

SATANISM LINKED TO SERIAL CRIMES



Bill Donohue comments on a media blackout:

“Jimmy Savile beat and raped a 12-year-old girl during a secret satanic ritual in a hospital.” This is the opening line in an English newspaper’s story on Sunday about BBC child rapist Jimmy Savile. The BBC icon, who died in 2011, is believed to be responsible for abusing at least 450 males and females, aged eight to 47.

Dr. Valerie Sinason, president of the Institute of Psychotherapy and Disability in the U.K., revealed that the aforementioned girl told her in 1992 what happened to her in 1975. Savile wore a robe and a mask while he abused the girl in the basement of a hospital; during the rape, Savile and his cohorts (also pedophiles) chanted, “Hail Satan” in the candle-lit room. Five years later, Dr. Sinason says, Savile abused another girl during a Black Mass ceremony; she, too, heard Latin chanting and witnessed a group of men wearing Satanist regalia. Neither girl knew one another and lived in different parts of the country.

Trevor L. Todd was a classmate of the Newtown, Connecticut mass killer, Adam Lanza. He says Lanza was a devil worshipper who had his own website on the Internet. Indeed, he says the website “had the word ‘Devil’ on it in red Gothic-style letters against a black background. It gave me the chills. It was just so weird.”

Is there a Satanic connection that helps explain the serial rapes of Jimmy Savile and the serial killings of Adam Lanza? We don't have enough evidence at the moment to say with certainty. But we do know that the media have shown very little interest in exploring this line of inquiry.

While issues like gun control, mental illness and violent video games are worthy of serious discussion, not to research the role that Satanism may have played is simply irresponsible. It is worth recalling that Charles Manson once told the press, "I am the Devil." It begs the question: What exactly are the media afraid of?

POPE BLAMED FOR GANG RAPE



Bill Donohue comments on a perverse article by Ian Buruma:

Ian Buruma is not exactly a household name, but he is a hero to readers of the *New York Review of Books*. His fan base will obviously warm to his latest piece in the Beirut newspaper, *The Daily Star* [click [here](#)].

Buruma begins by recounting the brutal rape of a young woman by six men on a New Delhi bus last month. His quick segue to Pope Benedict XVI's speech on gay marriage, which was given a few days before Christmas, was not only awkward, it was a dead give-away: the pope was responsible for the gang rape.

Buruma admits that the pope does not advocate violence against homosexuals, but in the end it doesn't matter. "I would argue that his speech [the pope's] actually encourages the kind of sexual aggression that can result in the savagery that took place in New Delhi."

Now if this were just the scribbling of another wingnut, it would matter little. But Buruma teaches at Bard College and has won several awards from prestigious institutions in the U.S. and Europe.

Curiously, he is the Henry R. Luce Professor of Democracy, Human Rights, and Journalism at Bard. What is curious about his post is that he is a strong opponent of human rights. To be specific, though he has written at length about Tariq Ramadan, he cannot bring himself to denounce the Muslim philosopher for refusing to condemn the Muslim practice of stoning adulterous women to death. Even more perverse, Buruma has trashed one of the most courageous defenders of human rights in the world, ex-Muslim and feminist Ayaan Hirsi Ali.

In other words, Buruma is a fraud. He cares not a whit about human rights, and is so in bed with the gay rights movement that he is utterly incapable of making critical distinctions. Moreover, his idea of cause and effect is so debased that it would allow his critics to accuse him of driving Christian persecution in Muslim-run nations.

IS CHRISTIANITY ANTI-GAY?



Bill Donohue comments on the way the media have covered the story on the decision by Pastor Louie Giglio to back out of giving the benediction at the inaugural ceremonies:

A left-wing website, Think Progress, attacked Pastor Giglio for remarks he made in the 1990s affirming Christian teachings on homosexuality. It cited as proof of Giglio's bigotry passages from the Bible that brand homosexuality as sinful. Now anyone is free to disagree with the Bible, but it is unprofessional of the media to simply adopt the Think Progress agenda. More than that, it shows an egregious bias.

To be specific, media outlets that tagged Giglio's orthodox Christian remarks as anti-gay include: ABC News, CBS News, NBC News, MSNBC, the *Washington Post*, *Investor's Business Daily*, the Associated Press, and UPI. Those that reported the story professionally by offering a descriptive account include CNN, Fox News, the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Chicago Tribune* and the *Los Angeles Times*.

The distinction is critical. To say that Giglio backed out because of his "previous anti-gay comments" is tantamount to saying Christianity is anti-gay because it sees homosexual behavior as sinful. It also sees adultery as sinful. Does that mean Christianity is bigoted against heterosexuals?

With regard to homosexuality, the teachings found in Christianity were taken from Judaism. Moreover, Islam also sees homosexuality as sinful. Are we to believe that the adherents of all these world religions are "anti-gay"? It is more likely that those who think this way have lost their bearings. They should lose their jobs, as well.

SHOULD OBAMA SWEAR ON DAS KAPITAL?



Bill Donohue comments on remarks made last night by Lawrence O'Donnell on his MSNBC show:

If anyone doubts that Lawrence O'Donnell hates Christianity, then he should go to the website of The Daily Caller and watch him in action. A transcript of his diatribe does not do justice to what possesses him—you have to see him strut his stuff to get a sense of his true pathology.

O'Donnell starts his rant by focusing on Atlanta Pastor Louie Giglio; the evangelical minister bowed to pressure from homosexual activists by agreeing not to give the benediction at President Obama's inaugural. Pastor Giglio's crime? He's a Christian. Practicing Christians, along with observant Jews, Mormons, Muslims and millions of others, accept the biblical teachings on the sinfulness of homosexuality. In the 1990s, Giglio addressed this subject, citing Christian teachings, and that was enough to set off the alarms in gay quarters.

Over the past few decades, many homosexuals and theologians have tried to argue that the Bible's passages condemning homosexuality should not be read as condemning homosexuality. In their postmodern mind, they say that interpretation is wrong. O'Donnell, to his credit, knows these savants are delusional. While he readily admits that the Bible condemns homosexuality, his level of cognitive development does not

allow him to discern the difference between behavior and status, which is why he falsely claims the Bible condemns “gay people.”

The problem for O'Donnell is not Giglio, it's the Bible. He says the practice of presidents putting their hand on the Bible is “one of our most absurdist [sic] traditions.” Furthermore, he says that because Obama embraces the gay agenda, he should not swear on the Bible. The point is not without merit. Given Obama's ideology, perhaps it would make more sense for him to swear on *Das Kapital*.

MICHAEL MOORE LIKES CHURCH INVASIONS



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

At the New York Film Critics Circle Awards on January 7, Michael Moore presented the Best First Film to David France for his documentary, “How to Survive a Plague.” The movie is a celebration of gay activism.

The documentary honors the day when homosexual terrorists from ACT UP invaded St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City on December 10, 1989. They interrupted the Mass by shouting and waving their fists; they tossed condoms in the air; they spat the Eucharist on the floor; they chained themselves to pews;

they stopped Catholics from going to Holy Communion.

In an editorial at the time, the *New York Times* called what happened, “an act of desecration.” On Monday, Moore said, “I personally like that one.”

Moore’s endorsement of fascistic tactics is nothing new. To be exact, Moore gave money to ACT UP right after they pulled their Nazi-like invasion in 1989. So Monday night’s outburst was not an anomaly—it’s who Michael Moore really is.

PROTECTING KIDS FROM RELIGION



Bill Donohue discusses an interesting *New York Times* forum:

On the “Opinion Pages” of today’s *New York Times* website there is a “Room for Debate” feature that asks commentators to reply to the question, “With Children, When Does Religion Go Too Far?”

The editor of *Christianity Today* says that many of his readers are “refugees from strict fundamentalist families,” noting that “children are often oppressed in religious households.” A former *Village Voice* editor writes of “Scientology’s ersatz secret police.” Speaking about religion in general, a specialist in cults opines that some religious groups “can be downright harmful to some of their members, especially children.” A gay writer says that after he was raped by an older man when he was a teenager, his Mormon mom and dad effectively blamed him.

A Jewish sociologist charges that Orthodox Jews keep their members in a “cultural and voluntary ghetto.” An international lawyer worries about Muslim mothers who make their girls wear headscarves “even while they are still hanging from monkey bars.” Finally, a Hindu woman confesses that although “Hinduism is an easy religion to follow,” its “sexist rules” anger her enough that she “combats[s] them through disobedience.”

There is no reason to doubt any of these accounts. Indeed, no one seriously doubts that there are tyrannical maniacs in every religion. But would the *New York Times* invite commentators to discuss, “With Children, When Does Secularism Go Too Far?” After all, our most pressing contemporary social problems are not a function of religion going too far with kids these days—they are a reflection of the near absence of religious training.

As the German sociologist Max Weber instructed, the bias of the investigator is present in the questions he asks. This is as true of social scientists as it is of journalists.

ESPN APOLOGIZES; CNN DOES NOT



Bill Donohue comments on the way ESPN and CNN handled recent episodes involving sexuality:

On Monday night, during the BCS national title game televised on ESPN, a camera focused on Katherine Webb, the Miss Alabama girlfriend of Alabama quarterback AJ McCarron. Announcer Brent

Musburger called her “a lovely lady” and “beautiful,” saying, “You quarterbacks get all the good-looking women.” The next day ESPN said, “we apologize that the commentary in this instance went too far and Brent understands that.”

Kathy Griffin, however, didn’t go too far for CNN on New Year’s Eve when she simulated oral sex on Anderson Cooper; there was no apology. CNN’s silence was not lost on Griffin. Indeed, the next night, she told David Letterman, “If you think this is the part where I’m gonna apologize for trying to go down on Anderson Cooper, you are sorely mistaken.” She added, “I tried, ladies and gays. I tried for you.”

So ESPN apologizes for an innocuous remark (Miss Webb said it was “kind of nice”), but CNN refuses to apologize for Griffin’s blatantly offensive stunt. This reveals much more than duplicity: the exact same mindset—one that is infused with hard liberal ideology—is prevalent at *both* networks.

To read Bill Donohue’s Newsmax article on the Kathy Griffin issue, click [here](#).

MEDIA BLACKOUT OF NEW NUNS



Bill Donohue released the following comments today:

Aside from Deacon Greg Kandra, the Catholic News Agency, and

EWTN, both the religious and secular media—including the Catholic media—have failed to report an important story that deserves wide attention: on New Year's Day, 11 Anglican nuns from the Community of St. Mary the Virgin in England entered the Catholic Church. Moreover, a sister from another order of Anglican nuns joined with them to form a new Catholic order, the Sisters of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

The 12 sisters were received wearing their black habits, the signature color of their new Benedictine order. William Oddie, a prominent English writer and broadcaster (himself a convert), described the scene: "Here was a pristine, freshly minted Catholic community, fizzing with new life and (unlike, I fear, most Catholic sisters these days) wearing full habits....I had feared they might be received in lay clothes, only being clothed in their habits once the new community had been formally established, but there was no nonsense of that kind."

The sisters will spend the next six weeks with a Benedictine community, learning the contours of the normative order. After that they will live a life of poverty in service to the Lord. "This historic event (I don't think it's too much to call it that)," says Oddie, "is a sign of great hope for the future of the Catholic Church in England."

So why isn't this "historic event" being publicized? Imagine the media reaction if on New Year's Day 12 renegade Anglican nuns had held a press conference in their street clothes announcing their intent to join a dissident Catholic order so they can press for gay marriage and women priests! It would have been front-page news. And had they rented an oversized luxury bus to haul them around town, that would have been world news. But because these are humble orthodox nuns, who eschew media gimmicks, there is a news blackout.

God bless these wonderful women.

BISHOP TOBIN DEFENDS MARRIAGE



As Rhode Island lawmakers are set to consider the issue of gay marriage, Providence Bishop Thomas J. Tobin released a letter to them today [[click here](#)] on this subject. Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Bishop Tobin's statement is perhaps the most comprehensive defense of marriage made by any bishop in the nation. Indeed, he leaves no matter attendant to this subject untouched.

Historical Issues: "The proposal to legalize same-sex marriage is an attempt to redefine the institution of marriage as it has existed in every culture from the beginning of human history."

Biblical Issues: "Marriage was defined by God for two specific purposes: to affirm the complementary roles of males and females in a loving relationship, and to provide a stable foundation for the procreation and raising of children. Homosexual relationships can achieve neither of these goals."

Sociological Issues: "The concept of same-sex marriage is an untested experiment with unpredictable long-term outcomes."

Constitutional Issues: "Another real problem to consider is that the establishment of same-sex marriage would pose yet another threat to religious freedom."

Timing Issues: "Why is Rhode Island spending time and energy on this issue right now when the Supreme Court might make the decision for us?"

Democratic Issues: “If we are in fact forced to discuss the nature of matrimony in our state, it should be placed before the general public in a referendum.”

Kudos to Bishop Tobin. He has framed this issue with authority, leaving no stone unturned.

CHURCHES DESERVE SANDY RELIEF FUNDS



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

I have contacted House Speaker John Boehner asking him to support the amendment to the Hurricane Sandy recovery appropriations bill that was introduced by outgoing Senator Joseph Lieberman. The bill rightly says that houses of worship that were damaged or destroyed deserve federal assistance.

I have also contacted FEMA chief Craig Fugate about this matter. “The time has come to formalize an inclusive FEMA policy that explicitly states that no religious entity will be turned down for relief funding on the basis of religion,” I said.

In both letters, I stressed the fact that no church or synagogue in the New York-New Jersey area that assisted those hit by the storm discriminated on the basis of religion. Moreover, I said that Sandy didn’t discriminate in choosing

its victims. Ergo, the federal government should not discriminate on the basis of an institution's mission.

Arguments against helping houses of worship don't stand up. In 2010, the U.S. State Department provided millions to restore mosques in 27 different Islamic nations. So is the Obama administration saying that Christian and Jewish houses of worship in the U.S. in need of restoration don't qualify for assistance but Islamic houses of worship overseas do?

Dana Sher of the ACLU is saying that "To rebuild houses of worship is a form of compelled support for religion, which is exactly what the First Amendment is designed to protect against." She doesn't know her history. President Thomas Jefferson didn't provide money to rebuild churches that were devastated—he approved a treaty that awarded \$300 to the Kaskaskia Indians for the purpose of building one! By the way, the church was Catholic.

Contact Boehner's office: (202) 225-0600; fax (202) 225-5117

Contact Fugate's office: william.fugate@dhs.gov