

BILL DONOHUE'S OPEN LETTER TO MAUREEN DOWD



My Dearest Maureen,

In today's *New York Times*, you write the following:

"The church insists it's an argument about religious freedom, not birth control. But, really, it's about birth control, and women's lower caste in the church. It's about conservative bishops targeting Democratic candidates who support contraception and abortion rights as a matter of public policy. And it's about a church that is obsessed with sex in ways it shouldn't be, and not obsessed with sex in ways it should be. The bishops and the Vatican care passionately about putting women in chastity belts."

I have a confession to make. While some may think you sound like a delusional weepy woman, don't listen to them. You see, I was in on those meetings with the bishops when we hatched plans to stick it to women and sabotage the Democrats.

We met over drinks. Plenty of them. Except for one bishop who said over time women could become our equal, all of us agreed that you gals need to be kept in your place. As you properly note, this means being subjugated to the lower caste, just the way we snookered Mother Teresa.

You are only partly right about the Democrats. In fact, starting last year our goal was to rig the Republican primary so that Romney would win. Why? Because then we could pull his Mormon strings without being accused of running the

government. So far, so good. Just don't tell Mitt.

We *are* obsessed about sex. Indeed, when I meet with the bishops, it's the only thing we talk about. Admittedly, it sometimes feels like I'm at a frat party, but boys will be boys. There is one difference: at frat parties, chastity belts for women are never discussed, but with the bishops, nothing is more important. The goal is to make a "one size fits all" belt, one that is not removable. Velcro works for all sizes, but it comes off. Not to worry, my dearest Maureen, we won't give up. That's because, quite unlike the stately *New York Times*, we're obsessed about sex.