

THE POLITICS OF CHILD RAPE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a front-page news story in today's *New York Times* on the problem of child sexual abuse:

Reporter Paul Vitello shows the shocking extent of child sexual abuse in Brooklyn's Orthodox Jewish community. He also details the cover-ups that have long been aided and abetted by law enforcement.

Where have all the church-and-state advocates been all these years when Orthodox rabbis were allowed by the D.A.'s office to settle these cases "internally"? Where have all the professional victims' groups been in staging protests outside synagogues? Where have all the sue-happy lawyers been seeking to plunder the Orthodox? Where have all the comedians and late-night entertainers been in cracking jokes about rabbis raping kids?

It's not just Orthodox Jews who have been given a pass: no group has gotten away easier than public school employees. Consider this. Because public school students have only 90 days to file suit, it is already too late to prosecute a teacher—in virtually every state—who molested a minor as recently as last spring. But if the offense took place in a Catholic school, the student has years to file suit. Not only that, molesting teachers *are still* shuffled from one school district to another; it's called "passing the trash."

Orthodox Jews try cases of child rape in rabbinical courts. Imagine if the Catholic Church failed to report abuse cases to the authorities and decided instead to institute its own ecclesial courts? Today's article quotes a Jewish attorney urging law enforcement to recognize "religious sensitivities" for the guilty by seeking alternatives to prison. Allow a Catholic attorney to advise the same and it's called

corruption.

Last year, 40 minors in this small Jewish community said they were abused. Last year, there were 10 such allegations in the entire Catholic Church in all 50 states. Catholics are fed up with the duplicity. It's not just Roman Polanski who can rape and run with impunity these days. The politics of child rape is sickening.

SARAH SILVERMAN'S OBSCENE RIP AT VATICAN

Comedian Sarah Silverman appeared on Bill Maher's HBO show on October 9 attacking the Vatican. She began her monologue bemoaning the plight of world hunger, and then found a solution: "What is the Vatican worth, like 500 billion dollars? This is great, sell the Vatican, take a big chunk of the money, build a gorgeous condominium for you and all your friends to live in...and with the money left over, feed the whole f-ing world."

Speaking of the pope, Silverman continued, "You preach to live humbly, and I totally agree. So, now maybe it's time for you to move out of your house that is a city. On an ego level alone, you will be the biggest hero in the history of ever. And by the way, any involvement in the Holocaust, bygones...."

Silverman closed by saying, "If you sell the Vatican, and you take that money, and you use it to feed every single human being on the planet, you will get crazy p-y. All the p-y."

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responds as follows:

Silverman's assault on Catholicism is just another example of HBO's corporate irresponsibility. Time and again, if it's not Bill Maher thrashing the Catholic Church, it's one of his guests. There is obviously something pathological going on there: Silverman's filthy diatribe would never be allowed if the chosen target were the Chief Rabbi of Jerusalem and the state of Israel.

Here's a reality check for Silverman: the Catholic Church operates more hospitals and feeds more of the poor than any private institution in the world. It also saved more Jews during the Holocaust than any other institution in the world.

Contact HBO head Bill Nelson: Bill.nelson@hbo.com

ABORTION HAUNTS PEACE PRIZE WINNER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments today on why the abortion issue continues to haunt President Obama:

A few weeks ago, President Obama said that no federal dollars will be spent on abortion in the health care bill he intends to sign. This immediately won the plaudits of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). But things have changed.

On September 30, in a letter to the U.S. Senate, sent by three bishops representing the USCCB, they stressed that "Health care reform especially needs to protect those at the beginning of life and at its end, the most vulnerable and the voiceless." Yesterday, the bishops issued another letter, stating, "we remain apprehensive when amendments protecting

freedom of conscience and ensuring no taxpayer money for abortion are defeated in committee votes.”

After listening to White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs two days ago, it is a fair bet that Catholic skepticism has turned to cynicism. When asked about the bishops’ concerns, Gibbs said, “there’s a law that precludes the use of federal funds for abortion that isn’t going to be changed in these health care bills.” Gibbs was referring to the Hyde Amendment.

The president, however, supports the Freedom of Choice Act, a bill that would revoke the Hyde Amendment. Moreover, when Obama’s campaign staff was asked in December 2007 about this issue, the answer was clear: “Obama does not support the Hyde Amendment.”

President Obama cannot have it both ways. Unlike another Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Mother Teresa, who said abortion was “the greatest destroyer of peace,” Obama has never indicated that abortion undermines the cause of peace. Indeed, he champions abortion as if it were a sacred right. If he wants to pivot at this juncture, Catholics will welcome it. If he doesn’t, he will have to live with the consequences.

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.

CROSS BELONGS ON PUBLIC LAND

The U.S. Supreme Court will hear arguments today on the constitutionality of a seven-foot cross placed on public land in the Mojave National Preserve in San Bernardino County, California. Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the case:

In 1892, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that “this is a Christian nation.” Ever since, radical secularists have tried to stamp out that reality, holding that it excludes non-Christians. It does, and that is because this country’s founding was not the work of non-Christians: to be precise, it was the work of Protestant, white, heterosexual men. Not Catholics or Jews, not blacks, not homosexuals, not females. As the *New York Times* likes to say, “That’s All the News Fit to Print.”

Yet it is the *New York Times* that is today carping over the cross. Defensively, its editorial begins by saying that this case leads to such overheated charges as, “There is a war against Christianity under way; or civil liberties groups are trying to turn this into a secular nation.” Both accusations are accurate. Consider who is bringing suit against the World War I veterans who first erected the cross in 1934—about a generation after the high court proclaimed we are a Christian country—the ACLU. In two books, I have documented the anti-Christian animus that has marked the ACLU from its founding in 1920. And in *Secular Sabotage*, published last month, I document the multi-group effort to turn this country into a secular nation. Thus, the *Times* is twice wrong.

One reason the *Times* is wrong is its faulty sense of history: it is simply not true to insist that the founders said “there

must be a wall of separation between church and state.” That metaphor was broached by Thomas Jefferson in 1802 in a letter to Baptists, and two days later he went to church services in a government building, the Capitol, thus making mince meat of the argument that he wanted a wall between church and state. So if Mr. Church and State thought it okay to have Christian services in a taxpayer-funded building, does the *Times* or the ACLU really think that Jefferson, or any of the founding fathers, would object to a cross—privately funded—on public lands honoring veterans, almost all of whom were Christians?

LETTERMAN PALES NEXT TO PENN & TELLER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue says CBS should focus on what Penn & Teller have done more than what David Letterman did:

Howard Kurtz of the *Washington Post* questions whether CBS is up to covering, as well as investigating, the mess David Letterman has gotten himself into. We second that concern, but would prefer that CBS concentrate on a more serious issue: the malicious thrashing of Catholicism that was delivered by Penn & Teller on their season finale on Showtime, August 27 (Showtime is owned by CBS).

The lead story in the Catholic League’s journal, *Catalyst*, reads, “Penn & Teller Explode: CBS At Fault.” Inside the October issue there is another piece titled, “Setting the Record Straight: Penn & Teller’s Lies.” Both articles chronicle the vicious lies that were told about the Catholic Church, and the calculated effort to smear the Vatican. We

have posted the half-hour video on our website, www.catholicleague.org. Moreover, copies of the video have been sent to every bishop in the nation. We are asking that CBS not renew Penn & Teller's contract.

What Letterman did was indefensible, and the jury is out on whether he violated sexual harassment laws. But the jury is not out on Penn & Teller: they crossed the line and engaged in the most hurtful, bigoted and immoral behavior ever seen on TV. If Imus and Michael Richards suffered for their transgressions, and were not allowed to skate because they are comedians, then justice demands that at the very least CBS not bring Penn & Teller back.

Contact CBS President Leslie Moonves: lmoonves@cbs.com

HUMANISTS RIP VATICAN ON SEX ABUSE

There were several news reports last week on the Vatican's reply to critics from the International Humanist and Ethical Union; the London-based organization condemned the Vatican for not dealing responsibly with the issue of sexual abuse. The Vatican will soon release a report on this subject to the Committee on the Rights of the Child, a U.N. agency.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue answered the critics today:

The International Humanist and Ethical Union is an ethical disgrace. Consider that Vern Bullough, a noted world humanist, was a past vice president of the organization. He was also a man who held Alfred Kinsey in high esteem, despite the fact—or

because of the fact—that Kinsey was a sado-masochistic, child-abusing, voyeuristic pervert. One thing we know for sure: Bullough modeled himself on Kinsey’s perversions.

When Bullough died in 2006, he was fondly remembered by William A. Percy, a gay activist who unsuccessfully offered a bounty of \$20,000 for the outing of a living American Cardinal. Percy maintained that Bullough “never denounced NAMBLA,” the organized group of gay child molesters. Moreover, he rushed to support the infamous Rind study that put a sweet gloss on man-boy sex. Dr. Judith A. Reisman explains why: Bullough was the “self-confessed pedophile editor of *The Journal of Paedophilia*.”

There is a Vern Bullough website that is quite revealing. It has an endless link to porn sites that feature pedophilia, rape and bestiality; not surprisingly, some of the fare are downright anti-Catholic.

In other words, Catholics don’t need any advice from the International Humanist and Ethical Union on the subject of child sexual abuse. The organization has so fully discredited itself that it has forfeited the moral right to point fingers at any person or institution.

“THE INVENTION OF LYING” IS PERNICIOUS

Jeff Field, policy analyst and editor of the Catholic League’s monthly journal, *Catalyst*, provided Bill Donohue with a review of “The Invention of Lying”; Field saw the movie today in New York City. Here are Donohue’s thoughts on it:

The trailer to the movie gave no indication of its atheistic-themed plot, but there was enough of a buzz about the agenda of screenwriter Ricky Gervais that we decided to check it out. We're glad we did. "The Invention of Lying" is not the kind of in-your-face assault that Hollywood often serves up, but therein lies its perniciousness: because this anti-religion-make that anti-Christian-film is laced with some romance and humor, the message it sends is all the more sinister.

The movie centers on a world where no one lies. But that changes when the lead character's mother is dying and the dutiful son finds utility in spinning a tale about a place that resembles heaven, thus saving her from being consigned to an "Eternity of Nothingness." He subsequently floats the idea that there is a God-like "Man in the Sky," a belief accepted by most, though some cynics wonder why AIDS exists (it's never diabetes that Hollywood flags). In mockery, the lead character later shows up looking like a fat Jesus, and an image of him appears on a stained-glass window holding the Two Tablets (of Moses), posing as if on the Cross. In the end, he and his girl are the only two people who haven't drunk all the moonshine about "The Man in the Sky."

We at the Catholic League prefer our bigotry straight-up. We don't like bigotry-lite, which this is not. But we also don't like it slipped into our drink. It is not for nothing that the Office for Film & Broadcasting of the bishops' conference slammed the movie as "morally offensive." But we are pleased to note that the atheists still use our religion as the model, and still portray God as male. There is hope for them yet.

LETTERMAN'S SEXPLOITS MAKE HIM A HERO

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments today on the reaction to David Letterman's revelation about having sex with his employees:

David Letterman began the week laughing about the authorities going after child rapist Roman Polanski, and he ended the week laughing about his own sexual exploits. His fans, of course, wouldn't care if he sodomized the girls. Ali Hamoudeh of New York spoke for many when he said, "We love Letterman no matter what he does. He brings us joy." And that's all that counts—he brings joy. Besides, who cares? CBS quotes a Hollywood publicist today who says "the star wouldn't be hurt by the revelations and might even be helped by them."

It certainly didn't hurt Letterman's career when he laughed at the Catholic Church for what happened in 2002. That summer a man and a woman had sex in St. Patrick's Cathedral around 4:00 p.m. on a Holy Day of Obligation for Catholics. They did so in plain view of men, women and children and had their performance described on the radio as part of some sick contest. Most people were aghast, the radio hosts who rigged the caper were fired, and apologies were issued by the radio station. Letterman, however, found it so hysterical that he used the story to tell jokes about it for three nights. Wonder how many nights he will use his own sexploits as source material?

There was a time, not long ago, when feminists would demonstrate in the street demanding Letterman be fired for sexual harassment. As defined by feminists, sexual harassment typically kicks in whenever a boss, usually a man, uses his position of power to initiate sex with his subordinates. But Letterman need not worry: feminists have shown so much

interest in matching men at the game of sexual promiscuity that the issue of sexual harassment no longer interests them. Here's the proof. The National Organization for Women lists six issues as "Key Issues" and twenty more as "Other Important Issues." Sexual harassment is not one of the six hot issues, though "Lesbian Rights" is; sexual harassment is not even one of the twenty "Other" issues, though "Fighting the Right" is. In other words, as long as Letterman doesn't tell lesbian jokes, he can take advantage of all the girls he wants.

DISHONESTY MARKS HEALTH CARE DEBATE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue addresses the dishonesty that marks the debate over health care reform:

Sen. Max Baucus, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, is quoted in today's *New York Times* commenting on allegations that abortion would be covered in the health care bill: "We are not changing current law." Similarly, Sen. Olympia Snowe is quoted in the same newspaper as saying, "We want to preserve the status quo on abortion." Interestingly, there is an editorial in today's *New York Times* which calls for total funding of abortion for any reason and at any time during pregnancy, but which also disagrees with what Baucus and Snowe said. Indeed, it explicitly says that Baucus achieved a "compromise" between full funding and no funding.

Here's what the editorial says: "Health plans could provide abortion coverage provided they used only premium money and co-payments contributed by beneficiaries and kept that money segregated from the subsidy. In every state, there would have

to be at least one plan that covers abortions and one that does not.” Thus, the *New York Times* shows how dishonest Baucus and Snowe are—existing public policy is not anything like that at either the federal or state level. But wait, the *Times* is also being dishonest when it maintains that by some magical force monies raised from premiums can be “segregated” from the subsidy: money is fungible and that is why the bishops are right to call such schemes a fiction.

It gets worse. Yesterday, Sen. Orrin Hatch introduced an amendment that essentially codifies the status quo, namely, it would ensure that the Hyde Amendment restrictions on federal funds for most abortions remained undisturbed in the proposed health care legislation. And who voted against the status quo? Baucus and Snowe. Consistent in their dishonesty, Baucus and Snowe also voted to kill conscience rights protections for health care workers, all the while maintaining that what they were doing was preserving the status quo. What they were really doing was preserving their place in the Abortion Hall of Shame.