

HOLLYWOOD AND HITLER



Bill Donohue comments on an article in the *Hollywood Reporter* by Ben Urwand that is an excerpt from his forthcoming book, *The Collaboration: Hollywood's Pact with Hitler*:

Not only did the Hollywood studios obediently bow to Hitler's masters by killing scenes deemed objectionable, they even hired Nazis at Paramount to work with them. The head of MGM in Germany actually acceded to a request by Hitler's henchmen to divorce his Jewish wife; she wound up in a concentration camp.

Standing against the Hollywood moguls, Urwand says, was Joseph Breen, the Irish Catholic official who worked for, and eventually succeeded, Will Hays of the so-called Hays Office; the private association monitored Hollywood movies for objectionable fare. Looks like Breen's commitment to decency trumped Hollywood's commitment to cash.

Breen was not a fan of the way Hollywood conducted itself, but he did not balk when asked by the two authors of the Hays Code, Martin Quigley and Jesuit priest Father Daniel Lord, to make a public statement condemning anti-Semitism in 1939. Meanwhile, those who ran the movie industry were cutting and splicing their films to meet Nazi approval.

Hollywood hasn't changed a bit. Today, it is in bed with Communist censors in China, inviting them on to its sets to offer advice on what is acceptable and what is not. If they don't cooperate with the slave masters, they risk having their films spiked: the violent film "Django Unchained" was pulled from Chinese theaters on opening day in April.

When the Catholic League merely criticizes a movie, we are

tagged a censor. When Hollywood studio chiefs cooperate with Chinese government agents by altering their films, they find ways to congratulate themselves. For example, Steven Soderbergh welcomes the input of Communist censors: "It's fascinating to listen to people's interpretation of your story." He must have learned his obsequiousness from those who collaborated with Hitler.

CARDINAL GEORGE STANDS ON PRINCIPLE



Bill Donohue defends Francis Cardinal George:

Everyone knows that the Catholic Church has a long and proud history of immigrant outreach. Everyone knows that the Catholic Church, like virtually every religion in the history of the world, believes marriage should be confined to one man and one woman. It should come as no surprise, then, that Catholics who financially support pro-immigrant organizations expect that their contribution will not fund entities that reject Church teachings on marriage.

The Chicago Archbishop, Francis Cardinal George, made a principled decision not to funnel funds, via the Catholic Campaign for Human Development (CCHD), to the Illinois Coalition of Immigrant and Refugee Rights, a pro-gay marriage institution. This has led to an uproar among some in Chicago. Their angst is contrived.

As Cardinal George said in his open letter of July 29, organizations that apply for CCHD funding do so knowing that they are expected to respect Church teachings. No one forces them to apply; they are free to secure funds elsewhere. But when they violate their agreement, and are called out for doing so, they should not pretend to be victims.

Mark Brown, a columnist for the *Chicago Sun-Times*, writes today that all along he has said that “it’s a mistake for the church to use the grants to punish organizations that it knows to be doing good work in the community...” So when an organization applies for funding, and is then denied because it violated an agreement that it voluntarily entered into, it is being punished for doing so. Amazing logic. Hope any handyman who enters into an agreement with Brown knows about his moral compass.

If Cardinal George denied funding to a pro-immigrant organization that was aligned with racist or anti-Semitic causes, he would be heralded as a champion of human rights. But because the issue is gay marriage, he is condemned. The politics are so transparent that it’s making a joke of those promoting it.

Contact Mark Brown: markbrown@suntimes.com

**POPULIST POPE PROVES
IRRESISTIBLE**



In the wake of Pope Francis' trip to Brazil, Bill Donohue comments on his irresistible appeal:

Pope Francis is the perfect pontiff for our age, a truly populist pope. He is able to do something that few others have been able to do: he can espouse the traditional moral teachings of the Catholic Church—teachings that are profoundly countercultural—yet at the same time speak with a relevancy that is almost impossible to duplicate. Style does not change substance, but it can facilitate the transmission of substantive teachings.

It is not just his simplicity of manner—living in modest quarters, driving in compact sedans, carrying his own belongings, donning the hats of ordinary people—it is his simplicity of thought. Pope Francis is hardly anti-intellectual, but he is rightly wary of making intellectual appeals that never reach the people. He knows there is a place for administrative oversight and data collection, but he warns against a “functionalism” that distances the hierarchy from the faithful. Surely he celebrates the role of bishops as apostles of Christ, but he is careful to warn of the dangers of clericalism.

This is what a populist pope is all about. Pope Francis wants to touch the people, and he also wants them to participate in the makings of Christianity. But he is not prepared to lower the bar: he instructs us to forgive *and* forget. He welcomes everyone, yet counsels that inclusivity cannot be achieved at the price of compromising basic moral truths. He may not appeal to die-hard secularists, or to cynics, but to those who are prepared to allow the Church, and themselves, a chance to reboot, he is indispensable.

God bless our populist pope.

POPE ON GAYS DRIVES MEDIA WILD



Bill Donohue comments on media reaction to remarks made by Pope Francis on homosexual priests:

The pope speaks about materialism for one straight week in Brazil before millions of people, and his formal comments garner 74 news stories on Lexis-Nexis. He speaks off-the-cuff about homosexual priests before a handful of reporters on the airplane going back to Rome and his remarks trigger 220 news stories. One might logically conclude that the pope broke some new ground with his comments on gay priests. But he didn't.

When asked about homosexual priests, Pope Francis said, "If a person is gay and seeks God and has good will, who am I to judge him?" He added that "The problem is not having this orientation. We must be brothers. The problem is lobbying by this orientation...."

Pope Benedict XVI, responding to the homosexual scandal in the Catholic Church (one more time—less than 5 percent of the cases of priestly sexual abuse involved pedophilia), did not make it impossible for gays to enter the priesthood; he simply made it more difficult for those who were practicing gays to enter. Pope Francis said nothing to contradict what his

predecessor said. And by addressing the gay lobby, he was clearly speaking out against what the late Father Andrew Greeley called the “lavender mafia.”

About ten years ago, I was interviewed by David France for a book he was writing, *Our Fathers*, about gays in the Catholic Church. Here is a selection of what I said: “I don’t think most Catholics would care if their priest is gay or straight, to tell the truth. I think the issue for them is whether he can live up to his vow of celibacy. I’d take a chaste gay priest any day over a promiscuous straight one.”

France was ecstatic, much the way reporters are now with the pope. In both instances, their eudemonia is a reflection of the way they stereotype orthodox Catholics.

USA TODAY FLAGS LETTERMAN’S BIGOTRY



Bill Donohue comments on a poll taken today on the website of *USA Today* asking respondents to choose which video they liked best: the one where David Letterman compared all priests to molesters, or the one where

Jay Leno said Pope Francis could be mistaken for Lady Gaga:

Leno’s jab was inoffensive, but Letterman’s July 23 monologue (which I commented on), was vile. His “altar boy” quip—World Youth Day is called by the Vatican “salute to altar boys”—is a vicious hit on 40,000 innocent priests.

USA Today took Letterman's offensive remarks to a new level. It not only flagged his bigotry, it celebrated it. Predictably, many more respondents preferred Letterman's obscene statement to Leno's throw-away line.

USA Today is exercised over racial profiling, but it obviously thinks religious profiling is acceptable, at least when it comes to Catholic priests. And they consider themselves open-minded and fair.

Contact *USA Today* Standards and Ethics Editor Brent Jones:
bwjones@usatoday.com

CATHOLIC CONFERENCE

HOMOSEXUAL



Bill Donohue comments on the four-day Courage Conference which opens today in Mundelein, Illinois:

The Catholic outreach program for homosexuals, Courage, has done magnificent work seeking to help homosexuals abide by the Church's teachings on sexuality. Instead of being congratulated for its work, left-wing activists and militant gays have condemned it. Their latest attack is a petition demanding that Chicago Archbishop Francis Cardinal George cancel his plans to say Mass on Friday at the Courage Conference. The petition drive has failed: Cardinal George will not cancel his plans.

Critics of the conference are contending that Courage is

seeking to persuade Catholic homosexuals to seek therapy, the purpose of which is to convert them to heterosexuality. The charge is patently false. I had the pleasure of knowing Father John Harvey, who spearheaded Courage for many years; he died in 2010. I also know, and hold in high regard, the other co-founder of Courage, Father Benedict Groeschel. Together, they did more to help Catholic homosexuals than any gay group in the nation.

Courage is not some renegade Catholic group like Dignity: it is an apostolate of the Catholic Church that has won the praise of Pope John Paul II and many others. Its goal is to “help persons with same-sex attractions develop a life of interior chastity in union with Christ.” It does not implore its members to seek gay-conversion therapy, and indeed it does not provide therapy to its members.

Even if Courage did push such therapy, what business is it of outsiders to tell it what to do? And what exactly are they afraid of? Moreover, whatever happened to their much-vaunted virtue, namely “choice”?

People for the American Way is particularly upset that Father Paul Scalia, son of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia, is speaking at the Courage Conference. We’re delighted he is. Too bad it won’t be carried on C-SPAN.

THE ATHEIST “CHAPLAINS” PLOY

even odds
elevated subway
big sip
original copy
jumbo shrimp

Bill Donohue comments on demands to employ atheist “chaplains”:

An amendment has been proposed to the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act to add atheist “chaplains” to the armed forces. The principal organization pushing this idea is the Military Association of Atheists and Freethinkers. The president of this entity, Jason Torpy, claims it is unfair for Christians et al. to have chaplains, but not atheists.

Now it is true that throughout the nation, atheists have no chaplains; it is also true that vegetarians have no butchers. No matter, Torpy says chaplains are needed to serve the 40,000 atheists in the armed forces. His figure is wrong: the Department of Defense says there are 9,400 atheists or agnostics among the 1.4 million active-duty personnel. Given that there are five times as many agnostics as there are atheists, nationally, that means there are less than 2,000 atheists in the military. Which means Torpy’s figure is 20 times the actual number.

Torpy’s ploy is familiar. The number-one goal of those atheists who are activists is to censor the public expression of religion, especially Christianity. If this doesn’t work, they settle for contrived competition, thus hoping to neuter its effects. That’s why atheist organizations seek to censor Christmas displays on public property, and when that fails, they seek to erect anti-Christian statements next to nativity scenes.

Torpy’s organization is on record opposing Christmas concerts on air force bases, Christian war memorials, and nativity scenes on public property (his organization brags about ending the “stranglehold” that crèches have). His group also supports anti-Christian billboards that compare Christianity to

slavery.

The fact is that 95 percent of all Americans who are affiliated with a religion are Christian. To be sure, atheists have rights, but not among them is the right to war on Christianity, even in a backdoor manner.

LETTERMAN LIBELS POPE AND PRIESTS



Bill Donohue comments on David Letterman's opening monologue of July 23:

Last night, Letterman mentioned Pope Francis' appearance at World Youth Day in Brazil by saying, "And I'm telling you if there's anything the kids can't get enough of, it's a 76-year-old virgin. Come on! World Youth Day. Or as the Vatican calls it, salute to altar boys."

There are some people who can't be shamed. One might think that a man who is known for sexually harassing his staff, and for serial adultery, might be cautious about making such a statement.

Letterman, who admitted in January that he sees a psychiatrist once a week, may want to discuss his latest outburst with his shrink. This guy has some very deep issues that must be addressed—sooner rather than later.

One more thing: His cheap shots did not go over well with his audience. Hopefully, Letterman and his Catholic-bashing writers will get the message.

Contact his publicity director, Kim Izzo-Emmet: krizzo-emmet@cbs.com

VANISHING ATHEISTS



Bill Donohue comments on a study, "Christianity in its Global Context, 1970-2020," published by the Center for the Study of Global Christianity at the Gordon Conwell Theological Seminary:



Looks like the best days for agnostics and atheists are long past: in 1970, agnostics were 14.7 percent of the world's population, and atheists were 4.5 percent; in 2010, the figures dropped to 9.8 and 2.0 percent, respectively; by 2020, it is estimated that agnostics will constitute 8.9 percent, and atheists will make up 1.8 percent.

Much of the decrease is attributable to the demise of that atheistic genocidal wonderland called Communism: the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 led to a spike in religious affiliation, both in Russia and in Eastern Europe; China is also in the throes of a religious revival. Russia was 38

percent Christian in 1970, and in 2010 the number jumped to 71 percent. The world's first officially atheistic state, Albania, is now 63 percent Muslim and 32 percent Christian.

It is expected that by 2020, the percent of the world's population that is Christian will witness a slight uptick; the increase will be greater for Muslims. Asia, as a whole, is witnessing a sharp drop in agnostics and atheists, as are those who live in the Caribbean. Even in Europe it is expected that atheists will decrease markedly: they were 8.2 percent in 1970, and are projected to be 2.1 percent in 2020; agnostics are expected to stay steady at 13.1 percent. It is in places such as Northern America, Western Europe, Australia and New Zealand where non-believers will realize some gains.

Data like these undercut the superstition that the world is becoming increasingly secular. In the U.S., for instance, we hear a lot about the growth of the "nones," those who are not affiliated with any religion. But even among this segment of the population, only 2.6 percent of Americans are agnostic, and a mere 1.9 percent are atheist.

In the U.S., as well as globally, the belief in nothingness is mostly confined to white people who stayed in school for a long time. Too bad they didn't learn to think independently.

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS PROFILING



Bill Donohue comments on two genres of profiling:

"There is nothing more painful to me at this stage in my life than to walk down a street and hear footsteps and start thinking about robbery—then look around and see somebody white and feel relieved." According to those who have slammed George Zimmerman for racial profiling, those words would qualify as the penultimate expression of racial profiling. Those are the words of Rev. Jesse Jackson[click [here](#)]. Jackson has led the charge accusing Zimmerman of racial profiling.

Jackson is not alone in his selective interest in combating profiling. Just as bad are those who protested alleged racial profiling in the Zimmerman case, but who have a long record of actively promoting religious profiling. To be specific, those who have made sweeping condemnations of priests, because of the actions of a small minority of offenders, include Joy Behar, Whoopi Goldberg, Bill Maher, Kathy Griffin, and Alec Baldwin. All of them accused Zimmerman of racially profiling Trayvon Martin. To read a sample of their responses, click [here](#).

Doing a Google search of "religious profiling" turns up stories that are mostly about Muslims. Searching for "imams and" elicits stories about "caliphs," "rabbis," "rabbis and peace," and "mosques council UK." Searching for "Catholic priests and" garners stories on "marriage," "celibacy," "child molestation," and "science"; the articles are mostly disparaging. When searching for "religious profiling and Catholic priests," the first story is one that *endorses* sweeping attacks on priests!

Yesterday, the *New York Post* ran a story titled, "Brooklyn DA

Releases Names of 46 Convicted Child Sex-Abusers Who Terrorized the Orthodox Jewish Community From Within"; this covered a four-year period. This alarming story was not reported either yesterday or today in the *New York Times*. Take note: there haven't been 46 *credible accusations* made against 40,000 priests in the United States in the last four years.

The bias is nauseating. Priests, when compared to African Americans, Muslims, and Jews, are fair game. All should be treated with equal justice.