

SMEARING DENNIS PRAGER

When Keith Ellison—a Muslim recently elected to the U.S. Congress—said he would use the Koran, not the Bible, at his swearing-in next month, he was criticized by commentator and talk-show host Dennis Prager, a Jewish scholar and the author of a book on anti-Semitism. On November 28, Prager wrote that if Ellison were to follow through, it would send a damaging signal to American unity. For that observation, Prager was viciously attacked by the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) and the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR).

On December 1, the ADL called Prager's comments "intolerant, misinformed and downright un-American." On December 4, CAIR said it has petitioned the Holocaust Memorial Council (which oversees the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum) to remove Prager from its board.

Today, Catholic League president Bill Donohue, and Don Feder, president of Jews Against Anti-Christian Defamation, issued a joint statement supporting Prager:

"We, too, will contact the Holocaust Memorial Council. What we will say is that Dennis Prager is an outstanding American who was wisely chosen to serve on the museum's advisory council. We will further note that he is the subject of a patently unfair and defamatory attack by the ADL and CAIR. Our nation's motto, 'E Pluribus Unum,' is not 'Out of One, Many,' rather it reads 'Out of Many, One.'

"The Bible is the constitutive source of the Judeo-Christian ethos upon which the U.S. was founded. The Declaration of Independence and the U.S. Constitution are products of Judeo-Christian civilization. As Prager said, Jews take their oath on the Bible, even though they do not believe in the New Testament. It's a matter of respect: it's a symbolic statement that pays due homage to our common heritage. Ergo, the same

rule applies to everyone.

"We proudly stand by Dennis Prager. What he said was accurate and what has been said against him is scurrilous."

MEDIA TO MUSLIMS: YOU'RE NOT LIKE THE REST OF US

Bill Donohue, president of the Catholic League, called attention today to the media portrayal of Muslims during the pope's visit to Turkey:

"One of the basic mantras of multiculturalism is that all peoples and all cultures are essentially the same. But if this were true, then how does one explain how the media portrayed Muslims this past week?"

- NPR, 11-26: "Should the pope pray, make the sign of the cross or get down on his knees while there, he's likely to further anger Turkish Muslims...."
- *New York Times*, 11-28: "But on this trip, any mention too specific about religious freedom holds the danger of offending Turkey."
- AP, 11-28: "It [Haghia Sophia] is now a museum, and Turks would take offense at any religious gesture by the pontiff...."
- AP, 11-28: "Benedict also said guarantees of religious freedom are essential for a just society, comments that risked bringing the Vatican into conflict with some Islamic nations that allow only Muslims to worship or impose restrictions on religious minorities."
- *New York Daily News*, 11-29: "Pope Benedict began a sensitive trip to Turkey yesterday seeking to ease

Muslim concerns, but risked stoking more anger by urging religious leaders to 'utterly refuse' to back violence in the name of faith."

"The subtext of these statements is that Muslims are not like the rest of us. After all, can anyone imagine Jews getting angry because the pope made the sign of the cross while in Israel? Moreover, why is it that the sheer mention of religious liberty is likely to offend? What kind of people are they, anyway? And who, other than Muslims, would actually get angry if the leader of some other religion were to say that killing in the name of God is wrong? What does this say about their religion?

"If this is all it takes to anger Muslims—along with cartoons they don't like—then we're all in big trouble. It's time we started asking the tough questions."