

ANTI-RELIGIOUS BIAS MARKS TWO OBAMA PICKS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue drew attention to two of President Obama's nominees who harbor an anti-religious bias:

It is one thing for a professor or pundit to maintain extremist views on constitutional law, quite another to have such a person tenured in a federal legal office. Dawn Johnsen, nominated to head the Office of Legal Counsel, and Chai Feldblum, nominated to join the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, have both exhibited an animus against religious institutions that is striking. Johnsen is a pro-abortion zealot and Feldblum is a pro-gay rights extremist. Moreover, both are profoundly opposed to religious liberty.

In 1988, Johnsen worked on a case that went before the U.S. Supreme Court seeking to revoke the tax exempt status of the Catholic Church. The Church's offense? Its expressed opposition to abortion. Though she didn't win, we know what her goal is, and we know what she would like to do to all churches. Johnsen is not merely pro-abortion—she celebrates it. To wit: she testified in February that after a woman has her child aborted, “The experience is no longer traumatic; the response of most women to the experience is relief.” Really? Is that why so many who enjoy this “experience” wind up on the couch or in the morgue?

Feldblum is such a radical activist that she wants to subordinate a constitutional right, namely freedom of religion, to a right she invented, namely sexual liberty. Moreover, she has lobbied for “a new vision for securing governmental *and private institutional recognition* of diverse kinds of partnerships....” (My emphasis.) This includes, “Queer couples who decide to jointly create and raise a child with

another queer person or couple, in two households.” She also wants “Separation of church and state in all matters, including regulation and recognition of relationships, households and families.” Read: she wants to privatize marriage and provide equal status to every conceivable “partnership.”

Johnsen and Feldblum are not only out of the mainstream of jurisprudential thought, they are professed enemies of religious liberty.