

SUPPORT THE SALVATION ARMY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on recent attacks against the Salvation Army:

No organization, religious or secular, does a better job of helping the poor and the homeless at Christmastime than the Salvation Army. This year it is coming under attack by homosexuals and the sexually confused, arguing that it is not supportive of their politics. It is not supposed to be. The Salvation Army is a Christian charity.

The attacks started when a singer, Ellie Goulding from England, threatened not to sing at a Dallas Cowboys halftime show on Thanksgiving Day: she is demanding that the Salvation Army pledge to support the homosexual cause. Thus would she deprive the needy of support unless her ideological goals are met.

We encourage all Catholics to give more to the Salvation Army this year than ever before. Send a message to those who would deny the poor a decent Christmas, all in the name of their selfish agenda.

CHRISTMAS REIGNS IN WISCONSIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a victory in Wisconsin that atheists are deploring:

By a vote of 64-30, the Wisconsin Assembly has voted to call the Christmas tree in the state Capitol rotunda a Christmas tree. The governor, Tony Evers, wanted it called a “holiday tree.” He failed to say what holiday—which means “holy day”—it

represents. Now he knows.

The Assembly also voted to adopt a resolution recognizing Thanksgiving week as National Bible Week.

The Christian haters at Freedom From Religion Foundation were appalled by both decisions.

It was Evers' predecessor, Scott Walker, who, in 2011, called the Christmas tree a Christmas tree; it previously had been known as the "holiday tree." Evers wanted that name back, but now he has lost.

Why would Evers want to insult Christians at Christmastime? One website which features his bio says that his religion is "Not Available." We can only guess what that means. We know of no people of faith who believe that it is okay to intentionally allow a baby to die who survives a botched abortion. Evers does.

His official bio says "the governor believes in bringing people together to solve the problems facing our state." Is that what he did in June when he divided the people by putting a homosexual "Rainbow Pride Flag" over the State Capitol? It led to a petition of 10,000 residents who objected.

Evers has a history of anti-Catholicism. Before he became governor, he was the Wisconsin Superintendent of Public Instruction. In that role he sought to deny Catholic students who attended an independent Catholic school transportation, even though the school was affiliated with the Archdiocese of Milwaukee. He was sued for his bigoted stunt.

Organized atheists are a menace to the First Amendment. Kudos to the Wisconsin lawmakers who stood up to these bullies, and to their lackey, Tony Evers.

Contact Maggie Gau, Evers' chief of staff:
maggie.gau@wisconsin.gov

MEASURE OF JUSTICE FOR CARDINAL PELL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest news regarding Cardinal George Pell's ordeal:

Australia's highest court has given Cardinal George Pell a measure of justice by agreeing to hear his appeal. Convicted in December of molesting two choirboys in the 1990s, his case will now get a final hearing in the early part of 2020.

Pell has been defamed, wrongly convicted, and unjustly sentenced to solitary confinement. More than 20 witnesses took his side: they never saw anyone break ranks from a procession of choristers, altar servers and clerics to be with Pell in the back of a church, the supposed location of the abuse.

One of the two boys allegedly abused by Pell died of a drug overdose, but not before telling his mother—on two occasions—that Pell never molested him. So if he was not abused, neither was the complainant: they were allegedly abused at the same time and in the same place.

Keep Cardinal Pell in your prayers this Christmas season. There is still a glimmer of hope that justice will triumph in the end.

USA TODAY TRACKS FORMER PRIESTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a lengthy story in *USA Today* about accused priests who are no longer in ministry:

USA Today is on a tear against the Catholic Church. Last month it published a 3700-word-story on efforts by the bishops to fight discriminatory legislation. Now it has unloaded again, this time indicting the Church in a 6226-word-story for not tracking former priests accused of sexual abuse.

The newspaper must be vying for a Pulitzer. Why else would it invest a ton of money employing 39 reporters to investigate alleged wrongdoing by the Catholic Church over the last nine months, “wrongdoing” that is routine for every organization? What it found is hardly startling.

USA Today says that the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) does not track former priests accused of sexual abuse. That is correct. Neither does *USA Today* have a GPS tracking system to locate the whereabouts of former employees accused of sexual misconduct. That’s because no employer is required to do so by law. So why is it so stunning to learn that the USCCB plays by the same rules as everyone else? Unless, of course, the name of the game is to shame the Church?

The reporters found a priest who was accused of sexual abuse in the 1970s, and was later named in a settlement with the Miami Archdiocese. He is now 85. Is there more to this story? Nope, that’s it.

Philadelphia has a Child and Family Therapy Training Center which offers clinical programs, workshops and courses. One of the faculty members who worked there was a former priest

accused of sexual abuse.

Now whose fault is it that the Center didn't know of accusations against him? Why did they employ him to give lectures on sexual abuse? When his former boss was asked about him in 2015, she said he told her about the accusations, denied they were true, and she believed him. She said he was a "terrific teacher." He is currently a licensed marriage and family therapist. Why didn't the newspaper contact his employer for an interview? It had more than three dozen reporters on the story.

The news story opens with John Dagwell. He is a former Catholic brother who plead guilty in a criminal case in 1988 for molesting a student. "Despite his past," the news article says, "Dagwell was never required to register as a sex offender." With good reason—he didn't have to. Later in the story it is reported that there was no federal law requiring sex offenders to register at that time. So why the early drama about him not registering? In fact it wasn't until 2006 that the Congress passed such a law; it wasn't upheld by the Supreme Court until this past June.

Here's another gem. A layman at a Catholic high school entered into a settlement agreement in 2013 with former students claiming abuse. The reporters quote a real estate agent who lives near him saying she can't believe his name doesn't show up in Florida's sex registry. Maybe that's because he was never found guilty. Didn't this occur to the reporters? Do they know what the law says?

According to FindLaw, a trusted legal online source, the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act makes it a federal crime "to knowingly fail to register with a state's authorities, or to fail to update registration at specified times, in accordance with the law's requirements."

In other words, it is up to the convicted—*not the accused or*

the former employer—to register. Knowing this to be true, why didn't USA Today make this plain? Let me guess: To do so would have imploded its story.

The newspaper could have written a similar story on virtually any organization, but instead it chose only one. It needs to explain to Catholics why.

Contact the editor-in-chief, Nicole Carroll:
nicole@usatoday.com

GEORGETOWN'S PITIFUL CONFERENCE ON ABUSE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a report released this week on a conference on clergy sexual abuse:

On June 14-15, over 50 persons, most of whom were Catholic, assembled at Georgetown University for an event titled, "National Convening on Lay Leadership for a Wounded Church and Divided Nation." It was organized by the Initiative on Catholic Social Thought and Public Life, headed by John Carr and Kim Daniels. The issue before the gathering was the clergy sexual abuse scandal. A report on the proceedings was released this week.

The report aptly noted that "The Church's moral credibility has been seriously wounded by the abuse crisis, and bishops no longer possess the moral standing they once enjoyed in public life." It could also be said that the intellectual credibility of the Initiative on Catholic Social Thought and Public Life has been seriously wounded by this venture. To say that nothing of any substance was accomplished is perhaps the

kindest thing that could be said about it.

The report lists 10 recommendations on how to address clergy sexual abuse, most of which are pedestrian. How creative is it for the report to list such things as “Focus on Gospel mission and build unity”? Another ground-breaking suggestion is, “Be both humble and bold.” A real throw-away line is the advice to “Build partnerships and enhance collaboration among clergy and laypeople.” More vagueness is evident in their recommendation to “Develop a national collaboration among ministries.”

Such platitudes mean zero if not operationalized. How are these nebulous outcomes to be achieved? That’s where the rubber meets the road. It’s like having a convention on crime and concluding that everyone needs to be more vigilant. Swell.

Most of the report centers on three issues: clericalism, diversity, and the laity, none of which has anything to do with why young males were abused by priests. The rights of accused priests were not mentioned.

Ever since the Vatican summit earlier this year, clericalism has emerged as the number-one talking point in establishment Catholic circles. Clericalism may have something to do with why some bishops were enablers, but it is of no explanatory value understanding why priests abused young males. Invoking clericalism is a dodge: its purpose is to direct the conversation away from the molesting priests. That way the subject of homosexuality can be skirted.

This is so thoroughly dishonest. If 81 percent of the victims were male and 78 percent were postpubescent, that means that homosexual priests are responsible for most of the problem. This does not mean that all gay priests are molesters—they are not—but it does mean that gay priests are responsible for most of the abuse.

It is commonly said that many of the priests who engaged in gay sex with their victims did not identify themselves as gay.

So what? It would be like saying that an Irishman who has a drinking problem is not Irish because he thinks he is an Italian. What matters is that just as the Irish are overrepresented among alcoholics, gay priests are overrepresented among sexual abusers. To pretend otherwise is deceitful.

Similarly, diversity has absolutely nothing to do with clergy sexual abuse. Having more minorities and persons from different economic strata participate in the affairs of the Church are worthy goals, but so is combating spousal abuse. Recommendations that are unrelated to the problem are positively useless.

There is great irony in a conference of lay Catholics saying that terms like “Your Eminence” and “Your Excellency” need to be retired—they smack of clericalism—while demanding a greater role for themselves. This reads like a textbook power grab. Lay clericalism is hardly less of a problem.

Any recommendations to curb clergy sexual abuse that do not address the link between dissidence and abuse is absurd. Where do they think the Paul Shanleys of the Church got their ideas, and the brazenness to act on their worst impulses? From orthodox Church teachings on sexuality?

Of course the organizers of this event don’t see the link between dissent and abuse: they work for Georgetown University, home to two pro-abortion student groups. That they singled out the *National Catholic Reporter* for praise—it rejects the Church’s teachings on sexuality—shows how utterly clueless they are.

Even worse, Carr and Daniels welcomed as participants some who have worked tirelessly to undermine the Church. One of the moderators, in fact, is a man who [taught the secular media how to subvert the bishops](#) during their “Fortnight for Freedom” events. His name is John Gehring, a tool of George Soros.

Why was Terrence McKiernan chosen to be at the event? Are Carr and Daniels aware that he has lied about Cardinal Timothy Dolan, accusing the archbishop of New York of hiding 55 predatory priests? When asked to reveal their names, he cannot do so. I know—I'm the one who has called him out for his smear.

Alexia Kelley is another curious invitee. What did they expect that a person who worked for Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good would bring to the table? This discredited and defunct organization, another Soros entity, showed up in the infamous Wikileaks document as an institution created for the express purpose of undermining the Catholic Church.

After reading this report, I am having second thoughts about awarding the laity more power. Consider what Michael Sean Winters of the *National Catholic Reporter* had to say about this subject.

He warned his fellow left-wing Catholics that “if there were elections for lay leaders, it is more likely than not that Bill Donohue and George Weigel and Raymond Arroyo would win at the Catholic polls.”

Let's start the early voting now.

Contact: john.carr@georgetown.edu

DEFINING RACISM DOWN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the way racism has been politicized:

Racism, true racism, is being devalued, and nothing contributes to its dumbing-down more than its promiscuous

invocation. Being called a racist is by now so common that it has lost its sting. Indeed, the very concept of racism is increasingly irrelevant. For example, Julian Castro, who is running for president, boasts he is opposed to “environmental racism.” Does anyone know what that is, including him?

When someone says there is an “Hispanic invasion” going on, is that proof of racism, or is it an expression of concern about large numbers of people who are entering our country illegally from points south of our border?

When a reporter standing in front of an alley in Baltimore suggests that President Trump is a racist for saying the city is a “rodent-infested mess”—and a large rat is seen running in the alley behind the reporter—doesn’t that undercut the charge?

When actress Ellen Pompeo recently said that Kamala Harris was “overconfident,” was that evidence of Pompeo’s racism, as some said, or was it evidence of devaluing the meaning of racism?

Megyn Kelly was branded a racist for noting that when she was young it was okay for a white kid to put on blackface on Halloween. Her observation was undeniably true. Does that make her a racist for recalling it?

New York Governor Andrew Cuomo recently said on the radio that bigots used to called Sicilians (he is half Sicilian) “nigger wops.” Some black leaders condemned him for making a racist remark. Does that make Cuomo a racist or was he using the exact language used by racists to punctuate his point?

In 2016, comedian Larry Wilmore at the White House Correspondents’ Dinner turned to President Barack Obama (who went by Barry when he was younger) and said, “Yo, Barry, you did it, my nigger.” Is Wilmore a racist, or was he just joking around? Obama laughed at it. Does that make him a racist enabler, or someone who knows he’s being roasted?

When Republicans complained about IRS abuses against conservative organizations under President Obama, MSNBC host Martin Bashir called the GOP leaders racist, saying they are using the scandal “as their latest weapon in the war against the black man in the White House.” Was that what they were doing—dabbling in racism—or protesting corruption by IRS officials?

MSNBC host Chris Matthews said it was racist to talk about all the people on food stamps. Was he right about that, or was Newt Gingrich right when he said to him, “Why do you assume food stamps refers to blacks? What kind of racist thinking do you have?” [Note: the majority of people on food stamps are white.]

Daily Beast columnist Michael Tomasky once accused Mitt Romney of being a “spineless, disingenuous, supercilious, race-mongering pyromaniac” because he used a “heavily loaded word.” What was that racist word? Obamacare. If that makes Romney a racist, would that make the Obama White House racist for promoting what it called Obamacare?

About a decade ago, when Walmart sold white and black Barbie dolls, they were initially priced the same. But when the store had to prepare for inventory, it marked down certain items. Was it proof of racism, as some charged, that the black doll was reduced in price? Or was it simply a routine business practice?

The devaluing of racism began in the academy. Here are seven examples of “racial microaggressions” taught in our nation’s leading colleges and universities:

- Asking someone, “Where are you from?”
- Asking an Asian person to help with a math or science problem
- Observing that “America is a melting pot”
- Opining that “There is only one race, the human race”

- Saying, "I believe the most qualified person should get the job"
- Noting that "Everyone can succeed in this society, if they work hard enough"
- Commenting, "We got gypped"

If the scales seem tipped against conservatives it is because they are. For example, Joe Biden recently said that "Poor kids are just as bright and just as talented as white kids." Does that make him a racist, or was it just a clumsy way of saying that low-income kids have the same potential to succeed as high-income kids?

When Biden once said, "You cannot go to a 7-Eleven or a Dunkin' Donuts unless you have a slight Indian accent," was he making a racist remark, or was it simply a sociological observation?

When he said that one of the best things about Obama was that he was "clean" and "articulate," was he voicing his racism, or his penchant for making gaffes?

When President Bill Clinton was being impeached, Biden, and many other Democrats (white and black alike) called it a "lynching." Now President Donald Trump is calling attempts to impeach him a "lynching." If Trump is a racist for using this term, in this context, wouldn't that make Biden a racist as well?

Let's be fair: Biden is no racist, and neither is Trump. But according to standards that Biden has now adopted as proof of Trump's racism, he most certainly is.

When Harvard University hosts a separate graduation ceremony for black students, is it being sensitive or racist? Would it be sensitive or racist if it did the same for white students? To put it differently, are there no principles left? Or is this just a political game, frontloaded against conservatives?

Here's something else to think about. On a scale of 1 to 10, what score should be given to someone who owns a restaurant, tells racist jokes, but does not discriminate against anyone? What score should be given to Harvard administrators who never tell racist jokes, but who discriminate against Asians—they put a cap on how many can get in?

The reason why accusations of racism are losing their sting has everything to do with the duplicity of the accusers, and their relentless invocations of it. When real racists are lumped in with those who are either innocent, or at worst guilty of inartful constructions, that's a lose-lose, the biggest losers of which are those who are truly victimized.

ATHEISTS WHO ARE HATERS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the work of the Freedom From Religion Foundation:

When I studied at New York University for my undergraduate degree, no one had a greater influence on me than Sidney Hook.

Hook was one of the most brilliant political philosophers of the 20th century. He started as a Marxist and wound up a moderate conservative. He was also an atheist, though I never detected, or read about, any hateful comments that he ever made about religion, or people of faith. He was too decent a man to engage in hate speech.

There is no reason to believe that most atheists today are hateful persons; they simply don't believe in God. Unfortunately, when it comes to organized atheists, that's a different story: many are hateful persons, spilling their venom at innocent men and women who practice their faith.

Among the worst are the atheist haters at Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF).

When FFRF is in the news, it is a sure bet it is trying to censor some person or religious symbol. It is known for what it is against, not what it is for, save hatred for religion. Recently, it got bent out of shape when Oklahoma Gov. Kevin Stitt said he would speak at a Protestant church in Tulsa. What makes FFRF's beef so dishonest is its habit of ignoring politicians who use black churches for a rally. This goes on all the time.

FFRF is based in Madison, Wisconsin, a left-wing college town. It was founded in 1976 by Anne Nicol Gaylor and her daughter, Annie Laurie Gaylor. They regard themselves and their members as "freethinkers," to be distinguished from all of those close-minded persons who believe in God. They are too smart for that. Yet they have no idea how the world began or why we are here, choosing to believe in nothing. "Nothinkers" may be a more apt way of characterizing them.

Last year at this time, FFRF featured Cecile Richards at its annual convention; she was the outgoing president of Planned Parenthood. She was a good choice: FFRF is passionately pro-abortion. So much so that Anne Nicol Gaylor once wrote a book, *Abortion Is A Blessing*. So much for the argument that "no one is really *for* abortion."

Why are so many organized atheists rabidly pro-abortion? Sex. They believe in a pansexual world where everything goes, absent any judgment. For them, the three most dreaded words in the English language are, "Thou Shalt Not." They don't want to be told by anyone what they should and should not do, and they sure don't want to hear from religious Americans.

One reason why FFRF is on the march these days is because of the lack of competition from American Atheists. There is great irony in this story: its former chief, David Silverman, was

fired on April 12, 2018 for sexually assaulting women. Had he not sneered at "Thou Shalt Not" he might still be president.

Religious liberty is constantly under attack by FFRF. It recently became apoplectic when it learned that the Trump administration, under the tutelage of Secretary of State Mike Pompeo, announced the formation of the Commission on Unalienable Rights. This entity, led by Mary Ann Glendon, the brilliant Harvard law professor who serves on the Catholic League's advisory board, is charged with assessing human rights from the perspective of natural law and natural rights. These founding principles scare the daylight out of FFRF: that's because they reflect our Creator, the source of our unalienable rights.

Religious symbols in the workplace bother FFRF. They want them banished. When it learned that employees in a municipal building in Taylor County, Texas had crosses on their desks, it went bonkers. Another worker had the gall to have a Bible on his desk. To make matters worse, "God Bless America" signs were also found, including one on the door of the Veterans' Service Office.

FFRF sees Christian symbols as analogous to swastikas. That's why it had a fit with an Alabama school board in Cullman County when it added "In God We Trust" to school displays last year. In 2017, it wrote a threatening letter to Dan Hughes, mayor of Henderson County in Tennessee. Why? FFRF learned of a biblical verse from Psalms etched on the wall of the local county courthouse. It did not matter that the verse had been there for a half century without anyone complaining.

The good news is that FFRF loses more than it wins. Over the summer it took it on the chin when a federal appeals court overturned a lower court ruling on the constitutionality of allowing Lehigh County, Pennsylvania to keep its 75-year-old seal that has an image of a Christian cross. The Philadelphia appeals court noted that the seal did not amount to a

government endorsement of religion.

The House of Representatives begins each legislative day with a prayer, a practice that has been observed since the First Continental Congress. In 2016, FFRF officials demanded equal time: it asked House Chaplain Father Patrick Conroy for the right to offer a “non-prayer” invocation. After they were denied, they sued. In 2017, they lost in federal district court. The next year they lost on an appeal to the D.C. Circuit Court. It was only fitting that they lost on Good Friday.

Veterans often rely on religion for peace and solace. When FFRF found out in 2007 that the Department of Veterans Affairs gave veterans spiritual assessments, asking about their religious practices, it sued. Chalk up another loss.

FFRF hates Christmas. If it can't censor nativity scenes, it settles for a contrived competition, displaying some silly secular symbols next to the crèches. This is another example of its “against” agenda: it is always against something that Christians like. Satanic displays, of course, meet with its approval. Though the atheists would like to stop the Catholic League from displaying its life-size nativity scene every year in Central Park, it cannot: we get a permit from the New York City Parks Department; the government cannot discriminate against people of faith in venues that are considered a public forum.

FFRF has a special hatred of Catholics. From time to time, it likes to take out newspaper ads imploring Catholics to leave the Church. I have never seen it ask Muslims to leave their mosques or Jews to leave their synagogues.

Whenever a Catholic is in the news for doing something wrong, FFRF pounces on it. But when Stephen Hicks murdered three Muslims near the campus of the University of North Carolina in 2015, it said nothing. That's because Hicks was a militant

atheist.

Lots of Americans who are not Catholic are proponents of school choice, but when this issue surfaces, FFRF chooses to make it a Catholic issue. For example, Trump's Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, has been accused by FFRF of pushing a "theocratic agenda to destroy public, secular education." The leading "theocrats," of course, are Catholics.

In some parts of the country, it has long been considered acceptable to have polling stations in or adjacent to a church. Voters simply cast their ballot and leave. But the issue is not that simple for FFRF. Annie Laurie Gaylor zeroed in on Catholics when she addressed this in 2003, and her words were not measured. "Asking a feminist to vote in a Roman Catholic Church is like asking a black man to vote in a KKK hall." That's right—there is no difference between a local Catholic church and a facility used by racists and terrorists.

Whenever a pope comes to the United States, FFRF rears its ugly head in protest. It not only objects to spending public monies for security purposes (newsflash: the pope is a head of state, not just a religious leader), it objects when public institutions cooperate with his visit. In 2017, it was angered when it learned that the football team at the University of Michigan attended a papal audience. When it learned that the athletes were to receive a papal blessing, it said this was a violation of the First Amendment. It looked foolish again—no one paid it any heed.

FFRF doesn't like Catholic judges. It is therefore not surprising to learn that it thinks we have too many Catholics on the Supreme Court. It has a special hatred of Catholic male judges. In 2014, it took out a full-page ad in the *New York Times* objecting to the *Hobby Lobby* decision (which did not involve a Catholic company) because the five Catholic male judges voted to sustain religious liberties.

“DOGMA SHOULD NOT TRUMP OUR CIVIL LIBERTIES. ALL-MALE ALL-ROMAN CATHOLIC MAJORITY ON SUPREME COURT PUTS RELIGIOUS WRONGS OVER WOMEN’S RIGHTS.”

Translated this means that it was furious with the ruling that sustained the right of an evangelical Christian owner not to pay for contraception in his healthcare plan for workers. FFRF blamed the male Catholics for the decision.

FFRF never says a word about the fact that one third of the Supreme Court is Jewish, though Jews make up only two percent of the population. Nor does it say anything negative about Sonia Sotomayor: not only is she not a practicing Catholic, she is reliably pro-abortion and always follows the gay agenda. She is the kind of Catholic FFRF likes.

Aside from the late Christopher Hitchens, the famous atheist whom I debated on many occasions, it would be hard to find anyone who hates Mother Teresa (now St. Teresa of Calcutta). Hard but not impossible. FFRF does.

In 2003, FFRF condemned the Madison Metro System in Madison, Wisconsin because it put a picture of Mother Teresa on its bus pass for the month of April; its practice was to choose a prominent person each month for this honor. The fanatics at FFRF saw this as a violation of church and state. To show how much FFRF hates Catholics, when the May pass featured a picture of Rev. Martin Luther King, it said nothing.

In 2016, atheists took to the streets of Washington, D.C. to promote their cause. That agenda, of course, meant an agenda of hate. FFRF was there, of course, and no doubt was loving it when atheist Penn Jillette went on an obscene rant against Mother Teresa.

Owing to the clout of conservative evangelical Christians, FFRF has often set its sights on them, as well as Catholics. In 2012, it was so incensed about conservative Christians who allowed politicians to speak at their churches, that it

actually sued the IRS for not enforcing its rules. Naturally, it said nothing about African American churches inviting candidates for public office to address their congregations. In 2014, FFRF claimed victory when there was none: FFRF withdrew its lawsuit after the IRS simply clarified its strictures.

I am saving the best for last. In 2018, the IRS revoked the tax exemption status of NonBelief Relief, an agency incorporated by FFRF for failing to file its Form 990 for three consecutive years. FFRF then sued the IRS, claiming the tax-exempt status was unfairly revoked.*

In October, it held its annual convention, featuring speakers no one ever heard of, which is precisely what we would expect from a group of “Nothinkers.” They really are a sorry bunch of losers.

**This paragraph has been amended to reflect a more accurate representation.*

DENVER POST’S SELECTIVE INTEREST IN SEX ABUSE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on recent articles in the *Denver Post* on sexual abuse:

The sexual abuse of minors has always been a problem, of varying degrees, in settings where adults interact with pre-teens and teenagers. Today, there is no institution in the nation that has less of a problem with this offense than the Catholic Church: over the last ten years, the average number of credible accusations made against approximately 50,000

members of the clergy, in any given year, is in the single digits.

Now that the media have been deprived of doing stories on clergy sexual abuse in the Catholic Church—don't look for them to give profile to the data just cited—some have resorted to criticizing the Church for not keeping tabs on those who are no longer in ministry.

There is no law mandating that the employer of an employee who was terminated for sexual misconduct is responsible for tracking his whereabouts. If there were, given the high rate of such offenders in Hollywood, they would have to attach GPS ankle bracelets on its predators just to keep up with them all.

The *Denver Post* knows this to be true, but for some reason it holds the Catholic Church, *and the Catholic Church alone*, to a different standard. On November 4, it ran a front-page story on 11 priests accused of sexually molesting minors who are still alive. "Where are they now?"

The story is based on a report issued October 23 by the Colorado Attorney General on sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. It found that 166 minors were allegedly victimized by 43 priests over the past 70 years.

Of the 166, five priests abused 102 of the minors, or 61 percent of the total. In fact, two were responsible for 82 of the cases, or almost half of the total, and one was responsible for 63 of them, or 38 percent of all the cases. The worst offender, Father Harold Robert White, died in 2006.

Fully 84 percent of the victims were boys, and most were postpubescent, meaning that their victimizers were homosexuals. In keeping with the homosexual cover-up, neither the *Denver Post*, nor any of the other media outlets, made mention of this.

The *Denver Post* knows there is a serious sexual abuse problem today—not when Harry Truman was president—in the public schools, yet it does not run stories on the whereabouts of these predators. Just last year it published a story, “Colorado Public Schools Are Paying Millions to Settle Lawsuits When Educators Fail to Report Sex Abuse of Students, But Those Educators Avoid Legal Consequences.” It was quite revealing. “An investigation by the Denver Post found that the mandatory reporting law is seldom enforced and often results in leniency for violators.”

Which is more serious? Not monitoring abusers tossed from the priesthood, which is not illegal, or not reporting those who are abusing public school students today, which is illegal?

In December 2016, *USA TODAY* released a comprehensive report on sexual abuse in the public schools. Colorado received a grade of “C.” Importantly, it was faulted for not sharing teachers’ misconduct with other states.

If molesting Colorado teachers are allowed to seek employment in another state, and the school is not notified that it is hiring a molester, would not that be something for the *Denver Post* to write about? “Where are they now?” would be a good title for the story.

Maybe the Catholic Church in Colorado should take a leaf out of the playbook of the New York City public schools. They do not have to ask, “Where are they now?”

On November 2, the *New York Post* did a story on teachers released on charges of sexual misconduct. They are assigned to “rubber rooms,” offices where they shuffle papers. Aryeh Eller was removed in 1999 following charges of sexual harassment. He is not wandering the streets—he is in a rubber room. Last year, he made \$132,753, and over the past two decades he has pulled in at least \$1.7 million, plus full health and pension benefits. And he is not alone.

Of course, if the Catholic Church assigned paper-shuffling jobs to its miscreant priests, with a hefty salary and benefits, then it would be condemned for ripping off parishioners. This is the kind of Catch-22 game the media love to play. It is all so dishonest.

Contact the reporter, Elise Schmelzer:
eschmelzer@denverpost.com

WILL OUR CULTURE WAR BECOME A CIVIL WAR?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a recent poll showing how divided the nation is:

On October 23, the Georgetown Institute of Politics and Public Service Battleground Civility Poll revealed that two-thirds of Americans believe the U.S. is on the edge of civil war. This was true across the board: sex, age, race, geography, ideology—it did not matter. But why has our culture become so uncivil that it engulfs our national political discourse?

The social fabric began to tear in the 1960s, the decade that celebrated radical individualism. In the 1970s, Christopher Lasch, a man of the left, recounted our maladies in his book, *The Culture of Narcissism*. There are many reasons why we have become more coarse, more self-absorbed, and more uncivil. Those who craft our culture, especially the pop culture, have played a major role.

Music, dance, theater, art, TV, movies—as well as dress, language, manners, and etiquette—have all gone south. We are now at street level.

It is so ironic to note that now, after trashing civility for a half century, our cultural elites are horrified by the outcome. What else would they expect? Yes, our president is crude. So are his enemies. Big surprise. Having nurtured incivility for decades, the harvest is now upon us.

The *New York Times* is constantly decrying the incivility that marks the nation's capital. Yet it calls for more incivility. For example, there is a column in the October 29 edition of the *Times* by Jennifer Weiner cheering the incivility that greeted Trump at a recent World Series game. "If booing is incivility," she says, "bring it on."

Weiner blames Republicans and conservatives for the problem. They need to be more like her side. "For them, cruelty is the point. For us, kindness matters. When they go low, we go high."

Was it "kindness" that *New York Times* columnist David Leonhardt was promoting when he recently called on Americans to "take to the streets" over Trump's policies? He used as a model the Women's Marches on Washington. Did he mean the 2017 one that was sponsored by [anti-Catholic organizations](#)? Or the 2019 one that was sponsored by [anti-Semites](#)?

Three days after Leonhardt's op-ed, his colleague, Michelle Goldberg, expressed her dismay at Americans for not "taking to the streets en masse." Her idea of "kindness" was evident when she was in college: she beckoned pro-abortion students to storm a pro-life exhibit and kick the crosses down. She screamed, "do your part and spit at [pro-lifers]. [Kick them in the head.](#)"

Just a few days ago, the *Washington Post* did a news story on left-wing activists and their ideological kin. These extremists predict more people will take to the streets of Washington, tying up traffic. Will they show their "kindness"

by getting violent? You bet. Sociology professor Dana Fisher says, “the natural progression is to get more confrontational and, sometimes, to get more violent.”

Antifa is a group of urban terrorists who wear masks while they assault innocent persons. [The left loves them](#). In April, CNN’s Chris Cuomo praised them for their “good cause” (he did not explain why anarchy is a “good cause”). In May, CNN did a show on Antifa that also heralded their “good cause.” In June, journalist Andy Ngo was the recipient of Antifa’s “kindness” when they beat him so mercilessly that they almost killed him.

Incivility was not generated by conservatives in Hollywood or New York City. The left has worked hard to morally debase our society. Now that many who are not in their ranks have adopted their stylebook, if not their support for violence, it’s a little too late to cry foul.