

EDUCATING O'REILLY



Last night, Bill O'Reilly bemoaned, once again, what he says is the absence of a Christian response to anti-Christian bigotry. In his exchange with Rev. Robert Jeffress, he said, "There isn't really a leader in the American

Catholic Church...There is no Christian society like the Jewish Defamation League."

Here is Bill Donohue's response:

This is stunning. The man chosen to discuss anti-Christian bigotry is known for slamming O'Reilly's own religion. In 2010, Jeffress said the Roman Catholic Church was the outgrowth of a "corruption" called the "Babylonian mystery." He continued, "Much of what you see in the Catholic Church today doesn't come from God's word. It comes from that cult-like pagan religion. Isn't this the genius of Satan?"

Moreover, if there is no Catholic anti-defamation league, then why do O'Reilly's producers keep calling our office for information? This has been going on for years. Why did one of his producers recently come to our office to obtain a video we have in our archives of James Hormel laughing approvingly at the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence? O'Reilly used the video on January 9.

O'Reilly has been selling himself as the lone crusader against radical secularism for years. This is nonsense. Also, if he wants to know who the real leader of the Catholic Church is in America today, he should have an extended interview with Cardinal Timothy Dolan, the Archbishop of New York and the president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

GAY MARRIAGE AND THE “ME DECADES”



Bill Donohue comments on yesterday's U.S. Supreme Court oral arguments over Proposition 8 and same-sex marriage:

Charles Cooper, the lawyer defending Proposition 8, urged the high court not to refocus “the definition of marriage away from the raising of children and to the emotional needs and desires of adults.” In doing so, he was simply restating the basic sociological observation that the purpose of marriage is to serve the best interests of children in the institution of the family. To put it differently, marriage was not created to make adults happy. Ironically, Maureen Dowd took Cooper to task today, asking, “Did he miss the last few Me Decades?” She just doesn't get it: it is precisely because he didn't miss them that he seeks not to sustain them.

Cooper's adversary, Theodore Olson, shares Dowd's handicap. He said marriage is a “personal right,” not “society's right.” If it were a personal right he needs to explain why the Framers, and all the jurists since the 18th century, never discovered it. Also, societies do not possess rights—they have interests. Only individuals have rights.

In his dissent in the 2003 *Lawrence v. Texas* decision that legalized homosexuality, Justice Antonin Scalia warned that if the laws against homosexuality are to be jettisoned, then there would be no principled basis left to proscribe such

things as polygamy and incest. He was widely scorned for saying so. Guess what? Yesterday, Justice Sonia Sotomayor asked Olson if gay marriage is okay, why not polygamy and incest? Without a trace of evidence, he said they involve exploitation and abuse. [Note: Only one newspaper in the U.S., the *San Francisco Chronicle*, cited her concern in today's print edition.]

Olson needs to meet Allen and Patricia Muth. Brother and sister, they have sought to marry, and they would take great umbrage at the very idea that they are exploited or abused. Ditto for thousands of women in polygamous relationships: they love their husbands and their co-wives. Moreover, Kinsey associate Wardell Pomeroy argued over 40 years ago that incest "can sometimes be beneficial." In short, the "Me Decades" are on trial.

BILL MAHER'S UGLY HISTORY



Bill Donohue explains the next step in the Catholic League's response to Bill Maher's Catholic bashing:

Having given up on HBO to do anything about Bill Maher's bigotry, we are contacting the board of directors of Time Warner, the parent company of HBO. All will receive a report detailing Maher's relentless assaults on priests, dating back to 1998.

To read my letter, click [here](#); to read the report, click [here](#). Maher's hatred of Catholicism is pathological, pure and simple. It is time someone addressed his ugly history.

Contact Investor Relations at Time Warner: ir@timewarner.com

MAHER SAYS POPE RUNS CHILD SEX RING



Bill Donohue comments on Bill Maher's latest attack:

The March 22nd episode of "Real Time" was one of Bill Maher's most obscene assaults on Catholicism. He not only went on another rant against the Catholic Church, he stooped to a new low when he attacked Pope Francis. After labeling the pope a "virgin bachelor," Maher opined, "What other business could you be in where your company gets caught running a child sex ring since forever and you still keep your customers?"

HBO seems either afraid of Maher, or the officials there like what he says. We need to know whether the parent company, Time Warner, feels the same way. That is why we are mailing a copy of Maher's anti-Catholic remarks, dating back to 1998, to Time Warner's board of directors.

Contact: richard.plepler@hbo.com

“STOMP ON JESUS” STUNT ELICITS APOLOGY



Bill Donohue comments on the “Stomp On Jesus” stunt orchestrated by Florida Atlantic University professor Deandre Poole:

On Friday, I wrote to Dr. Poole asking why he didn’t invite his students to write the name “Obama” on a piece of paper—instead of “Jesus”—and then have them stomp on it. I also provided Poole’s e-mail address so that our subscribers could relay their concerns.

Later that day, Florida Atlantic University issued an apology. Included in the apology was a statement that no protesting student would suffer any sanctions. We are happy with the outcome, and we are grateful that our subscribers helped to generate it.

WHY NOT STOMP ON OBAMA?



The following letter by Bill Donohue was e-mailed to Florida Atlantic University professor Deandre Poole today:

Dear Dr. Poole:

The assignment you gave asking students to stomp on a piece of paper with the word "Jesus" on it was reportedly an exercise in the cultural meaning of symbols taken from the textbook, "Intercultural Communications: A Contextual Approach," 5th edition. But the word "Jesus" is never mentioned in the textbook, so that was your call. You could have asked them to stomp on the word "Obama," but that may have made you feel uncomfortable given your activist role in the Democratic Party and the pro-Obama book you are currently writing. Get the point?

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights

Contact Dr. Poole: dpool3@fau.edu

BISHOPS FIND HHS REVISIONS FLAWED



Bill Donohue comments on the latest statement by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) on the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate:

The March 20 statement by the USCCB (made by general counsel Anthony Picarello and associate general counsel Michael F. Moses) on the HHS revisions is the most definitive assessment to date. Though they concede that “the definition of an exempt ‘religious employer’ has been revised to eliminate some of the intrusive and constitutionally improper government inquiries into religious teaching and beliefs that were inherent in an earlier definition,” the changes are still inadequate. Even the Obama administration admits that its definition of a “religious employer” excludes many organizations that are widely understood as such.

Individual business owners also don’t receive the relief they seek from the mandate. Moreover, the terms of what qualifies as an “accommodation” lack clarity, thus creating unnecessary confusion. Most important, the HHS mandate as currently written represents “an unprecedented (and now sustained) violation of religious liberty by the federal government.”

In other words, despite some movement on the part of the administration, most Catholic entities are still vulnerable to the HHS edict. The only way to truly resolve this issue is for the administration to withdraw the mandate. Surely it could accommodate women seeking services that the Catholic Church sees as morally objectionable with a tax credit, or by some other means. What it does not have to do is burden religious institutions.

CUOMO ENDANGERS MINORITY WOMEN



New York Governor Andrew Cuomo is endangering the lives of poor African American and Hispanic women. While he does not intend to do so, this is the inescapable outcome of his radical abortion-without-limits proposal. Moreover, Cuomo wants to allow non-physicians to do abortions. History shows that when abortion standards are relaxed, the ones who suffer are poor women of color. By contrast, Park Avenue white girls will continue to be serviced by doctors.

To read Bill Donohue's account of Cuomo's legislation, see his Newsmax article that was published March 20 [click [here](#) to access it.]

HHS MANDATE DISPUTE GOES UNREPORTED



Bill Donohue comments on media coverage of H.R. 940, the Health Care Conscience Rights Act:

Two weeks have elapsed since a bill was introduced by Rep.

Diane Black that challenges the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate, and still no reporting on it by the mainstream media. The bill, which has the explicit support of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), provides conscience rights protections in health care. Specifically, the legislation would ensure that the ObamaCare regulation that forces employers to provide coverage for abortion-inducing drugs, sterilization and contraception could not override the conscience rights of objecting parties.

Cardinal Sean O'Malley, who heads the USCCB Committee on Pro-Life Activities, wrote to every member of the House on March 8 asking for their support. He urged them to make this a priority, incorporating it in the upcoming "must-pass" legislation. For a good analysis of this controversy, see today's article by Terry Jeffrey at cnsnews.com.

When it comes to Catholic issues, the big dailies don't lack for coverage. But on this dispute, which pits the bishops against the Obama administration, there has been a blackout. Among those not reporting on this story are the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post*, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Miami Herald*, the *Dallas Morning News*, the *Houston Chronicle*, the *Denver Post*, the *San Francisco Chronicle* and the *Los Angeles Times*. The lone newspaper that has covered this subject is the *Washington Times*. Not surprisingly, the failure of these newspapers to report on this story accounts for the lack of coverage by the broadcast news programs, as well as cable TV.

Religious liberty should mean something even to those who are not observant. At stake is whether the federal government can impose a secular agenda on people of faith. Catholics, in particular, have been involved in this fight ever since the HHS mandate was introduced. For the media to ignore this issue is simply irresponsible.

SPEAK OUT? OR SHUT UP?

**BE QUIET
SHOUT
LOUD!**

Bill Donohue comments on how two bicoastal newspapers are reporting on Pope Francis and the so-called Dirty War:

No sooner had Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio been elected Pope Francis when the *Los Angeles Times* started reporting on his alleged “timidity” in fighting Argentina’s dictatorship during the Dirty War, 1976 to 1983. The newspaper also cited the rap that he was “too quiet” during this period. Similarly, the *New York Times* is saying that the pope is being accused of “knowing about abuses and failing to do enough to stop them.” What is particularly striking about today’s front-page story on this issue—the pope “faces his own entanglement with the Dirty War”—is that it took four journalists in four different nations to work on it.

Anyone who thinks these newspapers want a more vocal Catholic Church would be wrong: it totally depends on the issue.

For example, when Cardinal Timothy Dolan accepted the invitation to speak at the Republican National Convention (he also closed the Democratic National Convention with a prayer), the *Los Angeles Times* said he should not have accepted because “lending his presence” sent the wrong message; he should have allowed “a local and lower-profile cleric to do the honors.” Last year, right before the election, the same newspaper ran an editorial calling on the IRS to keep “politics out of the pulpit,” specifically citing as objectionable those bishops who spoke out against the Health and Human Services (HHS)

mandate. Last year, the *New York Times* branded the Catholic response to the mandate “a dramatic stunt, full of indignation but built on air.” A month before the election, it accused leaders of the Catholic Church of “making inflammatory allegations” about the HHS edict.

So what do the *Los Angeles Times* and the *New York Times* want? They want the bishops to check in with them so they can decide whether the the Catholic Church should speak out or shut up. Fat chance.