

League Threatens RICO Action Against ACT-UP; Demonstration at National Shrine Fizzles

By William A. Donohue

As an anti-defamation organization, much of what the Catholic League does is reactive in nature, that is, we respond to instances of bias and bigotry. But given the times we live in, it is not always acceptable to wait until problems emerge. Being pro-active has its risks, but being passive is not without risks either. The recent near confrontation between the gay outfit ACT-UP and the Catholic League is a case in point.

During Holy Week, ACT-UP spokesman Wayne Turner announced that his group was going to demonstrate against James Cardinal Hickey and possibly break into the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception on Easter Sunday while the Cardinal was saying Mass. Upon hearing of this, the Catholic League immediately made an announcement of its own: try it and we'll sue under RICO (Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act). On Easter Sunday, ACT-UP protested outside the church, but never attempted an invasion.

ACT-UP, which is no stranger to church-busting, was angry with Cardinal Hickey for the remarks he made in a letter to President Clinton. The Cardinal was justifiably outraged over the irresponsible statements that Dr. Joycelyn Elders, the Surgeon General, made in her March 22nd interview in the *Advocate*, a gay magazine. Dr. Elders, who has a track record of Catholic-bashing, took another swipe at those whose religion she disagrees with by crudely characterizing Catholic teaching on sexuality. She also went so far as to endorse homosexuality as an acceptable lifestyle. It would take too

long to list all of her amazing comments. Suffice it to say that I discussed this matter with Pat Buchanan for one hour on his radio show and still didn't cover all the issues .

It comes as no surprise that in a democracy there will be many competing voices on virtually every issue. But democrats are committed to resolving their grievances peacefully. To do otherwise is to abet anarchy, and anarchy, as Aristotle knew, typically abets despotism. So when ACT-UP said that it might invade the nation's largest Roman Catholic Church on Easter Sunday, we took them at their word and issued a news release alerting the media to our pledge: if ACT-UP invades, the Catholic League will sue. More than that, we'll use RICO.

RICO is the law that was originally intended to be used against organized crime but has more recently been used against anti-abortion protesters. Ideally, the application of this law should be limited to its original intent. But if those whose agenda we do not share are willing to use it, with the blessings of the court, against pro-lifers, then surely RICO can be, and indeed ought to be, used against church-busters.

In the news release, I said the following: "Invading houses of worship is what Nazis do, and there is literally no difference between busting into a service in a synagogue and busting into a Roman Catholic church during a Mass. Both are equally despicable acts of terrorism." I added that "What ACT-UP is threatening has nothing to do with civil disobedience: it is terrorism, pure and simple."

No doubt there are some who think this response is too strong. They would countenance dialogue. Dialogue is fine, but in order for it to have a chance of succeeding, both parties must be willing to abide by the rules of civilized discourse. The evidence suggests that ACT-UP is not interested in talk. It favors assault. It also needs to be said that passivity during war does not yield peace; it more typically yields bloodshed,

as well as the loss of liberty. And that is not a prospect the Catholic League is willing to accept.

League Backs Boston St. Patrick's Parade Cancellation

The Catholic League applauded the decision of the South Boston Allied War Veterans Council to cancel the St. Patrick's Day parade rather than submit to a court order allowing homosexual activists to march as a separate unit. The League's Boston office director C. Joseph Doyle called the decision an "act of courage, principle and integrity."

The decision to cancel the parade was made after the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court upheld a lower court decision which held that the parade was a "public accommodation."

The Catholic League, which filed an amicus brief in the case in support of the Veterans Council, blasted the court's decision.

Catholic League president William A. Donohue stated that the ruling brought to a head "the war that homosexual militants have been waging against Catholics and the Catholic Church."

Donohue went on to accuse the homosexual militants of lying to achieve their end. "It is a patent lie ... to say that homosexuals have been excluded from marching in the St. Patrick's Day Parade. It is well-known that homosexuals have long marched in every St. Patrick's Day Parade from Boston to

San Francisco. But when gays marched, they did so by marching with their parish or association, and did not try to make a public display of their lifestyle.” He went on to note, “The reason why Irish Catholics don’t want a homosexual contingent to march as a group has everything to do with their religious beliefs and their First Amendment rights. Homosexuality, like adultery, incest and bestiality, is viewed by Catholics, as well as millions of others, as morally wrong. That is why they object when attempts are made to hijack their festivities for ends they do not support.”

Catholic League General Counsel Andrew J. McCauley indicated that an appeal to the United States federal courts on First Amendment religious freedom grounds was being considered. (See page 12 for a commentary on the Massachusetts decision by McCauley).- *JP*

Does the New York Times Employ Idiots or Bigots?

When I was a kid, I used to watch the New York St. Patrick’s Day Parade on TV with my grandfather. An Irish immigrant and former member of the New York City Police Department, Patrick Flynn wouldn’t miss watching that parade for all the money in the world. Then when I went to high school, I marched in the parade every year, enjoying it even better than watching it on TV. Now as an adult, and as president of the Catholic League, I spend my time filming homosexuals protesting their exclusion from the parade. There’s not much fun in that. Nor is there much fun reading the media’s twisted reaction to those who seek to crash the march. .

As to be expected, the *New York Times* champions the cause of the parade-busters. This past March, it openly condemned the Ancient Order of Hibernians (the parade's sponsors) for denying gays the right to parade under their own banner. Though the courts ruled last year that the Hibernians could bar gays (the New York ruling was not binding on the courts in Massachusetts), the controversy continues in the culture. In an editorial that appeared two days before the march, the *Times* blamed the Hibernians for exercising their constitutional right to freedom of association. It charged them with sending "a divisive, needlessly cruel message," and labeled the parade "an event that denigrates part of the city." The *Times* implored all politicians not to march in "this benighted display of bigotry."

Well, well. Now that's anger for you. The normally staid Ivy Leaguers at the *New York Times* don't like it when Irish Catholics celebrate their heritage. According to the *Times*, the intolerant ones are not those who show contempt for the traditions of others, but those who seek to secure their customs.

Now it would be instructive to know what the *Times* would say if heterosexuals asked to march in the Gay Pride Parade under the banner "Straight Is Great." It would be just as interesting to learn of the *Times*' reaction to a request by the Ku Klux Klan to enter a parade sponsored by African-Americans. Jews have parades, too, so does that mean that the PLO is free to participate in their events as well? Will the pro-abortion crowd allow pro-lifers to march with them the next time they take to the streets? Most important, would the *Times* call gays, blacks, Jews and radical feminists bigots for denying straights, the Klan, the PLO and pro-lifers the right to bust open their parades?

So why wouldn't the *Times* call its ideological friends bigots for doing the same thing as the Hibernians? Sure, politics is a part of it, but it's not the whole of it. Let's face it,

there are anti-Catholic bigots working at the *New York Times*.

In the same March 15th editorial, the *Times* said that “the Hibernians are the only ones staging a march that excludes people because they are open about a different sexual orientation.” Now there are either idiots working there or there is anti-Catholicism at work. You choose. The fact is that Jews, Hispanics, Moslems and others have all barred gays and lesbians from marching in their parades as a separate unit. The *New York Times* must know this because that’s where I read about it. So you figure it out. Are they idiots or bigots?

Perhaps you’re undecided. Try this. On May 8, 1993, Alan Finder of the *New York Times* wrote a column entitled “Another Parade Furor: Salute to Israel Uninvites Gay Group.” The article, as the title implies, is about the decision of the Salute to Israel Parades’ sponsors (the American Zionist Youth Foundation) to bar gays and lesbians from marching in the parade. Are we to believe that the editorial board which approved the March 15, 1994 editorial condemning the Hibernians didn’t know about the ruling of the American Zionist Youth Foundation?

Even if we generously assume that the editorial board did function like a bunch of idiots by not remembering what appeared in its own newspaper, that still doesn’t rule out bigotry. Bigots have a very selective way of interpreting reality. Indeed, that’s one of their defining marks. The *New York Times*, as anyone who reads it regularly must admit, is unequivocally committed to the gay rights agenda. That doesn’t make it anti-Catholic. But blind spots have a way of forming when zealotry is at work. And blind spots often suggest something deeper.

The St. Patrick’s Day parades that my grandfather liked so much are now seen by some as an exercise in bigotry. There is bigotry at work all right, but its source lay not with the

parade's sponsors.

– *William A. Donohue*

CATHOLIC BASHING ON CAMPUS

If I had to name the one place in the U.S. where Catholic bashing is most prevalent, it would be in higher education. Sure, the media love to bash Catholics, and so does Hollywood. There is bias on the job, in the arts and even in some government programs and regulations. But anyone who has spent much time in the academy knows that the typical college campus is more a hotbed of anti-Catholicism than anyplace else. Here's just two recent examples of what I mean; both cases triggered a strong response from the Catholic League.

In 1991, Patrick Mooney was fired as a resident assistant (dorm counselor) from Carnegie Mellon University. His offense? He refused, on the basis of his Catholicism, to wear a pro-lesbian button during in-service week training. CMU's punitive retaliation meant that Mooney was to lose thousands of dollars that he was counting on to defray tuition costs. But it was not for financial reasons that Mooney sued CMU: it was for the denial of his constitutional right to freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of religion. Having spoken with him, I am convinced that Mooney's cause is justice, not money. His case is still undecided in the courts.

More recently, Mooney and CMU administrators have clashed on two other occasions. The first instance involves a protest that Mooney lodged against a particularly offensive attack on Catholics and on John Cardinal O'Connor, in particular. The second matter concerns the pressing of "harassment" charges against Mooney for the crime of disagreeing with a visiting

professor about homosexuality.

The bigoted attack against Catholics came from a campus gay and lesbian group called cmuOUT. In both fliers and videos, Catholics were portrayed in a manner that would make the average professor apoplectic if the subject had been African-Americans. But since it was Catholics that were being abused, the bigotry was met with no resistance, save from Mooney and a student friend, Mark Sullivan. The vile movie, *Stop the Church*, was shown, and viciously obscene fliers were made about Cardinal O'Connor, complete with the inscription "Public Health Menace" printed on the top of a photo of New York's Archbishop. The clash between Mooney and the professor occurred on March 3rd. Mooney simply expressed to visiting professor Tim Saternow his feelings about the gay assaults on Cardinal O'Connor. Professor Saternow, who is gay, defended the group and then pressed "harassment" charges against Mooney for having the temerity to express his sentiments. Mooney said nothing inflammatory, nor was he charged with making any incendiary remark. But he is being brought up on charges nonetheless.

The other case involves classroom behavior. On February 16th, Stephen Hilker walked into his doctorate course in public administration at Western Michigan University with an external religious symbol clearly marked on his forehead; it was Ash Wednesday. It didn't take long before Dr. Ralph Chandler began an extensive diatribe against Catholics. Oh, yes, Dr. Chandler was careful not to mention Catholics by name, but a tape of the class (which we have in our possession) makes it clear that the "myths" that Dr. Chandler set out to debunk happened to be the central teachings of the Catholic Church.

Dr. Chandler's behavior has been defended, quite naturally, as freedom of speech. That Chandler knew that Hilker was a deacon is not something that impressed the administrators. Nor did they give much credence to the idea that lengthy tirades against an established religion have no legitimate educational

value. And apparently they feel that Dr. Chandler's opinions on the Trinity are of significant import to doctoral students in public administration.

Hilker's case not only illustrates the presence of anti-Catholicism on campus, it shows the degree to which academic fraud is tolerated and indeed defended. When students enroll in a course, they expect to be taught the subject matter that is listed in the course bulletin. For example, if they purchase a course in accounting, they do not expect a lecture on hammertoes. If they buy a course in astro physics, they do not expect a lecture on cognitive dissonance. And if they contract for a course on public administration, they do not expect to be lectured on the "myths" of the Roman Catholic Church.

Actually, the fraud is worse than this. Not for a minute would any college administrator tolerate a long dissertation on the irrational and incredulous religious beliefs of Native Americans. Were such an exercise to take place, it would quickly be labeled academic abuse, not academic freedom. Moreover, charges of insensitivity would be brought by the office of multiculturalism. And in all likelihood the offending professor would be subjected to a sensitivity training workshop wherein the mantra "respect for diversity" would never cease. But when it's Catholics who are the target of invective, the rules have a way of changing.

The reason why Catholic students are victimized for refusing to wear buttons that offend their conscience and are then prosecuted under trumped up charges is the same reason why Catholic students can be insulted with impunity by academic bullies: Catholicism is seen as oppressive by college faculty and administrators. Those who act on their religious convictions and those who openly identify themselves as Catholics are seen as the enemy, pure and simple. To be sure, not everyone on campus feels this way. But too many do and not enough is done to assure equal rights.

I've been in touch with the appropriate authorities at both CMU and Western Michigan. What happens next is their call. We'll keep you posted.

-William A. Donohue

HOMOSEXUALITY: WHAT? HOW? DANGERS AND REMEDIES

By Rev. John H. Miller, C.S.C., S.T.D

Father John H. Miller is the editor of *Social Justice Review* and the author of four books: *Fundamentals of the Liturgy* (1960), *Signs of Transformation in Christ* (1963), *Called by Love* (1989), and *Love Responds* (1990) . This article appeared in the January-February 1994 issue of *Social Justice Review* and is reprinted here with permission.

Christian compassion is more often than not our reaction to anyone's suffering. That is apparent in the case of the scourge of AIDS and is becoming rapidly more and more applicable to homosexuality itself. People feel so sorry for these people who suffer, not from homosexuality, but because people are against them.

I submit that this is not Christian compassion. While we must always feel sorry for the sinner, we cannot feel sorry for the wicked who refuse to acknowledge their sinfulness. That is itself sinful, recalcitrant, obstinate. I cannot feel sorry or experience compassion for those who try to justify homosexual actions by recasting the meaning of the Bible or by claiming that such people have no choice, that they are born this way and have a RIGHT to homosexual love.

Right off we must make a distinction that is becoming very useful among knowledgeable and loyal psychologists. I suppose they could have thought up another way of expressing it, but they make a distinction between the homosexual and the gay person. The homosexual is one who is not satisfied with or complacent in his condition, he wishes to live chastely and will follow the spiritual direction and accept the psychological help he needs in order to do so. It is possible to be a homosexual person and still be chaste and along with that happy. On the other hand, the gay person is "proud" of his homosexual tendency, he actively engages in homosexual actions, and these get uglier and more violent, while the gay activist himself becomes more and more militant.

The homosexual person can be helped; the gay activist is beyond reach. The homosexual person will make use of the sacrament of penance and the Eucharist; the gay activist will not budge from his penchant for the abnormal. The homosexual person will not flaunt his condition; the gay activist puts on an ugly scene whenever he can.

And some of our bishops, despite this acquired knowledge about such persons, while offering no help to the homosexual, set up offices for the gays – in some cases with a gay priest as director! Where, oh where has episcopal prudence gone?

WHAT?

What is homosexuality? It is clear, I believe, that it consists in a psychological tendency, more or less strong, to use persons of the same gender for sexual gratification. It is not homosexuality in the strict sense when young or grown men use same sex persons for gratification solely because females are lacking. This sort of thing was taken for granted by Napoleon when, upon being asked by one of the local madams in Egypt if he wanted her ladies to service his men, remarked "Non! Mes hommes se suffisent!" And today the young are known to experiment with homosexual actions without having any

prolonged desire for it. In other words, it is not the action that defines homosexuality, but rather the psychological compulsion that does so. Note, please, I am not condoning the action.

On the other hand, the psychological tendency is not sinful unless agreed to by actively engaging in it either by action or consensual thought or desire. Sin consists, not in a tendency, but always in an immoral act freely consented to.

Now, simply on the level of this distinction between tendency and action, we must allow for a difference in our reaction. We have no argument, let alone an animosity, toward the person who has such a tendency, but we very much object to and reasonably discriminate against a person who indulges in such conduct. On the one hand, we are truly compassionate toward the person who suffers from such an affliction, and later I will explain how. On the other hand, we must use every spiritual and civil means available to contain the spread of active vice on the part of gays.

HOW?

How does homosexuality start? When does it begin? Barring extremely strong psychological influence in later years, no one past the age of three develops the psychological tendency. It is precisely in the second half of a child's second year that the danger approaches. Let us zero in on the boy, as an example, for he has a particularly difficult problem. At that age he must begin to disassociate himself from his mother's psychology. Up until that time it was quite normal for him to depend on her for everything, for the mother, precisely as mother, is the first and best of teachers. But he's a boy; he must now acquire the masculine traits proper to his father's masculine psychology. The normal pattern for a boy of this age is to want to be with his father, to share his thinking and experiences, to learn to like what his father likes, to acquire the ability to do the things he does.

But what happens if he feels rejected by his father, or if his father is unaffectionate, rejecting, excessively stern, even excessively manly by demanding too much of the child, or if his father is effeminate and his mother overly possessive, showing hurt due to his change of interests? This will only send the child back to the protective arms of his mother. He will grow to acquire her psychology from which he was about to break – and ultimately her sexual attraction. The same is true of an effeminate or henpecked father; the boy will not be attracted to him as dominant. Or perhaps there may be in the family circle an uncle who is particularly dominant, manly but homosexual and communicates this tendency to the boy. Contrary-wise, that same person may be entirely normal and wholesome and save the situation for the boy, keeping him attuned to full masculine development and thus preventing the opposite. There are all sorts of combinations possible here.

This is basically the theory behind the etiology of homosexuality proposed by the British psychiatrist, Elizabeth Moberly, in her two books: *Psychogenesis: The Early Development of Gender Identity* (1983) and *Homosexuality: A New Christian Ethic* (1983); by the California psychologist, Joseph Nicolosi, in his *Reparative Therapy of Male Homosexuality – A New Clinical Approach* (1991); and by Fr. John Harvey in his book, *The Homosexual Person – New Thinking in Pastoral Care* (1987).

Admittedly, the problem of the etiology of this psychological abnormality is difficult; not all psychologists and psychiatrists are in agreement. Nonetheless, Moberly seems closest to the mark when she singles out as one underlying principal that the homosexual man or woman “has suffered from some deficit in the relationship with the parent of the same sex and that there is a corresponding drive to make good this deficit through the medium of same-sex or homosexual relationships” (*Homosexuality, A New Christian Ethic*). Furthermore, it is especially noteworthy that Nicolosi, who

has succeeded in changing some 200 homosexuals into heterosexuals, has repeatedly come upon the phenomenon of the male homosexual in search of his father's affection. It is also noteworthy that Nicolosi has been so successful that the gays in the Los Angeles area have trashed his office and tried to have passed a law prohibiting doctors from attempting to change homosexuals into heterosexuals. That alone says a lot.

DANGERS

The dangers to individuals and society are manifest: seduction (or recruitment, as the gays call it) of the young, the spoiling of human relationships, the spread of disease, the attack on marriage and family life, and the lessening in the eyes of the young of the dignity and sacredness of sex as well as the superior status of heterosexual marriage. If anyone should think that gay activists are not interested in the young, permit me to quote from the article of Michael Swift. "Speaking up for the Homoerotic Order" in The Gay Community News of Feb. 15-21, 1987:

We shall sodomize your sons, emblems of your feeble masculinity, of your shallow dreams and vulgar lies. We shall seduce them in your schools, in your dormitories, in your gymnasiums, in your seminaries, in your youth groups, in your movie theater bathrooms, in your houses of Congress, wherever men are with men together. Your sons shall become our minions and do our bidding. They shall be recast in our image. They will come to crave us and adore us.

Sick isn't it? But this same author is also responsible for outlining the following gay agenda: the abolition of heterosexual marriage, making love between males de rigueur, exiling those who oppose [us], abolishing the family unit, the placing of children in the care of the homosexually wise, the closing of all churches that condemn us, the making of homosexuality a requirement for true nobility, etc.

I believe it is clear that gay activism is wholeheartedly determined to do battle against human life and all that that stands for; true love among humans, marriage, birth, the family.

It must be said and proclaimed loudly and strongly that what is against marriage is against life. Homosexual actions in no way favor either; they are by nature intrinsically perverted in themselves and pervert all they touch. Hence, gays are on a direct collision course with marriage and its life-giving purpose and dignity. They are on a direct collision course with anything that can bring them happiness. Despite the misnomer "gay," they are very unhappy people, very promiscuous because they can't find lasting satisfaction or deep relationships, very prone to depression, and a prey to suicide.

But our children also stand in the path of this monstrous perversion, for the children of others are the future of the gay life-style. Since gays cannot generate their own offspring, they openly try to "recruit," (seduce is the proper word) the children of others into being their heirs. For this very reason gays "should never be allowed to teach our children once they come out of the closet." Unlike the chaste homosexual, gays are not innocent; they viciously attack the values of our culture and militantly intend to corrupt our youth. They cannot stand before students as role models, not the gays, for they propose to undo all the good and healthful influences from which a child may have previously benefited.

REMEDIES

Any solution whether to the psychological condition or to the dangers of its corruption of society, will depend, first of all, on whether one regards this phenomenon as evil. We have already stated the position of the Catholic Church; the psychological tendency in itself is not immoral. Though there are some religious bodies that regard even the disposition as

evil, theologically we cannot accept this. The condition as such is abnormal but morally neutral. Immorality enters only when the disposition is put into practice in some way. I am of the opinion that the belief of some religious denominations that the condition is evil is due to their conviction that the disposition is freely chosen. This is increasingly disproved by serious and competent psychological researchers. Just as the proposal that the condition is inherited is too simplistic.

Morally speaking, homosexual actions are wrong because they are contrary to nature. Males, for example, do not fit together in this way, no matter how much they love each other. And I do and must speak here of true love, for that is what friendship is: the love of benevolence that, by definition and reality, seeks always the well-being of the other, is selflessly devoted to the other. But enter the sexual dimension, and what should be beautiful, productive of good, enriching and fulfilling is automatically spoiled. Why? Because the use of sex between males can in no way but euphemistically, be called marital intercourse; use of sex between two men is necessarily using each other as objects for self-gratification and not of mutual self-giving. The organs employed cannot express mutual self-giving, life-sharing and life-giving, as sex must do in order to be true to itself, for while one party may use his life-giving and sharing organ, the other can only receive such an organ through what very definitely and clearly is nothing but a death-hole! Pardon me for using such an expression, but the anus can in no sense be called a life-giving or sharing organ; it yields only dead matter. And to anticipate another type of outlook, allowing oneself to be used sexually by another is not an expression of love, because instead of seeking the well-being of the other, it allows him to degrade himself. Anal intercourse, not only does violence to the body, but also debases the spirit.

Mistaken compassion must not allow us to "grant" civil rights

to gays. What an incredible misnomer! We recognize, not grant, civil rights for all human beings because they are human beings; we do not award civil rights to men or women because of their behavior, in this case outrageous behavior. I hold that all laws passed by governments, whether municipal, state or federal, insuring "civil" rights for gays, not only are offensive to blacks and other minorities, but they are illegal because immoral. No one is obliged morally to obey them, though one may have to suffer the consequences of violating a non-law. We must vigorously fight against such laws and have them rescinded. We have every natural, God-given right to discriminate against immoral, unhealthy, ugly, society-disturbing behavior. We have a natural right to live in peace and decency, not to have to lock up our children for their protection, and to defend the basic elements of our civilization.

Let me conclude with a few remarks about the chaste homosexual. The homosexual is always in search and in need of love. The tragedy of his situation (but consider also Hollywood and TV) is that he confuses sexual pleasure with love. To the homosexual who wishes to control himself we owe real Christian compassion and assistance as an apostolic duty born of love.

Father John Harvey's book, *The Homosexual Person – New Thinking in Pastoral Care*, is a godsend for anyone who is willing to help. Fr. Harvey is no softie; he does not give in to whining, he does not mollycoddle. He is strict, demanding and absolutely Catholic in the principles he follows. He demands continence of anyone who comes to him, group work, monthly personal spiritual direction and frequent reception of the sacraments. But note: his work is pastoral. I would be the last one to urge any unqualified person to start acting like a psychiatrist or psychologist. Get the names of truly reliable Catholic ones for referrals. But as devoted Catholics, desirous of pursuing the well-being of every person, we

certainly can engage in pastoral care. And I would sum up our pastoral care for the good homosexual in these few precious words: tough love, challenging love, spiritual disciplines born of love of God. Just as any child can recognize the difference between a parent's punishing out of annoyance or out of disciplining love, so the good homosexual will know when he meets a Christian who loves him enough to give him the time he needs, doesn't hesitate to correct and challenge him in a loving way, always tries to lead him to good and to God. And remember – this is crucial – whatever love we can muster in such a situation, we must guard it, spiritualize it, and insure that it does lead the sufferer to an intimate love relationship with Christ. We must try always to be another Christ with him or her. This is the occasion for genuine compassion as we Christians recognize and satisfy the need for love, acknowledging with our present Holy Father that “No one can live without love!”

Ashes to Ashes...

A LaGrange, Georgia, police detective, marking his first Ash Wednesday as a Catholic, was suspended for one day without pay for refusing to remove ashes from his forehead.

Dr. Donohue has spoken to the detective, Mark Clay, and has promised to intervene in the courts if his internal appeals within the department prove unsuccessful.

Dust to Dust...

Bishop Roger Schwietz, O.M.I., bishop of the diocese of Duluth, Minnesota, has resigned his position on the board of directors of the United Way of Greater Duluth because two member agencies violated the agency's abortion neutrality policy with the knowledge of the United Way executive committee. Bishop Schwietz has asked his flock to reconsider their relationship with and support of the United Way campaign.

Trash to Trash...

The Media Research Center (Alexandria, Virginia) reports that in over 1,000 hours of first-run prime-time TV broadcasting last year on the four major networks, religion came up only 116 times. Lay men and women shown practicing their faith were depicted unfavorably by a 68 to 18 percent margin. Clergy fared just slightly better (?) with 59 percent unfavorable and 15 percent favorable. The missing percentages were rated as "neutral" depictions.

Film critic Michael Medved called the study's finding troubling, but went on to report that there were signs that the pattern was changing in both the television and movie industries. We'll wait for the numbers.

– JP

Donohue Addresses N.Y. Police Holy Name Society Breakfast

By Karen Lynn Krugh

It was like St. Patrick's Day all over again. Just three days after the annual parade, nearly two thousand police officers, marching to the sound of bagpipes and bass drums, paraded down Fifth Avenue and into St. Patrick's Cathedral for the 76th Annual Mass and Communion Breakfast of the Holy Name Society of the Police Department of the City of New York. And waiting inside at the front of the Cathedral was Catholic League President William A. Donohue, who would have the honor of addressing the crowd at the breakfast later in the day. The morning began with a standing-room-only Mass at the Cathedral celebrated by Cardinal O'Connor. Fr. Philip Eichner, chair of the Catholic League board, was one of the concelebrants. During his homily, the Cardinal thanked the police officers for their dedication and willing service to the city and the citizens of New York. He related their work to the Gospel reading of the day in which Christ tells his followers, "Unless a grain of wheat falls to the ground and dies, it remains just a grain of wheat; but if it dies, it produces much fruit. Whoever loves his life loses it, and whoever hates his life in this world will preserve it for eternal life."

The analogy was clearly relevant to the everyday risks faced by police officers.

Following the Mass, the largest turnout of police officers in fifteen years again lined Fifth Avenue to march to the New York Hilton where the breakfast was held. When it came time for his introduction, it became clear that Dr. Donohue, the grandson of a New York City police officer, had a natural connection to the assembled officers.

His speech on anti-Catholicism began with quotes from academics, politicians and religious leaders. He referenced historical as well as contemporary occurrences of anti-Catholicism, including such incidents as the MTA's Madonna poster, the television programs "Picket Fences" and "The John Larroquette Show," speeches by spokespersons for the Nation of Islam and others. Dr. Donohue's speech was interrupted several times by spontaneous applause and peppered with laughter from the audience. Upon mentioning a recent incident in Georgia where a detective was suspended for a day after refusing to remove the ashes from his forehead on Ash Wednesday, many heads nodded in understanding. He had hit something very close to home – anti-Catholicism in law enforcement.

The gathering sat attentively while Dr. Donohue listed case after case of discrimination against Catholics. After a fiery delivery lasting more than twenty minutes, Dr. Donohue received a standing ovation from the enthusiastic crowd. In speaking with some of the officers later, they expressed to this writer their amazement at how enthralled the group had been. Many audience members went out of their way afterward to seek out Dr. Donohue and to show their support and enthusiasm for the work of the League. At a small reception immediately following the breakfast, Dr. Donohue received several other invitations to speak on anti-Catholicism in the area. Numerous other invitations were received in the national office during the week following the breakfast.

Accompanying Dr. Donohue were his wife Valerie, sister Tara and mother, Mrs. Anna Donohue, Board Chairman Fr. Philip Eichner and myself. Also present at the Mass and breakfast were William J. Bratton, New York City Police Commissioner; Peter Powers, Deputy Mayor of the City of New York; Peter Vallone, Speaker of the City of New York; Mark Green, Public Advocate; and the Staten Island and Bronx Borough Presidents, Guy V. Mollinari and Fernando Ferrer, among others. Chris Burke, the actor with Down syndrome from the series "Life Goes

On," was also in attendance with his father, a retired police officer. Cardinal O'Connor made a brief appearance and a touching speech at the breakfast.

N.Y. St. Pat's Parade Marred by Protesters

"Whose streets?" "Our streets!" "Whose streets?" "Our streets!"

Over and over, the chanting continued as one by one they were lifted into the waiting paddy-wagon. For the third time in as many years, ILGO (the Irish Lesbian and Gay Organization) had made it's presence known in New York's St. Patrick's Day Parade. The protest, like a newborn-kitten, has been blindly stumbling around the city trying to establish itself. Unlike the kitten, however, it has not grown and it has gained no sight.

1991 was perhaps the proudest year the gay and lesbian community has known in relation to the St. Patrick's Day Parade. Though they were placed at the rear of the parade and greeted by more jeers than cheers, they marched under their own banner, arm-in-arm with then-mayor David Dinkins. In 1992, they were denied a spot in the parade. A pre-parade protest was staged beginning at the Plaza Hotel. They made it as far as Fifth Avenue where they were stopped by police barricades and forced to participate only as observers. They did manage one major coup, though. For the first time in New York City history, the mayor did not march in the parade.

But success in that area didn't last long. In 1993, the courts finally said that the decision to determine who may or may not

march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade falls to the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH), the permanent permit holders for the parade.

In 1994, ILGO again protested their exclusion from the parade, this time by staging a protest on the steps of the New York Public Library at 42nd street and Fifth Avenue.

Through news reports and tape recorded announcements on the answering machines of the participating groups, the League learned that all protesters were participating with the intention of getting arrested. They would be charged with blocking traffic and resisting arrest but their goal was to prove their point, to make headlines, to defy the courts.

In 1993, 228 people were arrested. In 1994, there were 102 arrests. Is this growth? When the specific intent was to get arrested, does a decline of 126 people show progress? Does the willing participation of the city's new mayor, Rudolph Giuliani, show progress?

The homosexual community and its supporters are bitter, and they have chosen the Catholic Church as the focus of their anger. One sign reading "This is a 'Catholic' parade...and I'm 'straight'" gave evidence to the protesters feelings on the New York courts' decision. Another group of protesters, including one dressed as a nun, mocked Dr. Donohue and this writer as we videotaped them for our records. Presumably for the benefit of our taping, they began, tambourine in "sister's" hand, to sing their rendition of "God is a Lesbian" to the tune of "My Country 'Tis of Thee." The lyrics are far too offensive for us to allow for reprint in these pages.

Other attacks of the morning included blaming the Catholic Church for slavery and for the Holocaust.

The chant which dominated the protest – "We're Irish. We're Queer. We'll be here every year" – seems to ring less true with each passing year as fewer and fewer come out to support

their "cause." The participation of individuals with a homosexual orientation as members of other units in the parade is not at issue here. The issue is ILGO's insistence on marching as a separate contingent.

-KLK