

BEWARE ADVICE FROM FOES



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

In the wake of the election, practicing Catholics and Protestants of a traditional orientation have been inundated with advice from their liberal brethren. The advice generally goes like this: to win future elections, conservative Christians need to moderate their views on abortion, gay marriage, immigration, and other issues. In other words, they need to move left so that the liberal agenda can be fulfilled without resistance.

No serious Catholic or Protestant can ever accept the abortion-rights agenda. Moreover, there is less reason to do so now than ever before: more Americans consider themselves to be pro-life than at any time since *Roe*. This does not mean, however, that pro-life candidates who are manifestly stupid should be nominated.

No serious Catholic or Protestant can ever sanction gay marriage. To do so is not only a breach of Christian teaching, it is a recipe for social instability. This issue remains divisive, but it is worth recalling that until millions of out-of-state dollars were poured into a few state initiatives, the pro-traditional marriage side was 32-0 in state elections.

Immigration is different. On April 20, 2006, I wrote, "The position that the Democrats have staked out on this issue is something many Americans, myself included, feel is superior to that of the Republicans." For starters, Republicans should cease silly talk about deporting 11 million people and start talking about realistic pathways to citizenship (while simultaneously securing our borders). The American people may

not have invited immigrants to come here illegally, but they, along with both the Republicans and the Democrats, have found it very convenient to look the other way while millions did. This ambivalence must end, and it must be reflected in new legislation.

Finally, the religious liberty campaign sponsored by the bishops must go forward. Our foes would like to see it end, which is all the more reason why it must succeed.

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE CATHOLIC VOTE



Bill Donohue comments on the Catholic vote:



Catholics are a quarter of the electorate, and they voted for Obama over Romney by the same margin as the total electorate, 50%-48%. Contrary to what many pundits are saying, this suggests that the bishops' campaign for religious liberty, waged against the Health and Human Services mandate, actually paid off: Obama got 54% of the Catholic vote in 2008 to McCain's 45%.

Some commentators talk about the Catholic vote as if it were monolithic, and others say it doesn't exist. It would be more accurate to say there are four Catholic votes: practicing and non-practicing; white and Latino.

Among practicing Catholics, Obama received 42% to Romney's 57%; among non-practicing Catholics, Obama picked up 56% while Romney got 42%.

White Catholics gave Obama 40% of their votes while Romney earned 59%; Latino Catholics gave Obama 71% of their votes while Romney earned 27%.

From previous survey research published by the Pew Forum, we know that practicing Latino Catholics are less likely to support the Democrats than are non-practicing Latinos.

What this shows is that the more practicing a Catholic is, of any ethnic background, the less likely he is to support the more secular of the candidates.

Finally, there is a serious question whether non-practicing Catholics should be considered Catholic. By way of analogy, if someone tells a pollster that he is a vegetarian, but has long since abandoned a veggie-only diet, would it make empirical sense to count him as a vegetarian? Self-identity is an interesting psychological concept, but it is not necessarily an accurate reflection of a person's biography.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZERS NEEDED

✖ Bill Donohue comments on the election results:

In 2007, Barack Obama told Planned Parenthood that the first thing he would do if elected president would be to sign the Freedom of Choice Act (FOCA). Because of opposition from many quarters, including the Catholic League, the bill never got to his desk. But it may now come back, and if it does it could mean that Catholic hospitals would be required to perform

abortions lest they lose federal funding.

The fate of the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate that would force Catholic non-profits to pay for abortion-inducing drugs is sure to reach the U.S. Supreme Court.

Enough of the serious stuff—it's time to have some fun, especially on this rather dreary day. We can't wait until FOCA and the HHS mandate are thrust upon us, so we need to act now. Accordingly, we need to hire and train people with specific credentials. Here is my job description:

- Community organizers needed immediately
- No prior experience—in any job—is needed
- Chicago residents preferred, especially those from Hyde Park
- Membership in churches that promote racial divisions is a plus
- A passion for helping the poor must include opposition to school vouchers and support for more food stamps
- Long-time associations with urban terrorists preferred
- An apologetic stance on America's heritage is a must

Send all resumes to Bill Donohue. References are optional though preference will be given to those who list attorneys who have defended suspected terrorists, or who have at least heard of Eric Holder.

BBC AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH



This is the twelfth and last installment of Bill Donohue's report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

New York Times op-ed page columnist Joe Nocera has asked some tough questions about Mark Thompson's knowledge of the Jimmy Savile matter [click [here](#)]; Thompson, who will head the *Times* Company on Monday, was running the BBC when a report exposing BBC child rapist Jimmy Savile was spiked late last year. Concerning the question of whether Thompson ever heard about rumors of Savile's predatory behavior, Nocera cuts him a break, saying that "given the byzantine nature of the BBC bureaucracy, these are plausible denials."

Nocera's position is not without merit. The only reason I mention this is because of the double standard held by some of the harshest critics of the Catholic Church: they say that Pope John Paul II must have known about predatory priests in the employ of the Holy See, and that Pope Benedict XVI (Cardinal Ratzinger under John Paul), must also have known. Yes, of course they knew there was a problem, but just how big it was, and exactly who was involved is another matter altogether.

Thompson defends himself, in part, by saying that the enormous size of the BBC—23,000 employees, eight TV channels, 50 radio stations—made it impossible for him to know details that were known to others. Again, this position is not without merit. But the BBC is tiny next to the Catholic Church.

The pope governs an institution with over 1 billion members residing in every part of the globe. Besides the Roman Curia and the College of Cardinals, those who work for the pope include: more than 5,000 bishops; 400,000 priests; almost 40,000 permanent deacons; 55,000 non-ordained male religious;

over 700,000 female religious; and over 100,000 seminarians. They work in over 3,000 dioceses serving some 220,000 parishes throughout the world.

If Thompson is to be cut some slack, wouldn't justice demand that the pope be treated at least as generously? It should now be clear why I wrote these 12 reports.

INSANE BALLOT INITIATIVES



Bill Donohue comments on today's ballot initiatives:

Not too long ago in this country, no one in his right mind would suggest that it is a good idea to allow two men to get married, but today voters in Maine, Maryland, Minnesota and Washington will rule on this issue in one form or another.

Not too long ago in this country, no one in his right mind would suggest that it is a good idea to legalize the recreational use of cannabis, but today voters in Colorado, Oregon and Washington will decide whether they go along with the pot heads.

Not too long ago in this country, no one in his right mind would suggest that illegal aliens should have a right to in-state tuition rates at a state's universities (while citizens who are here legally but are from another state are denied such a perk), but today voters in Maryland will decide this very issue.

Not too long ago in this country, no one in his right mind would suggest that doctors can legally kill their patients, but today voters in Massachusetts will decide the question of physician-assisted suicide.

And up until almost yesterday, no one in his right mind would suggest that voters need to decide whether porn film actors should have to wear condoms as a condition of employment, but today voters in Los Angeles County will render a judgment on this pressing matter. What makes this so interesting is that the *Los Angeles Times* has run an editorial *opposing* condom use for the porn stars. Nice to know it endorses lethal sex acts.

As they say, people get the government they deserve.

PULPIT POLITICS



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

M. Alex Johnson of NBC News and the editorial board of the *Los Angeles Times* are quite upset with the pro-Romney clergy, yet they have absolutely nothing to say about the pro-Obama clergy.

Consider the facts. The Pew Research Center released its findings on this subject last week: “Black Protestants are twice as likely as churchgoers to be hearing about the candidates at church.” Moreover, “Nearly half (45%) of black Protestant churchgoers say the messages they hear at church

favor a candidate, and every one of those says the message favors Obama." [My italics.] I guess NBC News and the *Los Angeles Times* missed that report. I guess they also missed the news story by Rachel Zoll of the Associated Press; she did a fair job covering this subject, citing the Pew findings.

The evidence that black ministers have been using the pulpit to promote Obama is hardly new. Just recently, the *Charlotte Observer* and the *Washington Post* offered plenty of detail on this issue. Also of interest is California Governor Jerry Brown: he campaigned in black churches for his ballot initiative to soak the rich.

Top prize for hypocrisy, however, goes to Nicholas Cafardi, a law professor at Duquesne University. On November 2, in a column he wrote for a Catholic dissident newspaper, he attacked Bishop Daniel Jenky for a letter that the Peoria bishop asked his priests to read at Mass yesterday. The letter, which Cafardi describes as a "non-endorsement endorsement," amounted to "a partisan political rant." Yet on that very same day, it was reported that Cafardi was one of over 60 "faith leaders and ministers" who signed a statement that *literally endorsed Obama*. Indeed, they raved about everything from ObamaCare to Head Start, both abject failures.

Different strokes for different folks? Or left-wing politics as usual? Both answers are correct.