

WHY ISN'T ABORTION "MORAL"?



Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Dana Milbank's column on abortion in today's *Washington Post*:

It's an old tactic—attacking the advocates of both sides of a contentious issue. In doing so, the pundit attempts to seize the mantle of objectivity. But it often doesn't work, and it certainly didn't work for Dana Milbank.

Milbank takes shots at both sides of the abortion issue. Some of what he says is uncontestable, but there are also some unfair swipes. No matter, what is most important is what he says at the end of his piece. He takes issue with an abortion advocate who said of her own abortion that "abortion is often the most moral choice." Milbank says, sarcastically, "Abortion as a 'most moral'" choice? He also told the abortion rights crowd that they need to "acknowledge that the other side [the pro-life side], and most Americans, have legitimate concerns."

Every honest person must concede that abortion is the intentional killing of a nascent human being. It's Bio 101—not religion. Milbank knows this as well. After all, if abortion doesn't kill, why wouldn't it be a moral act? Why is abortion different from a root canal? If a tooth extraction is needed, no one thinks twice about it. Why is an abortion extraction different?

Also, what are the "legitimate concerns" that most Americans have about abortion? Do they relate to cost? Or do they have something to do with what is being extracted? Milbank doesn't say.

It is often said that no one is really pro-abortion. I'm still

waiting to find out why not.

Contact Milbank: danamilbank@washpost.com

THE PLIGHT OF PRIESTS' WIVES



Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an op-ed in today's *New York Times* by Sara Ritchey:

The Vatican recently announced that it is going to facilitate the process of allowing former Episcopal priests and congregations to enter the Roman Catholic Church as intact groups. "What will life be like for the wives of Roman Catholic priests?" asks Sara Ritchey. She is very worried about what will happen to these women, and ends her piece by advising that "it will be prudent for the Vatican to honor the dignity of the wives and children of its freshly ordained married priests."

If Ritchey has evidence that married wives of Catholic priests have been brutalized, stigmatized or otherwise oppressed, she should play it. That there isn't any is obvious. Indeed, there were married priests until the twelfth century, and no tales of woe about their wives have ever surfaced. Admittedly, Ritchey found a monk who made caustic comments about a priest's wife. But he died in 1072. Surely even an assistant professor can do better than this.

In 1982, two years after the Catholic Church said Protestant clergymen who were married could become Catholic priests, the *New York Times* did a story about one of these priests and his wife. “Mrs. Parker,” the story said, “is a cheerful woman who said members of the women’s guild at Holy Trinity parish here ‘treat me just like anyone else.’” In 1993, there was an article in *The Observer* about former Anglican priests who had converted to Catholicism in England, and again no complaints were reported. Indeed, as one wife put it, “If anything, I am more fulfilled now because my husband is so much happier.”

It is obvious that people such as Ritchey are really interested in having women ordained as priests—they oppose celibacy because they think it is an obstacle toward that end. Interestingly, on the opposite side of her op-ed is an editorial criticizing the Supreme Court ruling this week affirming the right of churches to determine its employment strictures. Had the decision gone the other way, lawsuits would have been flying charging the Church with discrimination for not allowing women priests. But the decision was unanimous, effectively closing the door. Looks like Ritchey’s pipe dream hasn’t got a prayer.

RELIGIOUS LEADERS AFFIRM MARRIAGE



A letter was released today on the subject of marriage that was signed by 39 religious leaders from several religions; four Catholic bishops, led by the head of the United States Conference of Catholic

Bishops, Cardinal-designate Timothy Dolan, signed it as well. "Marriage and Religious Freedom: Fundamental Goods That Stand or Fall Together" is a strong statement affirming the traditional definition of marriage.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue explains its significance:

There is no world religion that embraces the bizarre idea that two men can get married, and there is no state in the nation where the people have directly chosen to approve it. Yet because of some judges and state lawmakers, the prospect of same-sex marriage looms.

The letter released today by some of the most prominent religious leaders in the United States does three things: it puts to rest the false idea that only a few religions object to homosexual marriage; it details how approval of same-sex marriage affects society; and it demonstrates how such approval impinges on religious liberty. It is as erudite as it is timely.

This letter is so important that it behooves President Barack Obama and all the Republican candidates for president to speak to it. To read it, click [here](#).

Please pass the letter around and show it to those who claim that same-sex marriage has no impact on anyone but the parties to it.

HUGE DEFEAT FOR OBAMA



In a unanimous decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled today that churches are entitled to make employment decisions without interference by the government. In doing so, the high court affirmed what is known as the doctrine of “ministerial exception,” the long-standing right of churches to be shielded from discrimination lawsuits brought by employees.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue spoke to this issue today:

This is a great victory for religious liberty and a huge defeat for the Obama administration. Last October, when the Supreme Court heard oral arguments in this case, the Obama administration’s lawyer proved to be such a secular zealot that she stunned even the more liberal members of the high court. Leandra R. Kruger made such an extremist argument that she even got Justice Elena Kagan to agree wholeheartedly with Justice Antonin Scalia.

Had the Obama administration won, the government would have been able to order the Catholic Church to accept women priests. Looks like the old guard, entrenched in the 1960s, has lost again.

Many thanks to Leandra for blowing it big time.

**“ARE YOU THERE, CHELSEA” IS
PURE HOLLYWOOD**



“Are You There, Chelsea” starts tonight on NBC as part of its new lineup of mid-season shows; it is based on the bestselling book, *Are You There, Vodka? It’s Me, Chelsea*.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue gives Christians a heads-up:

NBC describes the Chelsea character, which is based on the life of author Chelsea Handler, as a “sexually dynamic advanced drinker”; the show opens with Chelsea in jail for drunk driving. *USA Today* says, “Almost every joke that’s not about Chelsea’s desire to drink is about her desire to have sex.” While she may be a drunken slut, Chelsea does not smoke. That would violate one of Hollywood’s taboos.

The real-life Chelsea Handler is in the show, and although she is Jewish, she plays a Christian. Her character is described by various reviewers as the “judgy, super-Christian sister” [of Chelsea]; a “born-again Christian” who is “supposed to be a bit of a stiff”; and an “uptight born-again Christian.” Another woman plays Chelsea’s “goofy virgin roommate”; she is also described as “a reliably funny gangly naif.” In other words, Chelsea is the role model for the middle-schoolers who will watch the show. It starts at 8:30 p.m. ET.

There is no word on whether the Chelsea character will mimic everything about Chelsea Handler’s life. “I had an abortion when I was 16,” she told the *New York Times*. “Because that’s what I should have done. Otherwise I would now have a 20-year-old kid.” Yup.

What is particularly interesting about the show is that the Christian character does not appear in the book upon which the script is written; it was made up entirely by NBC. But, of course, Hollywood can’t pass up an opportunity to stick it to Christians, even if they have to innovate.

Contact Vernon Sanders, Exec. VP, NBC Entertainment
Programming: vernon.sanders@nbcuni.com

“WHITE IRISH CATHOLICS” ROIL MICHELLE



Columnist Lynn Sweet reports that in Jodi Kantor's new book, *The Obamas*, Michelle Obama is described as being "distressed" over the dominance of three famous Illinois families. The future First Lady apparently made her comments in the

early 1990s when she worked in Chicago Mayor Richard Daley's City Hall.

Kantor says Michelle Obama "particularly resented the way power in Illinois was locked up generation after generation by a small group of families, all white Irish Catholic—the Daleys in Chicago, the Hynes and Madigans statewide."

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responded to the news today:

To say that Illinois politics, especially the Chicago brand, has been run by "white Irish Catholics" for a long time is true. It is also true, as I once said, that secular Jews run Hollywood (and unlike an earlier generation of Jews who made reverential movies about Catholicism, films about the Catholic Church over the past few decades have been mostly negative). But the high priests of political correctness only take exception to the latter generalization. No matter, Michelle will not have to answer for her remark, despite the fact that

she “resents” the dominance of “white Irish Catholics” in her home city and state.

Does this mean Michelle has a problem with the Catholic League? After all, its long-time president and vice president are both “white Irish Catholics.”

In all honesty, it’s time for the politically correct gang to take a deep breath and get a life. Generalizations about any racial, ethnic or religious group are not necessarily indicators of some deep-seated bigotry.

SNAP PROTECTS CHILD MOLESTERS



The weekly St. Louis alternative newspaper, *Riverfront Times*, published an exchange today between reporter Nicholas Phillips and David Clohessy, director of the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP).

Clohessy is quoted as saying the following about St. Louis Archbishop Robert Carlson: “Archbishop Carlson and his brother Catholic bishops have hired, hidden, transferred, defended and enabled child molesters. SNAP hasn’t. Carlson and his colleagues have ignored and concealed their crimes. SNAP hasn’t.”

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments as follows:

I will leave it to Archbishop Carlson’s lawyers to respond to Clohessy, but I cannot allow the SNAP director to lie about his own personal involvement in the cover-up of a known child

molester.

In the 1990s, David Clohessy knew about his brother Kevin's sexually predatory behavior and never called the cops. Yet he has the audacity to condemn others for not doing what he manifestly refused to do when he learned that his brother, a priest, was abusing young men. The SNAP director said at the time, "he's my brother; he's an abuser. Do I treat him like my brother?" Well, Mr. Clean, accused priests are the brothers of their bishop, so what would you say to both parties?

Dr. Steve Taylor is a psychiatrist who is sitting in prison for downloading child pornography from his computer. He is well known to SNAP—he was one of their go-to shrinks for years. Indeed, the convict is so well loved by SNAP that the founder of the organization, Barbara Blaine, intervened on his behalf and wrote to the Louisiana State Board of Medical Examiners pleading with them to cut Taylor some slack.

In other words, SNAP has hired, hidden, defended, enabled, ignored and concealed the crimes of child molesters.

Contact: SNAPclohessy@aol.com

BOSTON VICTIMS' SUMMIT BOMBS



Over the weekend, lawyers, columnists, reporters, psychiatrists, and activists attended the “10th Anniversary Celebration & Conference” in Boston; it marked the 10th anniversary of media reports on the Boston clergy sexual abuse scandal.

Commenting on the outcome is Catholic League president Bill Donohue:

A whopping 75 people turned out for the conference, 25 of whom were the speakers. How embarrassing. It’s clear that the professional victims’ lobby is spent. Everyone else has moved on, but those who have an ideological, emotional or financial interest in continuing this saga cannot let go. What a pitiful bunch of malcontents.

This a good sign. Catholics are talking about the announcement that Archbishop Timothy Dolan and Archbishop Edwin O’Brien will become Cardinal Dolan and Cardinal O’Brien next month—they’re not interested in wallowing in negativity.

SANTORUM’S ATTACKED

CATHOLICISM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on recent attacks on presidential candidate Rick Santorum’s religion:



Rick Santorum is deserving of closer scrutiny now that he is a top contender for the Republican nomination, but this does not justify either misrepresenting, or attacking, his faith.

John Gehring of Faith in Public Life fails to distinguish between the official teachings of the Catholic Church and the expressed opinions of some Church leaders, thus allowing him to paint Santorum as out of step with his religion. How interesting. Gehring works for an organization that receives approximately a quarter of its money from George Soros. Need I say more? So discount this guy.

Santorum has also been attacked by Steve Kornacki at Salon for his "Catholic-infused opposition to abortion." It may come as a shock to Kornacki that the late Christopher Hitchens was also pro-life, and that Nat Hentoff is proudly pro-life today. Their atheism hardly accounts for their understanding of Biology 101.

The blogsite Huffpost Hill says, "Santorum thinks the Catholic Church isn't conservative enough, which is kind of like thinking Megadeth doesn't thrash hard enough." Guess that means Santorum is a very Catholic kind of guy (Megadeth is a heavy metal band—I had to look it up). Should Santorum therefore be disqualified? Irin Carmon at Salon no doubt thinks so: "Rick Santorum is coming for your contraception." Probably around midnight.

Linda Hirshman, also at Salon, is having a stroke: "That an advocate of legislating strict Roman Catholic sexual doctrine came within eight votes of winning...warrants attention." Yeah, if this Catholic makes it to the White House, he'll seek stimulus money for mandatory chastity belts.

Let's face it, the left want a religious test for

president—they want to *exclude* all religious candidates. Which explains their love affair with Obama.

BOSTON VICTIMS BASK IN MISERY



Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a front-page story in today's *Boston Globe* on alleged victims of priestly sexual abuse who are speaking up on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the *Globe's* series on the scandal in the Boston Archdiocese:

Many Catholics that I have spoken to, including the clergy, have grown weary of those who claim they were victimized by a priest decades ago and are still not satisfied with the Church's response. No matter what the Church does—doling out millions, providing endless counseling and therapy, mandating training sessions for every employee to guard against abuse—it's never enough. It's time for some straight talk: these people don't want to move on, and that's because they have too much invested in maintaining their victim status.

Consider the remarks printed in today's *Boston Globe* by alleged victims.

- "The church has failed miserably, miserably, miserably"
- "I'm very underwhelmed"
- "I don't think it's anything [the reforms] to brag about"
- "If anything, it's worse than we ever thought"

Evidently, facts don't count to these people, but for the rest

of us, they do. Here are two worth pondering:

- Most of the abuse took place over a quarter-century ago, from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s
- No institution, secular or religious, has a better record combating sexual abuse today than the Catholic Church

When I speak to my friends who are not Catholic, they agree with everything I've just said. But many of my friends, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, are afraid of voicing their sentiments in public for fear of being branded insensitive. However, there is nothing noble about allowing intimidation to skew the truth. It won't happen at the Catholic League. Indeed, we are more emboldened than ever to get the truth out.