

# CONFESSIONAL SEAL AT RISK IN UTAH

Utah Rep. Angela Romero, a Democrat, is sponsoring a bill that would gut the seal of Confession. She maintains that it is necessary because priests learn of the sexual abuse of minors in confession and do not report this to the authorities.

In a January 13 letter to Rep. Romero, Bill Donohue wrote:

“I have two questions for you.

“Speaking about the victims of sexual abuse, you have said, ‘Their perpetrators went to confession, confided in a religious leader, and nothing ever happened.’ What evidence do you have for making this remark?

“Last year I asked a state lawmaker in California the same question. He sponsored a similar bill and, like you, he made a comment almost identical to the one you made. He could not offer any evidence. After we waged a vigorous campaign against him, he withdrew his bill.

“The second question is this: Why are you seeking to breach the priest-penitent exemption, but are not seeking to violate the lawyer-client privilege or the exemption afforded psychologists and their patients? Do they not learn of sexual abuse behind closed doors?”

We asked those who receive our emails to contact the Utah Speaker of the House, Rep. Brad Wilson, seeking his help in opposing this bill. Here is how he responded:

“I have serious concerns about this bill and the effects it could have on religious leaders as well as their ability to counsel members of their congregation. I do not support this bill in its current form and—unless significant changes are

made to ensure the protection of religious liberties—I will be voting against this bill.” (His emphasis.)

Rep. Romero, however, doubled down, saying she is going forward with her bill, accusing Donohue of making a “soft threat.” She was obviously referring to the following concluding portion of Donohue’s January 10 letter:

“You are treading on dangerous territory. When the government seeks to police the sacraments of the Catholic Church—or encroach on the tenets and practices of any world religion—it is gearing up for a court fight. The First Amendment secures religious liberty, and that entails separation of church and state.”

Donohue stood by that statement. Regarding her remark, she moved well beyond the “threat” stage when she introduced a bill that attacks a sacrament of the Catholic Church—and there is nothing “soft” about that. Now she is claiming victim status because of a pushback by Catholics. What did she expect? That Catholics would allow an agent of the state to trample on their constitutionally protected rights?

Here is what Romero told the media. “Am I against organized religion? No. I’m Catholic. Maybe this is a little more personal for me. I’ve had victims here in Utah, people who have experienced and sexual abuse and child abuse. Their perpetrators were protected by a religious institutions. I have a problem with that.” [This is exactly the way she was quoted.]

We have a problem with so-called Catholics telling us they are not against the Catholic Church when they seek to destroy one of their sacraments. That gets real personal. As for the perpetrators, there is no evidence—Donohue asked her to give it to him—showing that breaking the seal of Confession would result in prosecuting molesters.

It is a red herring, a contrived pretext that would allow the

government to effectively cause the Sacrament of Reconciliation to implode. No practicing Catholic would ever sponsor such a bill, nor would a member of the faithful from any other religion.

---

## **WESTERN EUROPE BALKS ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY**

Secretary of State Mike Pompeo has been a vocal advocate of religious liberty, both here and abroad. He has now established a new International Religious Freedom Alliance with 27 member states.

They have all pledged to promote religious beliefs in a myriad of ways, and have agreed to condemn religious persecution wherever it exists. Conscience rights are central to this initiative and a condemnation of “blasphemy laws” is another important feature.

One of the 27 nations that signed the statement was Colombia. Ironically, Open Doors recently assigned it 41st place among the worst 50 nations in the world known for Christian persecution. However, it is not state officials who are responsible—it is guerrillas and organized crime. It is a very positive sign that state officials are now pledging to condemn religious persecution.

Not surprisingly, Israel signed on as a supporter of religious liberty. Also unsurprising is the absence of Muslim-run states. Of the 50 worst nations for Christians to live in, as determined by Open Doors, 38 are run by Muslims.

It is not good news to learn that only 27 nations have so far

gotten on board. Most glaringly, only two nations from Western Europe have joined—the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. By contrast, 11 nations from Central and Eastern Europe are participants: Albania, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, and Slovenia.

In 1967, Enver Hoxha, a Communist, declared Albania to be the world's first atheist state. Now it is more supportive of religious liberty than France, Germany, and Spain. These three nations were recently named by the Gatestone Institute as among the worst perpetrators of anti-Christian attacks in Europe. That they refused to join an international alliance defending religious freedom is telling.

The collapse of Christianity and the rise of militant secularism has conquered Western Europe, and with it has come religious persecution. Conditions are better in North America, but they are not great. There is something organically sick about secularism in its current manifestation. It is not practicing Christians and Jews we need to fear—it is religious and secular fanatics.

What the Western world desperately needs is a Christian renaissance. Fortunately, Secretary Pompeo is doing what he can to inspire it.

---

## **FLORIDA                      CBS                      AFFILIATE APOLOGIZES**

On January 3, the CBS affiliate in St. Petersburg, Florida, WTSP, posted on its website a news story that read, "Former Sarasota Bishop Charged with Sexually Battering Child."It was

about a former bishop at the Westcoast Center for Human Development in Sarasota; he was arrested and charged with battering a child.

We had no problem with that story. But we did have a problem with a similar story on this bishop that was posted the next day. It was titled, “‘It’s Disheartening’: Former Catholic Church Abuse Victim Says Local Bishop Could Have More Victims.”

In fact, there was no Catholic bishop charged with sexual abuse—it was the same Protestant bishop mentioned in the first story. The story began by stating that this bishop was “behind bars.” Then—out of nowhere—it said that sexual abuse is happening across the country, citing a man who says he was abused 50 years ago by a Catholic priest.

The headline was totally dishonest. Furthermore, mentioning that a Catholic priest victimized someone a half-century ago was as gratuitous as it was scurrilous.

Something broke down. How could this CBS affiliate get it right the first day and then take cheap shots at the Catholic Church the next day—in a story unrelated to the bishop?

It would be like doing a story on a current reporter from a Sarasota newspaper charged with sexual misconduct, and then adding a story about a former WTSP reporter who was accused of a sexual offense 50 years ago, mentioning WTSP in the headline!

On January 6, we issued a news release addressing this matter. We are happy to report that after giving our readers the email address of Kelly Frank at WTSP, the station issued an apology. Here is the reply.

“After reading the headline and the story, we have added language to the headline and provided a clarification to make it clear that while the alleged victim we spoke to was a

member of the Catholic Church, the Bishop in question represented a non-denominational church. We regret this omission and apologize for it.”

Good for WTSP. It is always better to remedy a wrong and apologize for making it than to stonewall your critics.

Thanks to all of those who made their voice heard. Unless you follow through, progress will not be made. We can't do this by ourselves.

---

## **DETROIT FREE PRESS IS AN ABSOLUTE DISGRACE**

Let's say you are a reporter who detests the Catholic Church (there are more than a few out there), and would like to do an article that reflects badly on it. You come across a story that may qualify, but it is rather routine: it is about high school boys acting inappropriately.

Not satisfied, you decide to enhance the piece by trotting out a story about a noted Catholic public figure (Brett Kavanaugh) who was accused of acting offensively when he was in high school. It happened decades ago in some other part of the country, and the charges were never corroborated by anyone, but that doesn't matter. It can be made to fit.

Still not satisfied this will embarrass the Church, you add a story about a Catholic priest who, while having nothing to do with the original story, is serving time for what he did in the 1990s.

The story then ropes back to high school boys today in two

Detroit Catholic schools who did something really newsworthy: they got into a brawl following a hockey game.

This 2679-word cut-and-paste “news story” appeared in the January 2nd edition of the *Detroit Free Press*.

To say this story was disjointed would be an understatement: forcing unconnected stories—stuffing them together without any segue—is what we would expect from a high school student hoping to finally make the honor roll. If a reporter did a story on African American high school students who acted inappropriately, and added to it a story on O.J.—jamming in a story about Bill Cosby—and ended with a note about brawling black high school athletes, it wouldn’t pass the smell test. The odor of bigotry would be in the air.

Last year, the U.S. Department of Education found that between 2013 and 2016, Detroit Public Schools listed 45 criminal cases of sexual misconduct, and 233 incidents of sexual harassment involving students.

Worse, the district had no Title IX investigation procedure. Moreover, just a few years ago, *USA Today* did a major study of sexual misconduct in the public schools in every state, rating them on several measures. Michigan received an overall score of “F.”

Those who work at the *Detroit Free Press* have no interest in sticking it to the public schools, which is why they would never do to them what this article did to the Catholic Church. They are a disgrace to the profession of journalism.

We urged those who get our emails to contact *Detroit Free Press* editor Peter Bhatia.

Here is what he wrote in reply:

Thanks for your e-mail. However, the allegations made by Dr. Donohue are completely without merit. The story was responsible, deeply reported and factual, reporting on a

difficult situation that has arisen over time in Catholic boys' schools here. Take the time to read the story and I think you will see it is fair. To borrow a phrase from Daniel Patrick Moynihan, Dr. Donohue is entitled to his own opinion, but not his own facts.

Here is Bill Donohue's reply:

Mr. Bhatia's reply is flatulent. He says the story's facts are accurate. That was not my point, and he knows it. My point was that this was a contrived non-story with disjointed accounts spliced together to put a bad face on the Catholic Church. I even gave as an analogue how this might play out if the target were African Americans. His dodge is further proof of the dishonesty and juvenile journalism of the *Detroit Free Press*.

---

## **ABORTION, NOT THE PILL, FIRES THE LEFT**

The birth control pill became commercially available in 1960, and in 1973 abortion was legalized. Those on the left who have been pushing for a libertine culture have won the PR battle on contraception (most Americans are okay with it), but they have lost the PR battle on abortion (most Americans want limits on when and why it should be performed).

The public has been trending pro-life in recent years. This has upset the abortion industry, forcing them to develop new strategies. One preferred tactic is to include abortion-inducing drugs in public policies that allow for contraception.

The Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate promoted by the Obama administration was designed to force all employers,



including Catholic ones, to provide contraceptives in their insurance plans. They did not include abortion. However, they did include abortifacients, or abortion-inducing drugs. Why?

The Obama officials knew that abortion is viewed very differently than contraceptives, so that is why they left it out of the HHS mandate. They could have stopped right there—forcing employers to pay for contraceptives but not abortion. But they did not. They were bent on including abortifacients in their policy. In doing so, they showed their true colors: As we have been saying for years, the HHS mandate was never about contraceptives—it was always about abortion.

The long-term goal of pro-abortion activists is to have nationwide tax-funded abortions without any restrictions whatsoever. But they can't get that now, which explains why they have settled for public funding of abortifacients.

Regrettably, some on the pro-life side have failed to see what the pro-abortion game plan is. That includes the University of Notre Dame.

In February 2018, Notre Dame president Father John Jenkins announced that the university would start providing coverage for what he called “simple contraceptives.” He said the plan would not cover abortifacients. If he thought this policy would prove to be non-controversial, he was wrong. Not only did some Notre Dame students, faculty, and alumni not agree with funding contraceptives, those on the pro-abortion side were livid. They sued because abortion-inducing drugs were not covered.

They didn't wait long: their suit was filed in June, just four months later. Their incremental approach—push for abortifacients but not abortion—was exactly what the HHS mandate provided. Recently, on January 16, Notre Dame lost in district court in its bid to have the case dismissed. Jenkins should have known that the Left will never be appeased—they

always want more.

Leading the charge for abortifacients in the school's healthcare policy are Irish 4 Reproductive Health (a far-left student association) and three national pro-abortion and anti-Christian organizations. The students receive funding from Planned Parenthood and Catholics for Choice (a Catholic-bashing group).

What unites the four groups suing the University of Notre Dame is their contention that abortifacients are a form of birth control and should therefore not be excluded in a policy that allows for contraceptive coverage.

Are abortifacients really analogous to the pill as a form of birth control? Or are they really abortion-inducing medications?

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists says, "There is no scientific evidence that FDA-approved emergency contraceptives affect an existing pregnancy; no EC is classified as an abortifacient."

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops disagrees, saying there is much confusion over what constitutes an abortion. "HHS uses it to describe only the disruption of an already implanted pregnancy. However, because a human life begins when sperm and egg meet to form a new living organism, the moral problem of abortion arises whenever a drug or device destroys the new embryonic human being, for example by preventing his or her implantation in the uterine wall needed to survive."

Who does the pro-abortion industry agree with? For them, the question is irrelevant. They maintain that abortion, abortifacients, and contraceptives are all the same: they are a form of birth control.

Planned Parenthood says, "The Paragard [copper] IUD is the

most effective type of emergency contraception. It works up to 5 days after unprotected sex...” In other words, they agree with the bishops that it is an abortifacient.

NARAL Pro-Choice says, “Emergency contraception (EC), sometimes called ‘the morning-after pill,’ is birth control that significantly reduces the chances of becoming pregnant if taken soon after sex.” So it, too, agrees with the bishops, but it also celebrates its usage as a form of birth control.

Interestingly, the idea that abortion is a form of birth control was rejected in 2016 by pro-abortion politician Nancy Pelosi. This earned her the wrath of her fans at NARAL.

Pelosi, who calls herself a Catholic, is constantly under criticism for her pro-abortion stance, so it behooved her not to be seen as a proponent of the position that “abortion is a form of birth control.”

The pro-abortion students at the University of Notre Dame, and their pro-abortion allies, are ultimately determined to sell the notion that abortion is a form of birth control. But because there are some nervous Nellies out there (e.g., Pelosi), they are now settling for equating abortifacients with contraceptives. It is not the pill that fires them—it’s abortion.

---

## **ABORTION ACTIVISTS ENDANGER PUBLIC HEALTH**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why pro-abortion activists are a threat to public health:

Should abortions be considered elective surgery and therefore not be permitted during the coronavirus pandemic, or are they an essential healthcare issue that should be permitted? Predictably, in pro-life states like Ohio and Texas officials are saying abortions constitute elective surgery and should therefore not be allowed, while in pro-abortion states like Massachusetts and Washington, officials are defending them.

This issue has even split those in the medical community working in the same facility. Nearly 300 doctors, nurses and other healthcare workers at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center recently sent a letter to management asking them to “postpone procedures that can be performed in the future” so that they can accommodate the expected surge in patients due to the coronavirus.

The central issue in this case transcends the usual abortion debate: any elective surgery that is being performed during this crisis uses resources that are needed to help those who are hospitalized with the coronavirus.

Chethan Sathya is a pediatric surgeon and journalist in New York City. Here is his analysis of what is at stake. “Surgeries are resource-intensive—requiring surgeons, anesthesiologists, nurses, transport teams, medical beds and equipment such as ventilators. Suspending elective surgeries will free up those doctors, other medical personnel, and rooms and equipment.”

Dr. Sathya is also concerned about the effect that doing elective surgeries is bound to have on medical staff. “Because of the number of health-care workers required to work close to one another for each surgery,” he writes, “I have no doubt that continuing to perform non-urgent surgeries would lead to further spread of the virus among health-care workers.”

In other words, those who are pushing for abortions during the coronavirus are endangering the lives of healthcare workers.

But do they care?

Here is how Planned Parenthood has responded. "We're closely monitoring the spread of the new coronavirus, or COVID-19. The health and safety of our patients, staff, and communities is our top priority."

Notice that Planned Parenthood is only interested in its own agenda. It says not a word about tying up resources needed by those who are truly sick. By taking away needed personnel, gear and equipment from servicing those who are infected with the coronavirus, it is jeopardizing the lives of those at risk.

The heart of this dispute rests on the question of whether abortion is elective surgery or not. Planned Parenthood, NARAL, and others in the abortion industry argue that abortion is not elective surgery and must be provided at all times. But is it?

Take two women, Joy and Jane. Joy has a life-threatening heart problem and is scheduled for surgery. Jane wants an abortion. No one in his right mind would equate the two. If Joy doesn't get heart surgery, she will probably die. If Jane is denied her abortion, she lives (as does her baby).

It comes down to this: Joy has a need; Jane has a want. No woman *wants* to have heart surgery—they either need it or they don't. Conversely, no woman *needs* an abortion—it is, as they like to say, a matter of choice.

Does that mean that abortion is like any other elective surgery, such as a facelift (rhytidectomy) or a tummy tuck (abdominoplasty)? No. In those cases, only the person's face or tummy is affected. In the case of an abortion, another person is affected. And there is nothing elective about that person's fate.

---

# FURTHER VINDICATION OF POPE PIUS XII

Ronald Rychlak

January 27 marked the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau in Nazi-occupied Poland. That day, the International Day of Commemoration in Memory of the Victims of the Holocaust, was observed at the United Nations with a symposium entitled: "Remembering the Holocaust: The Documented Efforts of the Catholic Church to Save Lives."

It was co-sponsored by the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations, and Pave the Way Foundation. The conference brought together international experts on Catholic rescue efforts during the Nazi persecution. I was happy to be one of them.

Gary Krupp, who heads the Pave the Way Foundation, kicked off the event with a personal statement about his father's role in liberating the camps. He is the most vocal supporter of Pope Pius XII in the Jewish community. He asked the scholars many questions.

"During the rise of Adolf Hitler from the early 1920s, was the future Pope Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli), as Holy See Ambassador to Germany, and the Catholic Church silent about the coming dangers?"

The scholars noted that neither the future pope nor the Church itself was silent. Pacelli recognized the dangers of National Socialism and warned others about them early on. At first he did this in reports to his superiors, and later he did so both publicly and in diplomatic messages to other nations. He also

had a significant hand in the strong condemnations (including the encyclical published in German, *Mit brennender Sorge*) issued by Pope Pius XI. The Church was by no means silent.

“Did the Holy See officially recognize the Nazi regime by signing a concordat with Germany in 1933?”

It was pointed out that the agreement signed by the Holy See with Germany was not a recognition of the regime. It was made with the nation, and it remained in effect after the fall of Nazism.

The concordat ended up being very important in helping the Church continue to function during the war. It also provided a basis for protecting Jews with baptismal certificates, because it defined Jewishness as a faith and not a race. It is important to note that the concordat came after the regime had reached agreements with France, England, Italy, the Soviet Union, and had been recognized by the League of Nations. Clearly, the concordat was not an endorsement of the regime or mark of approval from the Church.

“What was the Nazi opinion of the Catholic Church and, consequently, why was it targeted by Hitler for destruction?”

All of the speakers set forth reasons why Hitler and the Nazis hated the Catholic Church. The Church sheltered victims, cooperated with the Allies, regularly filed diplomatic protests, used both its radio and newspaper to warn others about the Nazis, and Pope Pius XII joined in the plot to oust Hitler by any means necessary. The Nazis despised the Church and Pius XII, and they had good cause to do so.

“Was Pope Pius XII an anti-Semite? Was he silent during the Holocaust? Why didn’t he protest with a forceful public condemnation of the killing of the Jews?”

Pius learned early in the war that public words would not influence the Nazis in a positive manner. In fact, as several

of the experts explained, those closest to the matter – including the Allied military and bishops in occupied territories – often asked him to withhold public statements lest they lead to greater harm.

As for his actions, Pius provided the Allies with information about German troop movements, was deeply involved in the plot to overthrow Hitler, and he mandated that those who could shelter Jews from Nazi persecution do so. No, he was not an anti-Semite.

“Was Israeli diplomat Pinchas Lapide right when he estimated that the Catholic Church saved between 847,000 and 882,000 Jews during the Holocaust?”

The scholars all agreed that Lapide’s estimate is accurate as a minimum. With new archives opening and new information being found, many think the number is significantly higher. As Krupp noted, about a quarter of the Jews alive today can trace their fate back to ancestors who were saved by the Vatican of Pope Pius XII.

“How, why, and when did the esteem for the lifesaving actions taken during the Holocaust by the Holy See and Pope Pius XII begin to change? Was this the result of scholarship or propaganda?”

I took the opportunity to note the massive disinformation campaign run by the Soviets. They sought to discredit the pope, the Church, and religion itself. It was disinformation, not honest scholarship, that changed Pius XII’s reputation after his death.

“Pope Francis has ordered that Vatican Archives be opened eight years early, on March 2, 2020. What can we expect to learn from each archive and why did it take so long to open them?”

All the speakers said they were convinced that the new



documentary evidence will only strengthen their cases. Indeed, the opening of the Archives in March will shed further light on the truth of Pope Pius XII and the Church during the Holocaust.

*Ronald Rychlak is Professor of Law at the University of Mississippi and a member of the Catholic League's advisory board.*

---

## **WEINSTEIN'S      ANTI-CATHOLIC BIGOTRY RUNS DEEP**

As the Catholic League has pointed out before, Harvey Weinstein has a long history of making anti-Catholic movies, but only recently have we learned that his bigotry is not reserved to his artistic endeavors.

"Sopranos" star Annabella Sciorra has accused Weinstein of raping her. Some weeks after it allegedly occurred, she ran into him at a restaurant. She says she tried to talk to him about what happened. She told the jury last week what his reply was: "That's what all the nice Catholic girls say."

This shows how deeply ingrained is his bigotry. It also shows how this story, which was widely reported, was received by the media. Not one media outlet characterized his remark for what it is—a vile anti-Catholic slur.

If an Irish Catholic producer made one anti-Semitic movie after another, and was then charged with saying, "That's what all the nice Jewish girls say"—in reply to fending off an accusation of rape—the media would be all over it.

If Weinstein is a bigot, what does that make the media?

---

# THE END OF PRO-LIFE DEMOCRATS

When Bill Donohue taught in a Catholic elementary school in Spanish Harlem in the 1970s, he quoted to his African American and Puerto Rican students what Rev. Jesse Jackson said about abortion: It was genocide against black people. Senator Ted Kennedy also railed against abortion, as did virtually every Democrat.

The pro-abortion party was the Republicans, home to WASP elites like the Rockefellers who saw abortion as a way to resolve “the urban problem.” That’s why their lavish funding of Planned Parenthood wound up establishing clinics in minority neighborhoods.

But by the end of the 1970s, the parties flipped: Republicans became pro-life and the Democrats became pro-abortion. They did so because of religious reasons.

Evangelicals, most of whom were Republicans, supported *Roe v. Wade*. They did so largely because Catholics, most of whom were Democrats, were pro-life. But they quickly got over their irrational opposition and, by the time Ronald Reagan became president, they joined the pro-life cause. In the Democratic party, feminists took command and drove out the pro-life Catholic leadership. This pushed more Catholics to join the Republican party.

In the subsequent decades, the number of pro-abortion Republicans and the number of pro-life Democrats dwindled, though there was some room left for pro-life Democrats. Now that is over. What happened last week marked the end of pro-life Democrats.

Charles Camosy is a pro-life Democrat who teaches at Fordham

University. He resigned recently from the board of Democrats for Life in America because the party has left him with “no choice.” Bishop Thomas Tobin, who heads the Diocese of Providence, Rhode Island, asked on February 4, “Are pro-life voters not welcome in the Democratic party?”

They are not. Recently, Senator Bernie Sanders said, “I think being pro-choice is an absolutely essential part of being a Democrat.”

Does that mean that all abortions are justified, including those where the baby is just about to be born? Yes. Are there any Democrats running for president who draw the line when it comes to partial-birth abortion? No.

During a Feb. 7 debate, Senator Elizabeth Warren and Joe Biden both endorsed congressional legislation that would codify *Roe v. Wade* should the Supreme Court reverse this decision. Pete Buttigieg, who is unemployed, had a chance at a Fox News town hall to carve out a more moderate position, but refused to do so.

In May 2018, a Gallup poll found that 13 percent support third-term abortions. Why, then, would not one Democrat running for president agree with the 87 percent of Americans who say late-term abortions are indefensible?

Four years ago, Hillary Clinton hurt herself badly when she defended partial-birth abortion in a debate with Donald Trump. Apparently, nothing has been learned from that experience.

There was a time when New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and New York City Mayor Ed Koch, both Democrats and supporters of *Roe*, said “count me out” when it comes to late-term abortions. Now the Democrats have become the “count me in” party, the consequences of which will soon be known.

---

# SETH MEYERS LIKES NEO-NAZI TACTICS

Brooklyn has been hit with a wave of anti-Semitic attacks, and no one uses this as a pretext to make light of them. A Catholic church in Brooklyn was vandalized on January 12—a man interrupted Mass and desecrated the altar with red juice—and Seth Meyers took the occasion to make fun of it on his NBC show.

“A Brooklyn man was arrested at a Catholic church on Sunday for allegedly pouring juice on the altar and splashing it at the priest. Wow, that’s crazy, a crime in a Catholic church that led to an arrest. We will tolerate a lot of stuff here, but you can’t splash the juice. That’s where we draw the line.”

The Nazis used to bust into houses of worship in Germany, and now we have people like Seth Meyers thinking it is cute when neo-Nazis bust into Catholic churches in America. No, Catholics are not fearing pogroms, but it is alarming nonetheless to think that public personalities think it is cute to disrupt a religious service and vandalize a church. The man is sick.

Meyers crossed the line this time.