

SCORE ONE FOR OUR SIDE ON FR. SERRA

In early July, the California state legislature announced that it would postpone a vote on the proposal to remove the statue of Fr. Junípero Serra from the U.S. Capitol. A few weeks later, California Gov. Jerry Brown, while attending an event in the Vatican, flatly said, "We're going to keep his statue in Congress. It's done as far as I'm concerned." We are happy to report that we had a hand in this outcome.

At the beginning of the summer this issue was anything but settled. California State Senator Ricardo Lara was responsible for authoring the proposal to remove the statue, but after a massive campaign protesting his decision, he requested that the vote be postponed. He cited Pope Francis' upcoming visit as the reason for the postponement.

California Assemblyman William P. Brough and Sen. Pat Bates welcomed the good news. According to a joint statement released by Brough and Bates, "Debating such a bill just before the pope's visit would have conveyed a terrible message to him and millions of Catholics around the world, contradicting California's reputation as a tolerant and welcoming place for all people."

"Now that the California legislature has agreed to a delay," Bill Donohue said at the time, "perhaps they can take this opportunity to reconsider the proposal and drop the matter entirely. The Catholic League has contended that the opposition to Fr. Serra's statue rises out of misunderstandings of his work and legacy. It was to correct such misunderstandings that I published the booklet, *The Noble Legacy of Fr. Serra*; it was distributed to interested parties in California and beyond."

In the run-up to the vote, we blanketed California with copies of Donohue's booklet. John Liston, executive director of Serra International, wrote to him expressing his gratitude. "I think it went a long way in assisting the California legislature to suspend the vote to remove the statue of Fr. Serra from Statuary Hall," he said.

We are grateful to Gov. Brown for laying anchor on this matter. As we have continually argued, Fr. Serra deserves to be honored, not vilified. He was the most prominent person to champion human rights for American Indians. That is why he will be canonized by Pope Francis on September 23rd.

GAYS ARE NOT THE WHOLE OF FAMILY LIFE

A recent front page story in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* wanted to know why there is just one session on LGBT issues at the World Meeting of Families. Here's why: the event is featuring over 100 speakers, and gays comprise 1.6 percent of the population. Seems about right. Moreover, Bill Donohue's analysis of the program yields five areas of interest: theological, demographic, sexuality, challenges to the family, and family adversity.

Theological issues include "Living as the image of God: Created for Joy and Love"; "Promoting the Dignity of the Human Person"; "Mary of Nazareth: First Disciple and Mother of the Redeemer"; "The Bible: A Book for the Family"; and "Eucharist as a Model for the Family."

Demographic issues include "Family and Demographic Dynamics in the World"; "Blended Families"; "Hispanic Families";

“Immigrant Families”; “Women in the Family”; “The Elderly”; and “Grandparents.”

Sexuality issues include “The Meaning of Sexuality”; “Sexuality in the Divine Plan”; “The Complementarity of the Sexes”; “Homosexuality”; “*Humanae Vitae*”; “The ‘Hook-Up’ Culture”; and “Dating.”

Challenges include “Parents as Primary Catechists”; “Growing in Virtue”; “Fostering Vocations in the Home”; “Interfaith Marriage”; “Health Finances”; “Infertility”; and “Disabilities.”

Adversity issues include “Suffering and the Family”; “Forgiveness”; “Damaged Relationships”; “Separation”; “Divorce”; and “Domestic Violence.”

The only segments of society that are unhappy with the program are gays and their allies in the media. Time for them to get over it.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS SERVE THE POOR

As the new school year begins, it is important to acknowledge the yeoman work done by Catholic schools in serving lower-income families; many are non-white and some are non-Catholic.

In New York State, lawmakers have been fighting over competing education bills, and in the course of the debate several myths about Catholic schools have been floated. Father Philip Eichner is the president of Kellenberg Memorial High School in Uniondale, Long Island and a founder of nearby St. Martin de

Porres Marianist School; he is also the chairman of the board of directors of the Catholic League.

Father Eichner recently wrote a spirited defense of these schools, directing his attention to Assemblywoman Earlene Hooper. An excerpt of his letter is printed below. Much the same could be said about Catholic schools in other parts of the nation.

Dear Assemblywoman Hooper,

First of all, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Deputy Speaker of the New York State Assembly. Such an appointment reflects your own competence and commitment to the welfare of the people of Long Island.

I represent Kellenberg Memorial High School and St. Martin de Porres Marianist School in Uniondale. Both of these institutions were in the township area that you represented when you were on the Town of Hempstead Board. I am sure that you are acquainted with us: Kellenberg Memorial High School is a school from sixth to twelfth grades with 2600 students; and St. Martin de Porres is an elementary school from pre-K to eighth grade with 450 students.

This letter is occasioned by a flyer that you sent concerning your position on two pieces of legislation that were debated by the New York State Assembly and Senate. These two bills concerned education. In fact they were identical in content except one excluded private schools categorically. The other provided benefit only for public schools in the State of New York.

There are two aspects of your decision that I would like to bring to your attention. The first is the language of the flyer that you sent. It states that the bill A2551 covering all students in the State of New York whether in public or private schools is a **"bill for the rich."** Further, the flyer quotes you saying, **"I support our students, our teachers, our**

tax payers. Say no to the rich and reject A2551." You further state, **"that A8233" is a "people's bill."** It is a **"tax credit for the people. A2551 is for the rich and does not provide any assistance or money for the people."** These statements are somewhat strange since another part of the flyer says the following: **"commitment to a good education to all students is my mission."**

Does this mean to say that the tens of thousands of children in non-public schools are not legitimate members of your constituency, that we are not part of **"a good education to all students,"** that we are not part of the **"people"**? It seems that we are not only second class citizens, but that we do not exist at all. We are not classed as legitimate students, worthy of a good education, and that bill A2551 does not provide any assistance or money for the **"people."** Are we not part of the people whom you represent? Why this categoric exclusion? Who is our representative in the New York State Assembly? Do we not come under your benevolence and commitment? Why are these many thousands of students excluded from being people whom you support, since you said, **"I support our students, our teachers, our taxpayers?"** Are we not part of all three of those categories? In an era of fierce and powerful movements against all forms of discrimination, why are we discriminated against as students, as teachers, and as taxpayers? The discrimination here is categoric and complete. We are the **"non-citizens, nonstudents, non-taxpayers"** of your District. Who has made us so?

My second reason for contacting you is the title by which you intend to justify your unilateral exclusion. It is the use of the word **rich** to categorize all these other disenfranchised voters. You say that they are all **rich**. How do you come to that conclusion? It is somewhat of an insult to these people, not only to exclude them, but to designate them as the rich elite.

If you had said that you are pressured by the Teachers' Unions

to deny this benefit to private school students, I could understand your position more easily, since politics skirts around constitutional and moral issues in a very strange way. Are you not committed to the rich also as an Assemblywoman? Why do you invoke "class warfare" to defend your position, particularly when the assertion that all private school families are rich is categorically false. And I am sure that you know that.

To cite a case on this point, you have only to look at St. Martin de Porres Marianist School, a school which was in your District. It is a school that is 99% minority students, both of Hispanic and Haitian origin. Their parents work two jobs to support their families. They are not rich; they are not even middle class; most are lower middle class in income.

A little history on this school. A little over ten years ago, it was a parish school that was on the verge of closing because of lack of adequate financing. Rather than see this school disappear and these minority students dispersed to other educational institutions, the Marianist Community of Kellenberg Memorial High School decided that it would assume responsibility for this minority school and support it in a way that it would become a viable elementary school in Nassau County. A number of people have sacrificed a great deal in order to have their children at a school which would respect their dignity and prepare them for further education in high school and college. I invite you to visit this school and also to meet with their parents. We would be very happy to set-up a meeting whereby you could discuss with them why you think they are "rich." In order to support this endeavor at St. Martin de Porres, we provide lunch at no-cost and an afternoon program from 3:00p.m. to 6:00p.m. at no-cost, so that the students do not have to go home while their parents are still working. Yes, we invite you to come and talk with them.

I also invite you to come to Kellenberg Memorial High School where during this summer we employ over seventy of our

students in work around the school to help defray their tuition costs. These families are not the "rich." They are ordinary citizens of Nassau County who work very hard to provide their children with superior education. These parents sacrifice a great deal to assure a quality education for their children.

There is one more aspect of your vote that creates an irony in this whole question of educational funding. Your claim that these people who send their children to private schools are "rich." And yet the cost per student in public schools in Nassau County is over \$20,000.00 per student. Tuition for private parochial schools in this area is less than \$10,000.00. Who here is rich? The cost per student in public education has risen dramatically over the past ten years and yet there has been very little appreciable result of this increased cost. It is the tax on the parents of our students at Kellenberg Memorial and St. Martin de Porres Marianist School who are subsidizing the "**rich**" public schools. I believe that you have the analogy backwards. In America we have the cart before the horse—the right of education is that of the parents, not of the State. State controlled education has always been a mark of a dictatorship. How can American parents exercise their right to provide education for their children when they are being double-taxed to do so. Parents are penalized substantially if they want to exercise their Godgiven right to determine the education of their children. I compare this double taxation to the poll tax – you had to pay to vote. Thanks be to God, that we have eliminated that obstacle to true justice. We await the day when the right of educational choice will be restored to our parents without the onerous penalty that they now must endure.

Be assured of our concern for your work on behalf of the citizens of Nassau County.

Sincerely yours,

Father Philip K. Eichner, S.M.

President

KMHS

MILWAUKEE ART MUSEUM SPONSORS HATE SPEECH

On July 30, the Milwaukee Art Museum featured an offensive portrait of Pope Benedict XVI that was made up of 17,000 colored condoms. It was initially scheduled for display in November, but museum officials decided to move the exhibit to a summer date.

Bill Donohue unleashed a public letter to the chairman of the museum, Kenneth Krei, and to Michael Durney, the CEO of DHi Group, a New York firm. Both men are associated with officials who have vigorously defended this hate speech. Donald W. Layden, Jr. is the president of the museum, and David Gordon is a past director and CEO of the facility who now sits on the board of directors at DHi.

Donohue zeroed in on a remark by Layden that was entirely unpersuasive. "This was never intended to be derisive, mocking or disrespectful of the pope," Layden said. Donohue questioned, "Was it intended to be a love letter? If I sent him a portrait of his mother, nicely spliced together with condoms, would he be convinced if I said it wasn't meant to be derisive? Can we at least stop the posturing and get serious?"

Gordon minced no words speaking of artist Nicki Johnson's portrayal of the pope: "It is a work that offends the Catholic Church. So be it." To which Donohue replied: "Then why doesn't this brave man ask an anti-Muslim bigot to do a portrait of Muhammad woven with condoms? Would he have the guts to tell Muslims that if they are offended, too damn bad?"

Donohue did not fail to address the artist, Nicki Johnson. She said she was angry at Pope Benedict XVI because he counseled abstinence-based programs in Africa to fight AIDS, not condom distribution. Donohue said she was right about the pope's position, but wrong to suggest that it was empirically inaccurate. Donohue was pointed in his response.

"After the pope made his remarks," Donohue wrote, "it was the subject of analysis by Edward C. Green, then the director of the AIDS Prevention Research Project at the Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies. 'In every African country in which HIV infections have declined,' he said, 'this decline has been associated with a decrease in the proportion of men and women reporting more than one sex partner over the course of a year—which is exactly what fidelity programs promote.'"

Donohue then addressed the utility of condoms. "What about condoms? Don't they work? 'If AIDS prevention is to be based on evidence rather than ideology or bias,' Green said, 'then fidelity and abstinence programs need to be at the center of programs for general populations.' Does this mean the pope was right? Yes. Green argued that 'in truth, current empirical evidence supports him.'"

Donohue explained why the artist is angry. "Johnson is also miffed because the Catholic Church has had its greatest effect in sub-Saharan Africa, and that, she says, is where people are dying of AIDS the fastest. She is half right. As Green demonstrated, it is precisely in that part of Africa where *both* condoms and AIDS thrive. The success stories, which are built on the Catholic model, are in places such as Uganda."

The issue of public funding was cited by Donohue in a second news release on this issue.

At the federal level, the National Endowment for the Arts gave this museum an \$80,000 grant during the period of August 2008 to April 2010. In addition, it received \$212,500 in federal aid from other sources. Statewide, it receives monies from the Wisconsin Arts Board; it was given \$17,500 in fiscal year 2015. At the local level, it receives funding from the Milwaukee Arts Board for some exhibitions.

We contacted public officials at the state and local level about this abuse of funds. Government should be in the business of fighting bigotry, not underwriting it.

“Anti-Catholic art is always objectionable,” Donohue said, “but it is doubly so when it is publicly funded. Catholics in Wisconsin should not be forced to have their hard-earned dollars underwrite a museum that denigrates their religion. If Catholics are forbidden from erecting a nativity scene on public property, the state should be forbidden from funding speech that trashed Catholicism.”

It is always encouraging when the local Ordinary steps into these culture wars. In this regard, the strong condemnation of this exhibit by Milwaukee Archbishop Jerome ListECKi was hard to beat.

Archbishop ListECKi hit it out of the park: “Would the art museum accept works that depicted various political leaders in our state in cow dung (a significant animal for Wisconsin?)...Would they accept art featuring national or international popular social reconstructionists in a manner that would depict the opposite of what they represented, such as Ghandi sporting an uzi, Lincoln in Ku Klux Klan garb or Hitler with a yarmulke reading the Torah, all in the name of art and beauty?”

Milwaukee, and the people of Wisconsin, are lucky to have such

a courageous archbishop. They deserve better. Shame on the Milwaukee Art Museum for ripping off the public to support this juvenile exhibit. If they think this is art, then it is proof positive that their discernment abilities are shot.

ACCUSED PRIEST EXONERATED

On March 17, Bill Donohue wrote a news release titled, "Fr. Leo Riley Also Has Rights." Donohue gave four reasons why he believed that this priest was innocent of accusations made against him. A few weeks ago, he was cleared of all charges of wrongdoing by an independent investigative unit.

Donohue has never met, nor has he ever corresponded with, this Naples, Florida priest, but he felt from the beginning that Fr. Riley was innocent. Here's why.

First, Donohue wondered why it would take 30 years to elapse before an accusation of sexual assault would be made; others may want to delude themselves into thinking that "repressed memories" are real, but Donohue is not among them. Second, if Father Riley were truly guilty it is likely that others would have made accusations against him—he is 58—yet the record shows that this was the first and only time anyone charged him with abuse.

Third, Donohue mentioned the fact that "there are many Father Rileys all over the nation who have had their reputations smeared by vindictive men looking to take advantage of the hostile climate that exists against priests." Fourth, Donohue emphasized that he was entitled to a presumption of innocence.

Father Riley denied the allegations from the get-go and even offered to take a polygraph test; he passed with flying

colors. The investigation, which was triggered by the Archdiocese of Dubuque (Father Riley was in ministry there when the alleged offenses took place), was conducted by a former FBI agent. It should be noted that Archbishop Michael Jackels was under no legal obligation to do anything—the case was beyond the statute of limitations.

Officials at the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP) took the occasion to condemn Father Riley again. They should instead apologize for their maliciousness.

Please keep Father Riley and all priests in your prayers.

LENO SAYS COSBY GETS A PASS

Before recently leaving the Television Critics Association summer meeting in Beverly Hills, Jay Leno addressed the serial accusations against Bill Cosby. Here is what he said:

“I find it fascinating—how many accusers does he have now? 40? Well, 50 women come forward and people call them liars. And they go, ‘Oh, you waited 40 years?’ Men waited 50 years to say, ‘A priest touched me,’ and they got 7 million dollars. How come we believe them and we don’t believe the women? It does seem awful sexist to me...”

Leno is on to something. But it is not sexism that accounts for the disparate reactions: it’s a strange admixture of celebrity status and bigotry.

Cosby is a celebrity supreme and got the benefit of the doubt that John Q. Public would never get. Priests wish they were John Q. Public—at least they wouldn’t be treated as guilty until proven innocent.

Most of the media have ignored Leno's observation. Media outlets that have done a fair job reporting this story include the *Hollywood Reporter*, CBS News, AceShowbiz, Deadline, *USA Today*, and Salon. The one media outlet that covered the story but never printed Leno's remark about victims of priestly abuse getting 7 million dollars is the Associated Press. The best it could do was to make a veiled reference to Leno's priest analogy.

Equal treatment for priests. That is what animates the Catholic League. Kudos to Leno for calling attention to this issue.

GLAAD ISSUES PAPAL GUIDEBOOK

A homosexual organization known as GLAAD recently issued a guidebook called "The Papal Visit."

There is nothing Catholic about GLAAD, but there is something anti-Catholic about it. That's what makes its release of a papal guidebook for journalists so perverse. It has a history of applauding anti-Catholic plays and movies, and it loves to condemn Catholics who defend the Church. That GLAAD officials never forget to name Bill Donohue speaks well for both of them. They have even sought to ban Donohue from TV. But that hasn't worked out too well for them.

GLAAD is not a liberal homosexual group: it is a left-wing activist one. What disqualifies it as a liberal entity is its commitment to mind control. To be explicit, it is a member of the language police.

The papal guidebook instructs journalists who will cover the pope's visit this month not to use terms such as "the Church";

“homosexual”; “gay lifestyle”; and “homosexual lifestyle.” It doesn’t like “the Church” because that puts the bishops above the laity (they are). It doesn’t like the word “homosexual,” which explains why Donohue likes it. It doesn’t like the term “gay lifestyle.” Donohue agrees: ACT-UP founder Larry Kramer said it would be more accurate to call it a “deathstyle.”

GLAAD officials are also offended by words such as “deviant” and “disordered.” Too bad they never took Introduction to Sociology: the study of deviant behavior is a long-standing area of research. “Disordered” is the word used by the *Catholic Catechism* to describe the homosexual condition; it makes sense once we understand that men and women are naturally ordered toward each other (otherwise the human race would cease to exist). For reasons that are self-evident, GLAAD also objects to words such as “immoral” and “sinful.”

The papal guidebook lists eight lay Catholics who the media should beware of. As Donohue said, it speaks well for both of them that they never forget him. Good work, boys.

IT PAYS TO BE PRO-GAY

The ADL was founded to combat anti-Semitism; the American Jewish Committee was founded to promote Jewish interests; the Southern Poverty Law Center was founded to fight white racism; La Raza was founded to promote Hispanic rights; the NAACP was founded to stand up for blacks; the Satanic Temple was founded to advance Satanism; the National Education Association was founded to support teachers; American Atheists was founded to promote atheism; the American Humanist Association was founded to advance secularism; the SEIU was founded to defend the rights of service union workers; the Sierra Club was founded

to protect the environment.

None of these organizations were founded to fight gay bashing or Catholic bashing. All of them are formally on record supporting gays, and none of them are formally on record supporting Catholics.

Why is this? It pays culturally and economically to promote the interests of gays, but not Catholics. From Wall Street to Wal-Mart, most non-gay organizations across the nation have jumped on the gay bandwagon. Not to do so is to be culturally shunned and individually stigmatized. There is no such penalty for not supporting Catholics, and indeed there is little downside to bashing them. Just ask HBO. It also pays economically: on average, gays earn more than straights, and many lavishly grease these non-gay but gay-friendly groups. Consider the Gawker controversy.

Gawker fired journalists who ran a story about a married man, Timothy Geithner's brother (he is the CFO of Condé Nast) for allegedly soliciting sex from a male porn star. No one was fired for posting excerpts of a video showing Hulk Hogan having sex with a woman who was a friend of his wife (the wrestler is suing for \$100 million). Gawker founder Nick Denton explained why he took down the story about Geithner: "If the post had remained up, we probably would have triggered advertising losses this week into seven figures."

It pays to be pro-gay.

HUGE COVER-UP OF GAY LEADER'S

EXPLOITS

Last November, gay leader Terrence Bean was taken into custody in Portland, Oregon following an indictment by a jury that charged him with multiple sex crimes against minors. Now additional child sexual abuse charges have been made against him. Why isn't the media covering this? Because he's a prominent gay leader, that's why.

Bean is the co-founder of the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), the most influential gay group in the nation; he is also a big donor to President Obama and even flew on Air Force One with him. The Associated Press (AP) chose not to cover the latest allegations, but not because it has no interest in new charges against alleged sex offenders: it does if the accused is a priest.

On June 28, AP reported on new charges against James Rupp, a former Michigan priest who was accused of sexually assaulting boys decades ago. On April 8, AP reported on new charges against Rev. Joseph Maurizio Jr., a Pennsylvania priest accused of molesting boys in Honduras. But there was no AP story on the latest charges against Bean. The AP bias is even worse than this.

On July 7, the day before Bean was hit with new charges, his lawyers filed a motion to have the multiple sex charges against him dismissed. Guess who covered that? AP, of course. The cover-up doesn't end there.

HRC has no listing of Bean on its website, and it even lies about his role in founding the organization: it lists Steve Endean as the founder, when, in fact, he was a co-founder with Bean. That's not an error—it's disinformation. And by the way, guess what happened to Endean? He died of AIDS in 1993, having contracted the disease in 1985.

The Catholic League registered a complaint with AP. As for

HRC, it was not worth our time. But we were sure to let them know that we're on to them.

CRIMINALIZING THE BIBLE

They want him behind bars. His offense? He quoted from the Bible. The accused: Swiss Bishop Vitus Huonder. The accusers: gay activists in Europe and the United States.

On July 31, Bishop Huonder spoke at a Catholic forum in Germany, and in his remarks he quoted from Leviticus the passage condemning homosexuality. He also criticized gender theory.

Pink Cross, the umbrella group for Swiss LGBT groups, has now filed a criminal complaint against him. Citing the nation's hate speech laws, he is accused of fomenting violence against homosexuals. So far, more than a dozen gay groups and media outlets have pledged their support for Pink Cross. If found guilty, he could serve up to three years in prison.

In the U.S., New Ways Ministry, an anti-Catholic organization, is accusing Bishop Huonder of "preaching dangerous words." It charges him with "providing cover for those prejudiced against LGBT people who may enact discrimination and violence as a result." Though this fraudulent group has been denounced by many bishops, it is nonetheless treated as a legitimate Catholic voice by the mainstream media, as well as by the *National Catholic Reporter* (it has also been slammed by many bishops).

These same activists would like to arrest Pope Francis, if they could. After all, the Holy Father has quite openly condemned homosexuality and gender theory. Explicitly, he has

labeled proposals to legalize gay marriage “the envy of the Devil,” and has said, “Gender ideology is demonic!”