone* publish this trash? The answer is given, rather unwittingly, by Lord. “To liberals [in Australia], Pell was the enemy. He fought the ‘secular agenda,’ gay rights, abortion, IVF, euthanasia, sex outside of marriage.”

That’s right. Cardinal Pell is the poster boy for Catholic-hating secularists, not only in his home country but around the world. They hate him for his orthodoxy and the fact that he was, until recently, the third most senior cleric in the Catholic Church. No matter, he will go down in history as the

biggest scapegoat for clergy sexual abuse in the history of the Catholic Church.

Those who know the facts about former cardinal Theodore McCarrick, and Cardinal George Pell, know there is a world of difference between the two of them. Pell does not deserve to be spoken about in the same breath as McCarrick, but to those who hate the Church, they are one and the same. This is pure bunk.

Contact Rolling Stone editor: Jason.Fine@rollingstone.com