

POPE BRANDS TRANSGENDER THEORY AS EVIL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on transgender theory and its consequences:

Pope Francis is on the left of the political spectrum on economic and environmental issues, but he remains a conservative on moral issues. His defense of the rights of the unborn is as strong as his two predecessors, and there is nothing heterodox about his comments on marriage, the family, and sexuality: he is a defender of traditional moral values.

In his apostolic exhortation responding to the Amazon synod's call for the ordination of married men and a reconsideration of the Church's position on women deacons, he gave the so-called progressives nothing. In fact, he didn't even answer their plea—they were summarily dismissed. Worse, as far as the dissidents are concerned, was his embrace of complementarity, that is, the commonsensical observation that men and women are not identical but are indeed complementary.

The Holy Father goes beyond his two predecessors by strongly condemning gender theory. He was recently asked where he sees evil at work today. "One place is 'gender theory.'" He went on to say that gender theory is "dangerous" because it seeks to destroy basic differences between the sexes. "It would make everything homogenous, neutral. It is an attack on difference, on the creativity of God and on men and women." These remarks are nothing new for the pope. In 2014, he said, "Gender ideology is demonic."

Such comments would be enough to get Pope Francis banned from speaking in England—Franklin Graham was just banned for voicing similar comments—and from most colleges and universities in the United States. Many Catholic ones would

like to deny him the right to speak the truth about this subject as well, though they wouldn't have the nerve to do so.

If this madness about men and women being interchangeable were just a theory confined to the asylum and the academy (increasingly indistinguishable), no one would care. But unfortunately, it has been operationalized.

Connecticut allows men to compete in women's sports providing the guys consider themselves to be girls. They call such people transgender athletes. But real girls keep losing to these guys in girls' sports and so three real girls have sued claiming that they are being discriminated against under Title IX: it is a federal law that bars discrimination on the basis of sex.

The ACLU, which worked hard to defeat the Equal Rights Amendment for women for 50 years, is defending the discrimination against the girls. "The truth is," it says, "transgender women and girls [meaning men and boys who think they are not men and boys] have been competing in sports at all levels for years, and there is no research supporting the claim that they maintain a competitive advantage."

That's right, the lawyers at the ACLU need to see the research. We don't. That argument implodes by considering the Olympics. The reason why the Olympics is a showcase of sex segregation is precisely because men are stronger and faster than women. If there were not a competitive advantage enjoyed by men, the Olympics would be unisex. It never will be. That is because men have more testosterone than women, and even the ACLU can't do anything about that.

Why is this subject even a matter of debate? Because of the geniuses who populate the academy. It all comes down to the postmodern assault on truth, nature, and nature's God.

Once that is done, a man can consider himself to be a dog and compete in a dog show. He can even be walked by a professor of

sociology and access a hydrant. Wonders never cease.

NY STATE EDUCATION POWER GRAB ON HOLD

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a statement by New York State education officials on some proposed reforms:

New York State Department of Education has put on ice its proposal to allow public schools to exercise control over private schools. We fought this power grab on two occasions in the past two years and will continue to do so again if it is resurrected. We are delighted to learn that the vast majority of those who responded to the invitation to make a public response to this initiative were opposed to the plan.

On April 5, 2018, I wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Education at the New York State Education Department, Mary Elia, expressing the concerns of the Catholic League. Though the proximate cause for allowing a partial takeover of private schools was alleged curriculum deficiencies in some yeshivas operated by Orthodox Jews, there were passages in the guidelines that actually allowed the state to exercise more control of parochial schools than yeshivas.

We not only protested this idea, we rejected the entire scheme. At stake is the religious autonomy of Catholic and Jewish schools. "To be sure, there are legitimate educational matters that should concern the state," I said, "regardless of whether a school is private non-sectarian, religious, or public. There are also legitimate church and state issues involved when it comes to the public policing of religious

education.”

On August 28, 2019, I issued another statement, this time encouraging our allies to contact the New York State Education Department; we provided the email contact information. The notion that a local public school, which may be a failed institution, would be given oversight over an academically excellent Catholic school is something right out of the Twilight Zone.

Albany education officials should have hit the “stop button,” not the “pause button.” This proposal was killed in the court of public opinion and was certain to be killed in the courts as well. It should be withdrawn and buried.

Contact Christina Coughlin, Assistant Commissioner, Office of School Governance, Policy, and Religious and Independent Schools: emscmgts@nysed.gov

THE END OF PRO-LIFE DEMOCRATS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Democrats and abortion:

When I taught in a Catholic elementary school in Spanish Harlem in the 1970s, I quoted to my African American and Puerto Rican students what Rev. Jesse Jackson said about abortion: It was genocide against black people. Senator Ted Kennedy also railed against abortion, as did virtually every Democrat.

The pro-abortion party was the Republicans, home to WASP elites like the Rockefellers who saw abortion as a way to resolve “the urban problem.” That’s why their lavish funding

of Planned Parenthood wound up establishing clinics in minority neighborhoods.

But by the end of the 1970s, the parties flipped: Republicans became pro-life and the Democrats became pro-abortion. They did so because of religious reasons.

Evangelicals, most of whom were Republicans, supported *Roe v. Wade*. They did so largely because Catholics, most of whom were Democrats, were pro-life. But they quickly got over their irrational opposition and, by the time Ronald Reagan became president, they joined the pro-life cause. In the Democratic party, feminists took command and drove out the pro-life Catholic leadership. This pushed more Catholics to join the Republican party.

In the subsequent decades, the number of pro-abortion Republicans and the number of pro-life Democrats dwindled, though there was some room left for pro-life Democrats. Now that is over. What happened last week marked the end of pro-life Democrats.

Charles Camosy is a pro-life Democrat who teaches at Fordham University. He resigned last week from the board of Democrats for Life in America because the party has left him with “no choice.” Bishop Thomas Tobin, who heads the Diocese of Providence, Rhode Island, asked on February 4, “Are pro-life voters not welcome in the Democratic party?”

They are not. On Saturday, Senator Bernie Sanders said, “I think being pro-choice is an absolutely essential part of being a Democrat.”

Does that mean that all abortions are justified, including those where the baby is just about to be born? Yes. Are there any Democrats running for president who draw the line when it comes to partial-birth abortion? No.

During Friday’s debate, Senator Elizabeth Warren and Joe Biden

both endorsed congressional legislation that would codify *Roe v. Wade* should the Supreme Court reverse this decision. Senator Amy Klobuchar said she would only appoint judges who supported *Roe*. Pete Buttigieg, who is unemployed, had a chance at a Fox News town hall to carve out a more moderate position, but refused to do so. He previously said that “life begins at breath,” and stuck to his guns regarding the moral legitimacy of killing a baby who is 80 percent born.

In May 2018, a Gallup poll found that 13 percent support third-term abortions. Why, then, would not one Democrat running for president agree with the 87 percent of Americans who say late-term abortions are indefensible?

Four years ago, Hillary Clinton hurt herself badly when she defended partial-birth abortion in a debate with Donald Trump. Apparently, nothing has been learned from that experience.

There was a time when New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and New York City Mayor Ed Koch, both Democrats and supporters of *Roe*, said “count me out” when it comes to late-term abortions. Now the Democrats have become the “count me in” party, the consequences of which will soon be known.

WESTERN EUROPE BALKS ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new effort to ensure religious liberty:

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo has been a vocal advocate of religious liberty, both here and abroad. He has now established a new International Religious Freedom Alliance

with 27 member states.

They have all pledged to promote religious beliefs in a myriad of ways, and have agreed to condemn religious persecution wherever it exists. Conscience rights are central to this initiative and a condemnation of “blasphemy laws” is another important feature.

One of the 27 nations that signed the statement was Colombia. Ironically, Open Doors recently assigned it 41st place among the worst 50 nations in the world known for Christian persecution. However, it is not state officials who are responsible—it is guerrillas and organized crime. It is a very positive sign that state officials are now pledging to condemn religious persecution.

Not surprisingly, Israel signed on as a supporter of religious liberty. Also unsurprising is the absence of Muslim-run states. Of the 50 worst nations for Christians to live in, as determined by Open Doors, 38 are run by Muslims.

It is not good news to learn that only 27 nations have so far gotten on board. Most glaringly, only two nations from Western Europe have joined—the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. By contrast, 11 nations from Central and Eastern Europe are participants: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

In 1967, Enver Hoxha, a Communist, declared Albania to be the world’s first atheist state. Now it is more supportive of religious liberty than France, Germany, and Spain. These three nations were recently named by the Gatestone Institute as among the worst perpetrators of anti-Christian attacks in Europe. That they refused to join an international alliance defending religious freedom is telling.

The collapse of Christianity and the rise of militant secularism has conquered Western Europe, and with it has come

religious persecution. Conditions are better in North America, but they are not great. There is something organically sick about secularism in its current manifestation. It is not practicing Christians and Jews we need to fear—it is religious and secular fanatics.

What the Western world desperately needs is a Christian renaissance. Fortunately, Secretary Pompeo is doing what he can to inspire it.

WHY ARE DEMOCRATS SO UNHAPPY?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the results of recent surveys on happiness and life satisfaction:

The Democrats are an unhappy people. This has nothing to do with their hatred of President Trump: it's who they are.

Gallup released a poll on February 6 measuring personal life satisfaction. The survey was broken down on the basis of age, sex, income, marital status, family status (e.g. those who have young children), education, race, and political preference.

It was found that those who make over \$100,000 a year are the most likely segment of the population to say they are satisfied with their personal life. In second place are Republicans. In last place are those who make less than \$40,000. Democrats are second to last.

Similarly, a Gallup poll released last month on happiness found that Republicans are happier than Democrats. Moreover, the gap is widening between Republicans and Democrats on the scale of being "very happy." No data were collected based on

income.

Money may not buy happiness but it clearly has an impact on personal life satisfaction. That is easy to understand. But why are Democrats so unsatisfied and so relatively unhappy?

Some might say that because African Americans are more likely to be Democrats and are more likely to be at the low end of the income scale, that racial discrimination is indirectly causing the outcome. That assumption is wrong. The real reason for this divide is religion, not race.

Surveys done on wellbeing have consistently found that there is a positive correlation between religiosity (religious beliefs and practices) and happiness; the more religious a person is the happier he is likely to be.

This is true worldwide. A survey by the Pew Research Center released last year that measured religion and happiness on a global scale found that “actively religious people are more likely than their less-religious peers to describe themselves as ‘very happy.’”

We know from many surveys that blacks are much more religious than whites. Indeed, they have more in common with Republicans when it comes to religiosity than they do with white Democrats. The latter are the most secular segment of the population.

So when religion is factored in, we are left with the conclusion that it is white secular Democrats who are the most dissatisfied and the least happy. It is not race and party preference that makes one happy or unhappy. What matters is religiosity.

“Why Are Democrats So Unhappy?” The answer lies more with their lack of religious beliefs and practices—driven by white Democrats—than any other factor.

PRIEST ACCUSERS OF SUSPECT CHARACTER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the character of some priest accusers:

Last week we learned that Msgr. William Lynn, who was sentenced in 2012 for child endangerment when he was secretary for the clergy at the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, will be retried again—his conviction was twice overturned—on March 16. But it is an open question whether his accuser, Danny Gallagher, a.k.a, Billy Doe, will be called to testify.

Gallagher is one of many priest accusers who are of suspect character, yet this has mattered little to the courts or the media. Ralph Cipriano, who has done the best work of any journalist on this case, rightfully described Gallagher as “a former drug addict, heroin dealer, habitual liar, third-rate conman and thief,” who nonetheless was able to shake down the Church for \$5 million in a civil settlement.

How could this have happened? Gallagher told two social workers for the archdiocese what allegedly happened to him at the hands of priests and a layman. Cipriano says that the details he offered—“the anal rapes, the punches, the threats, the claims about being tied up naked with altar sashes, strangled with a seatbelt, and forced to suck blood off a priest’s penis—all those graphic details were dropped from his story” when he spoke to the police.

Worse, the defense lawyers were kept in the dark about this and also never learned of the explosive affidavit by detective Joe Walsh; he questioned Gallagher before the trial. He provided many stunning inconsistencies in Gallagher’s account,

concluding that he was an inveterate liar.

The week before last we learned that Father Roy T. Herberger from the Buffalo diocese filed a libel suit against his accuser who claimed that the priest abused him in the 1980s. The Diocese of Buffalo put the priest on administrative leave in June 2018, pending an investigation, and then concluded that the allegation was unfounded. He was returned to active ministry in December 2018.

Attorney Scott Riordan, who was hired by the diocese, did a report on the accuser. He found there was no record of him being at the school at the time when he was allegedly molested. The accuser said he was assaulted in the rectory of St. Ann church, but the priest had no key to get in as the parish was run by the Jesuits. The accuser said much of the abuse occurred in the priest's home in Lackawanna, but the priest never owned or rented a house in that neighborhood. And the inside of the home that the accuser described was found completely wrong by the owners.

It is not just in the United States where these travesties of justice are taking place.

Cardinal George Pell, who is in an Australian prison for alleged sexual abuse (awaiting a final appeal) was accused as far back as 1962. The case was dismissed because nothing could be substantiated. His accuser had been convicted 39 times for offenses ranging from assault to drug use. He was a violent drug addict who drove drunk and beat people.

In 1969, Pell was accused of doing nothing to help an abused boy who pleaded for help. But Pell was not in Australia that year—he was in Rome. At a later date he was accused of chasing away a complainant who informed him of a molesting priest. But Pell did not live where this allegedly happened, and the accuser was later imprisoned for sexually abusing children.

When Pell was accused of joking about a notorious molester

priest's sexual assaults at a funeral Mass in Ballarat, it was later found that there was no Mass that day and the priest whom Pell was allegedly joking with was living someplace else when the alleged incident took place.

The occasions that got Pell imprisoned have also been called into question. One of his accusers was an alcoholic, a drug addict, and a thug who beat and stalked his girlfriend. His co-accuser also had a record of violence. As for the two choirboys who claimed Pell abused them, one has since died of a drug overdose, but not before telling his mother, on two occasions, that the alleged incident never happened.

These are three of the most high profile cases where a priest has been accused by men whose characterological profile is seriously impaired.

There is another priest, Father Gordon MacRae, who is still in prison in New Hampshire for crimes he [vehemently denies](#), and whose accuser, Thomas Grover, has a history of theft, drugs, and violence. Even his former wife and stepson call him a "compulsive liar" and a "manipulator."

Lest anyone think that I will defend any accused priest, let me be clear: I will defend the due process rights of any accused priest, but will not exculpate any priest who is guilty of an offense. The Catholic League is here to defend the Catholic Church against wrongdoing: We are not here to defend wrongdoing committed by the Church.

MORE NONSENSE ABOUT SECRECY

IN THE CHURCH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on another article alleging the Catholic Church is not being transparent about abuse cases:

Last month, the Associated Press (AP) quoted a professor from Case Western University, Brian Clites, who made spurious comments about the Catholic Church. He was referred to as a “leading scholar on clergy sexual abuse,” a statement that was patently untrue. As I pointed out, the man has never written a book on anything, much less on this subject. How he became elevated to being a “leading” scholar only AP knows.

Now this genius is back. Clites posted a piece on “Catholic Investigations Are Still Shrouded in Secrecy” for the online publication, “The Conversation.” It was picked up by Yahoo for distribution.

Clites notes that Buffalo Bishop Richard Malone recently resigned after being criticized for some decisions he made handling clergy sexual abuse. That much is true. He then cites the case of Bishop Robert Finn of Kansas City as an example of a Vatican investigation that did not go public with its findings.

Clites fails to mention that when Finn learned of some disturbing photos on the laptop of a priest in his diocese, he contacted a police officer and an attorney. They concluded that the pictures of fully clothed girls, which were admittedly suspect (crotch shots), did not constitute child porn. It is important to note that there was no complainant—had Finn said nothing, no one would have known about this incident.

After the priest was evaluated by a psychiatrist, restrictions were placed on him. When he violated the agreement, Finn contacted the authorities. It is important to note again that

he had no legal mandate to do so—no law had been broken. When it was then learned that hundreds of offensive pictures were found on the priest's computer, the police were summoned. A week later the priest was arrested.

So why didn't Clites mention any of this? Because it would get in the way of his narrative about the shameful Catholic Church. He did not stop there.

Clites is critical of Pope Benedict XVI's decision to sanction an Australian priest in 2007. He should not be. The pope was confronted with a priest who rejected various Church teachings. Would not the editorial board of any newspaper fire a member of the board who decided to go rogue and promote a point of view that is contrary to the established policy? Should the Catholic Church be held to a different standard?

Similarly, Clites questions the "highly secretive" investigations of some nuns by the Vatican. Perhaps he never read about all the *faithful* nuns who had long been demanding such a probe: in some cases, they are surrounded by dissident sisters who have gone off the reservation.

Clites gives away his cards altogether when he writes of the "authoritarian and top-secret nature" of Church investigations. He must be thinking of the media and Hollywood: they still invoke confidentiality agreements governing sexual misconduct. Too bad they don't follow the lead of the Catholic Church—these gag orders were banned almost two decades ago.

Contact: brian.clites@case.edu