

# CARDINAL PELL PLEADS “NOT GUILTY”

Cardinal George Pell pleaded “not guilty” on May 1 to charges of sexual misconduct dating back decades ago. Though the majority of the charges against him were either thrown out or withdrawn, including the most serious accusations, Melbourne Magistrate Belinda Wallington said there was sufficient evidence to warrant a trial on some of the other charges.

We could see this coming.

Pell’s attorney, Robert Richter, argued that his client, the third-highest ranking Vatican official, is being targeted as the fall guy for crimes that other priests have committed. He attacked Pell’s accusers, saying, “Whether they are the product of fantasy or mental problems...or just pure invention...it’s in order to punish the representative of the Catholic Church in this country [Australia] for not stopping abuse by others.”

Richter said of the accusers that “Their complaints ought to be regarded as impossible and ought to be discharged without batting an eyelid.” He also stressed to the judge that Pell did not seek diplomatic immunity in the Holy See, and answered every question that the police asked.

Prior to the judge’s ruling, Bill Donohue noted that Wallington “is already on record noting the inconsistencies in the testimony of his [Pell’s] accusers, about which the prosecutor readily admits to as well. But both have indicated that any discrepancies could be sorted out in a trial, which suggests that the process will go forward.” Pell appeared in court on May 2 to learn of the details of the trial.

Sometime in the future—it could be a year or more—Cardinal Pell will appear before a jury on charges that he molested two

boys at a pool in Ballarat in the 1970s, and for forcing two boys to engage in a sex act with him in the 1990s in Melbourne's St. Patrick's Cathedral. Both cases are so contrived that only Church haters would be inclined to believe them.

The swimming pool incident involves horsing around with two boys, Lyndon Monument and Damian Dignan. Pell admits to tossing them in the air, but nothing else. They maintain that while he was tossing them he also managed to fondle them.

Did anyone see this? One witness came forward saying he had seen Pell playing with the boys, launching them in the air, but he never saw anything "untoward." Another witness, a woman who often took her daughter to the pool, said she never saw Pell do anything wrong.

Moreover, the court had previously heard that one of the accusers gave police a wholly different account from what he told others. This same person also confessed that he was having trouble remembering the exact placement of the cardinal's hand.

There is a reason why this accuser cannot remember exactly what happened: the alleged offense took place 40 years ago. Why did neither of the two boys say a word about this until a few years ago? And why have the media been so quiet about their identity? Here's what we know.

Monument was a big boozier, a drug addict, and a thug who beat and stalked his girlfriend. An ex-con, he was also arrested for burglary, assault, and making threats to kill. Dignan, who died earlier this year, also had a record of violence, and had been arrested for drunk driving. To top things off, both of them have made accusations against former teachers.

The St. Patrick's Cathedral incident involves two choir boys who are accusing Pell of making them perform oral sex on him after Mass two decades ago. The police investigated this

matter and found nothing to support it. One of the boys has since died, having overdosed on drugs. On two occasions, the boy's mother said her son admitted that Pell never abused him.

Father Charles Portelli, who assisted Pell during cathedral ceremonies, says that Pell was never alone, either before, during, or after Mass. "There was never an opportunity for the archbishop to be alone in the priest's sacristy." Maxwell Porter, who was sacristan at St. Patrick's at the time, agreed with this assessment. Rodney Dearing, a pastoral associate, testified that it would not be easy for Pell to reveal his genitals since his robes were not able to be parted in the middle or to the side. Moreover, he said, the robes were too heavy to be easily lifted to expose himself.

We have been following this case carefully for several years, and have no reason to doubt the veracity of Cardinal Pell.

Pell's morally challenged accusers, and their supporters, have never been interested in him, per se: He is a prominent surrogate for their real enemy—the Catholic Church. To be exact, Cardinal Pell is the whipping boy of the Church haters. That's what this witch-hunt has been about all along.

---

## **LIBERALS KILLED E.R.A., NOT "RELIGIOUS RIGHT"**

The April 20 editorial in the *New York Times* on the Equal Rights Amendment (E.R.A.) is flawed in several ways. It is not the "religious right" that is responsible for the failure of this amendment, it is liberals. The editorial demonizes the "religious right" for "fearmongering," when, in fact, it was liberal women who fought the E.R.A. for decades.

If the E.R.A. wins the support of two more states, it will have the 38 needed for ratification (the male-dominated Congress overwhelmingly passed it in 1972), though it may not survive a legal challenge: when advocates of the E.R.A. failed to muster 38 states in 1972, Congress extended the deadline for seven years, and then again for another three.

The clock has long run out, so it is debatable whether getting the needed three-fourths of the states to approve will count 36 years after the measure failed for the third time. Moreover, five of the states that voted for it later rescinded their vote, thus complicating matters even further.

Legalities aside, the *Times* editorial fails to tell the truth about the evolution of the E.R.A. Proof of the following account is detailed in Bill Donohue's 1985 book, *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union*, published by Transaction Press.

The idea that women should have the identical rights afforded men was first broached in 1916, and in 1923 the E.R.A. was proposed by the National Women's Party. Working against it were feminists who objected to identical rights, led by Eleanor Roosevelt. She said women needed special protection against hazardous and "demeaning" occupations, jobs that only men should have to do. Her opposition proved to be successful, though the measure would later resurface.

When the E.R.A. was defeated in the Senate in July 1946, the ACLU was delighted: mission accomplished. The ACLU member who worked the hardest to defeat it was Dorothy Kenyon, known as a "radical" judge; she chaired the ACLU's Committee on Women's Rights.

In the 1950s, the ACLU pulled out all the stops to defeat what it called the "so-called 'equal rights amendment' (for women)." The ACLU opposed it because of "the danger that it would destroy the power to enact differential legislation

granting equality in fact (as distinguished from mathematical identity)." The amendment was opposed by most of the trade unions (both women's and men's) as well as the League of Women Voters. Even the American Association of University Women was opposed to the "liberating" amendment.

The ACLU acknowledged at the time that there was some residue of discrimination against women, but "only the remnants of feudalism remain," making moot the need for an amendment. "Even the practice of unequal pay for equal work, a world-wide phenomenon extremely interesting in its psychological motivations," the ACLU said, "is nothing but a universally bad habit." Even Phyllis Schlafly, who fought the E.R.A. in the 1970s, never went that far.

All through the 1960s, while the ACLU was demanding equal rights for blacks, Indians, Hispanics, migrant farm workers, the poor, students, the mentally ill, draft dodgers, the Klan, Nazis, and prisoners, it fought the E.R.A. In fact, Kenyon argued that the 14th Amendment was sufficient for women. Then, like a lightning bolt out of the sky, Kenyon switched positions, leading the ACLU to support the E.R.A. in September 1970.

Schlafly mobilized conservatives to oppose the E.R.A. in the 1970s, but it was not conservatives who voted against it in New York and New Jersey. When the measure was put to a vote in 1975, after the male-dominated lawmakers in the two states voted for it, the measure was soundly defeated. Linda Greenhouse of the *New York Times* wrote that it was women, not men, who were responsible for the outcome.

The role that feminists played in killing the E.R.A. is not something that liberals want to talk about. They would rather demonize the "religious right."

The *Times* looks even more hypocritical when it says that while there are laws granting equal rights to women, "The E.R.A.

would add an extra layer of legal protection for women—and men—against discrimination.” Yet when it comes to laws offering a new round of legal protection for the unborn, or for white men victimized by affirmative action, the same *New York Times* says we have enough laws on the books for them.

If we are to have an honest discussion on the E.R.A., we will have to turn to sources other than the *New York Times* and the ACLU.

---

## **TRUMP PROMOTES RELIGIOUS LIBERTY**

In May, President Trump signed an executive order promoting religious liberty. It creates a faith-based program giving religious organizations a greater role in government social service programs.

We are particularly happy that Trump pledged not to use this initiative the way his predecessor did: Obama’s program stifled the religious voice in faith-based entities; Trump’s program enhances it. Accordingly, we don’t anticipate any problems.

---

## **CHRISTOPHOBES ATTACK CHICK-**

# FIL-A

It is the fastest growing phobia in the nation. Christophobia. To be sure, the fear of Christians is not overcoming America, but it has unquestionably overcome a large swath of non-believers, or those who profess no religious belief. Within this segment of the population, there are the indifferent at one end, and the haters at the other end.

If there is any doubt that the haters are growing, consider the overheated reaction by the *New Yorker* to a company that sells chicken sandwiches. Journalist Dan Piepenbring accuses Chick-fil-A of “carpet bombing” New York City. What did it do to merit such an accusation? It opened its fourth store in the Big Apple.

Why the ballistic response? The company is owned by practicing Christians. For instance, they believe marriage should be between a man and a woman. What else? That’s about it.

What few acknowledge is that Chick-fil-A practices what it preaches in ways that have nothing to do with politics. Before Christmas 2017, thousands were stranded in Atlanta on a Sunday evening because of a massive power outage. Chick-fil-A, which observes Sunday by closing, quickly reopened to feed travelers. After the shootings at a gay club in Orlando, Pulse, the “gay-hating” franchise opened on a Sunday to feed those waiting in line to give blood. And on a regular basis, it donates a ton of food to the homeless.

But none of this matters to the Bill de Blasio of the world. Indeed, the New York City mayor called for a boycott of Chick-fil-A when it opened in New York in 2016. Ironically, the Christian company that he hates winds up feeding the increasing number of homeless that his policies create.

What is driving the hatred of Chick-fil-A is the fear that its traditional moral values may prove inspiring.

The Left has only one God: power. That is what defines it. To the extent that Chick-fil-A inspires people to adopt its values, it is a threat to radical secularists. Moreover, survey data have repeatedly shown that a very large portion of the “nones,” those who answer “none” when asked about their religious affiliation, are on the Left. They see Christian activists as a threat. Jews are too secular to begin with, and Muslims are too small to matter. So they focus on Christians.

Last year, a survey from Baylor University found that 31 percent of the “nones” identified Christians as a “danger to our safety.” Less than half that number said the same about Muslims. Obviously, there has been no rash of Christians assaulting the “nones,” or anyone else, so the fear is not based in reality. But it is a perfect example of Christophobia, which is spreading like a disease among a large segment of secularists.

What the “nones” need is conversion therapy. This is not about converting them to Christianity, although that would be an ideal outcome, it is about getting them to stop with their irrational fear of Christians. What makes their fear so patently irrational is the fact that Christians, as evidenced by Chick-fil-A, are more likely to help them than hurt them.

---

## **MoMA GIVEN “DUNG ON VIRGIN MARY” ART**

Hedge fund tycoon Steve Cohen no longer wants to keep his famous anti-Catholic art, “The Holy Virgin Mary,” so he gave it to MoMA. That was a predictable choice: the museum likes to insult Catholics. This masterpiece, by Chris Ofili, features



elephant dung smeared on his portrait of Our Blessed Mother, along with pictures of vaginas and anuses. The media almost never mention the porn.

During Holy Week in 2009, MoMA featured the film, "The Pope's Toilet," a movie by two Uruguayans. It was more stupid than vile, though the *New York Times* was delighted to report that it was an "oblique dig" at the Catholic Church (it prefers more direct hits). In 2011, MoMA acquired a video, "A Fire in My Belly," showing large ants crawling all over Jesus on the Cross. The Smithsonian Institution, which first hosted this gem, withdrew it following a protest by the Catholic League.

The "dung on the Virgin Mary" classic set off a furor when it was shown at the Brooklyn Museum of Art in 1999; it was part of the "Sensation" exhibit. The protest was launched by the Catholic League, and supported by New York City mayor Rudy Giuliani. Bill Donohue led a demonstration in front of the museum, handing out "Vomit Bags" to those waiting in line. He was responding to a museum official who said the exhibition could make someone sick. Donohue agreed, noting that puke can be slippery.

The media, which is opposed to bigotry, save for anti-Catholic expressions of it, took the side of the museum. Some tried to justify Ofili's work by saying that Nigerians consider it honorific to use elephant dung in their artwork. But he was not a Nigerian (his parents were): he was a Brit. Moreover, when Donohue asked a well-educated Nigerian about this alleged tradition, he got indignant, saying those who make such statements are racists. The Catholic League objected to the Brooklyn Museum of Art hosting this event for the same reason it objected to the Smithsonian exhibit years later: Catholic taxpayers were forced to underwrite it. On the "Today" show, Donohue said of the former exhibit, "There are a lot of fat cat bigots who don't like Catholics in this country—let them sponsor it. But if the government cannot sponsor my religion, and it shouldn't, it shouldn't be in the business of allowing

people to bash my religion.”

MoMA not only disgraces itself by showcasing the “dung on the Virgin Mary,” it looks more like a third-class storefront in a seedy neighborhood, one that wallows in snuff art.

---

## **SCHNEIDERMAN’S      ASTOUNDING LIBERAL DUPLICITY**

New York Governor Eliot Spitzer championed women’s rights, even as he paid for prostitutes behind his wife’s back.

New York Congressman Anthony Weiner championed women’s rights, even as he used his 5-year-old son as a “chick magnet” to lure minors while sexting.

New York celebrity Harvey Weinstein championed women’s rights, even as he abused scores of women.

And now we have learned that another champion of women’s rights, New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman, regularly beat the women whom he dated.

In many ways, Schneiderman is the most interesting of them all. He lived a double life, and it was not limited to his duplicity with women. His behavior frequently belied his ideology.

### *Ideology:*

Schneiderman was a rabid supporter of the #MeToo movement, and brought suit against Harvey Weinstein over his sexual harassment offenses. He was aghast at Weinstein’s behavior. “We have never seen anything as despicable as what we’ve seen right here,” he said. Until now.

*Behavior:*

He liked his sex rough. He beat his dates until they bled, slapped them across the face, spat on them, called them "whores," and threatened to kill them. Michelle Manning Barish, one of his four victims (that we know of), said he warned her, "If you ever left me, I'd kill you."

*Ideology:*

When he was in the New York state senate, he sponsored a bill making life-threatening strangulation a felony, and made it a misdemeanor to "impede breathing."

*Behavior:*

He frequently choked his dates while having sex with them.

*Ideology:*

He was a big proponent of animal rights. Last year he prosecuted three men on animal cruelty and dogfighting charges on Long Island, noting that three of the dogs had to be euthanized.

*Behavior:*

Following in the footsteps of his father, who was a former treasurer of NARAL, he was a strident advocate of abortion-on-demand. He also blamed many in the pro-life community for the killing of abortionist Dr. Bernard Slepian, even though they had absolutely nothing to do with it.

*Ideology:*

He was a radical egalitarian who opposed laws that did not treat all segments of the population equally.

*Behavior:*

In 2009, he supported a bill that discriminated against Catholics by holding the Catholic Church to a much higher set of standards regarding the sexual abuse of minors than afforded the public schools.

*Ideology:*

He deplored racism. Here are two of his quotes: "Racism has no home in New York." "When racists try to intimidate our communities, they need to be condemned and condemned strongly."

*Behavior:*

One of his victims, Tanya Selvaratnam, who is from Sri Lanka, said, "Sometimes, he'd tell me to call him Master, and he'd slap me until I did." He took note of her dark skin, calling her his "brown slave," demanding that she acknowledge that she was his "property."

*Ideology:*

In 2010, he proposed more jail time and stiffer fines for barbershops and bodegas that sell "nutcracker," a sweet alcoholic drink. Two years later he spoke at the Long Island Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, condemning alcohol and drug abuse.

*Behavior:*

According to all of his victims, he was a heavy drinker and drug abuser. One of them said he "would almost always drink two bottles of wine in a night, then bring a bottle of Scotch into the bedroom. He would get plastered five nights out of seven." He also availed himself of her Xanax.

*Ideology:*

When he was in the state senate, he sponsored a bill called the Gun Violence Prevention Act; it was a response to the NRA's efforts against gun control. Just a few weeks ago, he sat down with high school students marking the 19th anniversary of the Columbine massacre.

*Behavior:*

He mocked anti-gun activists, calling parents and protesters from Sandy Hook Elementary School "losers."

*Ideology:*

He worked with the extremists from the Southern Poverty Law

Center imploring everyone to “stand up to hate.”

*Behavior:*

He arranged for a convicted felon, Oscar Lopez Rivera, co-founder of FALN, a terrorist organization, to lead the Puerto Rican Day Parade last year.

*Ideology:*

In 2011, after taking over as state attorney general, he boasted that “no one is above the law.”

*Behavior:*

After one of his victims complained that he was violating the law against jaywalking by “yanking” her across the street, he replied, “I am the law.”

*CONCLUSION:*

Schneiderman’s misogyny, violence, alcoholism, racism, and utter hypocrisy make him unusual, but it is a fair question to ask how many other prominent left-wing public figures and activists experience a disconnect between their ideology and their behavior. Too many it seems.