

MILEY v. MUSLIMS



Bill Donohue comments on reactions to Miley Cyrus and the Miss World pageant:

Last Sunday, at the MTV Video Music Awards, Miley Cyrus simulated masturbation with a giant foam finger, grabbed her crotch, rubbed herself against a man old enough to be her father, pretended the man was performing anal sex on her, and walked around in a nude latex bikini. Her mother loved it. So did her manager. Millions of young girls and guys loved it as well.

Next month, the Miss World pageant will be held in Indonesia. Some Muslims are urging the government to cancel the event. According to the leader, Riziek Shihab, "The Miss World pageant is only an excuse to exhibit women's body parts."

Who are the real feminists? Miley's fans? Or the Muslims? If debasing women is the yardstick, the Muslims win.

A perusal of the websites of the National Organization for Women and The Feminist Majority yields nothing about Miley, nor even a word about sexploitation. However, there is a great deal of commentary on abortion and lesbianism.

In this regard, the Catholic position is instructive.

Pope Paul VI's 1968 encyclical, *Humanae Vitae*, was a clarion call to men and women: today's culture allows men to sexually exploit women, cheapening relations between them. Pope John Paul II spoke eloquently about the commodification of sexuality, offering us a "Theology of the Body."

We don't have to agree with those who want to ban beauty

pageants to know that their concerns are not trivial, especially in a day and age when Miley (and her dutiful mother) may be lurking right around the corner.

ATHEISTS OPPOSE MEMORIAL CROSS



Bill Donohue comments on a threatened lawsuit by American Atheists; they are seeking to stop the erection of a memorial cross in Princeton, New Jersey:

New Jersey has a 9-11 memorial, and one of the local firefighters would like to display a beam in Princeton that was taken from the World Trade Center. American Atheists are objecting because the beam has a cross cut out on one side. To David Silverman, that is “grossly offensive.” So he is threatening to sue.

Silverman says that to allow the memorial cross is to give the “appearance that all of the people who suffered and died on 9-11 and their families are being memorialized by a Christian symbol.” It would be more accurate to say that Silverman and his minions are the only ones who would draw such a silly conclusion, but even if they did, that is no grounds for censorship. This is a free speech issue, and banning expression based on its content is unconstitutional. If Princeton yields, it could be sued for violating the First

Amendment.

Silverman's complaint that those who are not Christian will find the memorial cross "grossly offensive" is a bigoted comment on Jews and other non-Christians; it assumes that most are raving anti-Christians (he needs to leave his hate-filled circle and meet regular Americans). Moreover, his position is also sorely undercut by the person promoting the cross, Princeton Fire Chief Roy James. "I'm a Jew," he told Todd Starnes of Fox News, and "I'm fighting to have this cross there because I believe that someone's story is behind that."

We are asking our members to contact Princeton Mayor Liz Lempert.

Contact: llempert@princetonnj.gov

OBAMA AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY



Bill Donohue has written a piece for Newsmax on the Obama administration's recent filing of an amicus brief in favor of religious invocations at government meetings. In his article he considers possible motives for the administration's position. To read it, click [here](#).

NYT AND NPR LOVE ANTI-CATHOLIC FILM



Bill Donohue comments on the movie, "Paradise: Faith," which opens in New York and Los Angeles today:

A "devout" Catholic woman masturbates with a crucifix, flagellates herself, walks around the house praying on her knees, goes door-to-door with a statue of the Virgin Mary, and fights off her paraplegic Muslim husband who tries to rape her. The *New York Times* finds it "riveting," and NPR declares it "recommended." Last year, it won a special jury prize at the Venice Film Festival.

It is not certain whether the filmmaker, Ulrich Seidl, who is Austrian, is related to another Austrian, Mr. Adolf Hitler, though he could be. Like Hitler, Seidl is a vicious anti-Catholic ex-Catholic. When questioned why it was necessary to show the "devout" Catholic woman profaning a sacred symbol, he said, "it is right to show her masturbating using a cross, as she is making love to Jesus. Just because it might be a taboo doesn't mean I won't show it." But it depends: he won't show a "devout" Jew masturbating with the Star of David. That would be disrespectful. And NPR and the *New York Times* would never approve.

Fortunately, almost no one will see this movie. Not only is it in German and Arabic, with subtitles, it is only being shown in Los Angeles and New York; even there it is hard to find. But that doesn't mean our elites are not taking notice: it merited over 800 words in the *Times*, and NPR said that notwithstanding its "occasional missteps," it is a "success."

If I had known in advance it was opening in the East Village, I would have hired a photographer, and a few researchers, to take pictures and interview the theater-goers. It would be instructive to know who likes this kind of fare. One thing is for sure: they take their ideological cues from NPR and the *New York Times*. Don't all independent thinkers?

CALIFORNIA SEX ABUSE BILL ADVANCES



Bill Donohue comments on the California bill that would allow those who claim they were molested in a private institution more time to file lawsuits:

On August 14, SB 131 lost in the Assembly Appropriations Committee by a 6-4 vote; there were seven abstentions. Yesterday, it passed 12-4. The bill now heads to the Assembly; it could be voted on as early as Monday.

It was the Democrats who made the difference between last week and this week. Last week, they were indecisive; this week they decided to cast their vote in favor of a bill that discriminates against the Catholic Church.

We need a lawmaker who will introduce a bill that discriminates against the public sector. The bill should suspend the statute of limitations in cases involving the sexual abuse of minors who were victimized in a public school or any other public entity. All private institutions, including Catholic schools, would be given a pass.

This is the only way to send a message to the public about this phony war on child abuse. Anyone who is serious about this issue would never entertain a bill that had selective application.

CUOMO'S ABORTION PALS WIN FAVORS



Bill Donohue comments on New York State Gov. Andrew Cuomo's friends at NARAL Pro-Choice:

There is no organization that Gov. Cuomo loves more than NARAL, the most radical pro-abortion organization in New York State. And there is only one organization in New York State that received an exemption from his new lobbying reporting law for tax exempt groups—NARAL.

The *New York Times* reported today that the lone exemption to NARAL was granted by the state ethics commission because it contended that its donors might face “harm, threats, harassment, or reprisals”; these conditions are grounds for exemption. But the decision to grant the exemption was done in private, behind closed doors, thus contradicting Cuomo's call for transparency.

What the *Times* did not disclose is that this same slippery exemption was written into the regulations broached by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman on June 7: this

regulation, which applies to the political expenditures of non-profits, is being touted for its “groundbreaking effort to bring transparency to the political process.” Will NARAL be exempt from this regulation as well?

The only New York politician with the guts to do anything about this outrageous scam is Senate GOP leader Dean Skelos. In his August 1 letter to Daniel Horwitz, Chairman of the Joint Commission on Public Ethics, Skelos said of the donor disclosure law, “This regulation should be repealed and the information should be made public.” We agree.

NARAL-NY is corrupt. In 2011, Kelli Conlin, who headed the group for 19 years, pleaded guilty to stealing \$75,000 from NARAL; in 2012, she was slapped with another lawsuit accusing her of ripping off hundreds of thousands to finance her extravagant lifestyle. Are we to believe that no one at NARAL knew about her illegalities? And this is the group that is being given preferential treatment in skirting the law? Thus far this year, NARAL-NY has spent \$425,000 in lobbying, and no one has benefited more than Cuomo.

We are contacting New York lawmakers, Ethics Chairman Horwitz, and others, asking them to support Sen. Skelos’ requests.

Contact Daniel Horwitz: dhorwitz@lchattorneys.com

PBS MUHAMMAD FILM RAISES

QUESTIONS



Bill Donohue comments on the three-part PBS documentary, "The Life of Muhammad," which debuts tonight:

No one likes to see his religion trashed, and from everything we have learned about "The Life of Muhammad," Muslims have nothing to worry about. The New York *Daily News* says the film could be subtitled "Islam 101," boasting that "If it helps with greater understanding, it has done its job." A professor who appears in the series praises it for its "balance."

However, a look back at PBS' treatment of the Catholic Church yields few films that could reasonably be dubbed "Catholicism 101," or that could in any way be praised for promoting "greater understanding." In fact, most of the films were flagrantly imbalanced.

Nowhere is Muhammad depicted in the series. This is said to be in keeping with Koranic prohibitions against showing images of the prophet. But the Koran only condemns idolatry; it does not forbid representations of human beings. Indeed, there are illustrated Korans that depict Muhammad. Also, if showing human figures is taboo, why did Muhammad allow his wife, Aisha, to play with dolls? (She was 6-years-old when he married her, and 9 when the marriage was consummated; he was in his fifties.) Moreover, Muhammad himself kept copies of Jesus and Mary from destruction.

Oxford professor Tariq Ramadan erroneously says in the film

that “We never represent or have any images of any of the prophets.” Faris Kermani, the producer and director, does not deny that Ramadan is wrong. He simply says that he decided to respect “the current Muslim view, understanding that this has not always been the case.” So kind.

PBS has a long history of disparate treatment when it comes to portrayals of Islam and Catholicism. I hasten to add that its treatment of Islam has not always been fair, either. Click [here](#) to read more about this issue.

PETITION TO WITHDRAW HHS MANDATE



Bill Donohue explains why the need for a petition:

The Catholic community, led by the bishops, has voiced its objections to the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate on several occasions. The Obama administration has made “accommodations” and other revisions, but the fundamental problem remains: the HHS mandate adopts a definition of what constitutes a “religious employer” that is entirely too narrow; and the religious liberty abridgement entailed in this edict represents an unfair burden on Catholic non-profit organizations, and Catholic-owned private businesses.

The amount of time and money spent trying to reconcile the HHS mandate with legitimate First Amendment concerns has been

considerable, and without a satisfactory conclusion. Indeed, almost 70 lawsuits have been filed. The only sensible outcome is for the administration to withdraw the mandate altogether.

The problems inherent in ObamaCare are serious. From delaying “out-of-pocket costs” to postponing the employer mandate, it is evident that even those who support this legislation are growing weary. Add to this the more than a thousand waivers that have been granted, and the loss of support by labor unions, and the result is alarming. But none of these factors are as important as the constitutional issues that the HHS mandate presents: even if ObamaCare can be salvaged, the problems posed by the mandate remain.

The petition drive that we are launching today will end September 30, six weeks from today. We will forward the petitions to HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius on October 1. Please encourage family, friends and members of your parish to sign it. To sign it, click [here](#).

CALIFORNIA SEX ABUSE BILL STALLS



Bill Donohue comments on a California bill, SB 131, that would suspend the statute of limitations for one year in cases where someone claims he was molested when he was a minor in a private institution; the law applies to those who were 26-years-old in 2002:

Good news: SB 131 never got out of committee today. While the bill can still be voted on during this legislative session,

time is running out. The fact that it stalled today is encouraging.

This bill has more to do with punishing the Catholic Church for offenses alleged to have been committed decades ago than it does with protecting minors today. The bill is also an affront to fairness on another level: it gives the biggest offenders of all—those who work in the public schools—a pass.

The Catholic League salutes the California bishops, ably led by Los Angeles Archbishop José Gomez, and the California Catholic Conference. We also commend all those Catholic League members in California who let their voices be heard; we were happy to lead them. It goes to show that if our side is to win, we must raise our voices. No one can hear those who speak softly.

FACEBOOK'S DUPLICITY



Bill Donohue comments on the inconsistent way Facebook applies its global standards for unacceptable fare:

On July 1, the Catholic League filed a complaint with Facebook about an entry that showed an edgy picture of the Virgin Mary with the inscription, "Virgin Mary Should've Aborted." This was the reply: "We reviewed the page you reported for containing hate speech or symbols and found it doesn't violate our community standard on hate speech." When others continued to protest, the page was taken down, but then other pages,

similar in content, appeared; they are still posted.

Alison Schumer, who works in Facebook's communication department, said in June that "hate speech" is defined as "direct and serious attacks on any protected category of people," but that "distasteful humor" does not qualify. That is an eminently defensible definition. But if that policy was violated when a cartoon of a naked Muhammad was posted—this happened last September when a French magazine took liberties with the prophet—then why does Facebook currently allow the Virgin Mary to be assaulted? It censored the French page.

Two other issues are involved. First, the policy that Schumer defended speaks to categories of people, not individuals. But it was invoked against the French magazine because of its assault on an individual. The point being that if the anti-Muhammad post had to be taken down, why not the anti-Virgin Mary page? Second, the cartoon (not a photo) was a depiction of Muhammad lying on his stomach, with his butt exposed. If the reason for taking down this page is nudity, then how does Facebook explain doctored photos of Sarah Palin sitting on a chair with her legs spread, wearing a blouse, panties, nylons, and high heels? It's still up.

Overall, Facebook does a very fair job. But it owes Catholics an explanation. Better yet, simply treat Mary the way it treats Muhammad.

Contact Facebook's press room: press@fb.com