

# CATHOLIC DISSIDENTS OPPOSE THE BISHOPS



Bill Donohue comments on dissident Catholic organizations who are working against the bishops in their defense of religious liberty:

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops filed an amicus brief Tuesday in support of a lawsuit brought by a privately owned business, Hobby Lobby, that challenges the constitutionality of the Health and Human Services mandate that is forcing its pro-abortion, pro-contraception, and pro-sterilization agenda on those who reject these services as immoral.

Also on Tuesday, seven “Catholic” organizations joined with others to oppose Hobby Lobby. Catholics for Choice is a pro-abortion, anti-Catholic entity; CORPUS, Women’s Ordination Conference, and Women’s Alliance for Theology, Ethics and Ritual reject the Church’s teachings on ordination; DignityUSA and New Ways Ministry reject the Church’s teachings on homosexuality; and the National Coalition of American Nuns is pro-abortion and pro-gay marriage.

The latter group is particularly interesting. In a Marist poll released last week, it found that 84 percent of the American people favor abortion restrictions. But not the National Coalition of American Nuns: in 1989, they signed an amicus brief in *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services* in favor of unrestricted legal abortion. In 2006, they issued an “open letter” to Catholic voters in support of abortion and gay marriage. The year before, they blasted the selection of Pope Benedict XVI; in 2008, they publicly opposed his papal visit

to the U.S. In 2010, when the Catholic League protested the decision by the owner of the Empire State Building not to light the tower in recognition of Mother Teresa's centenary, these nuns signed a letter in support of the owner (so much for the bonds of "sisterhood"). In 1984, this same group opposed formal U.S. diplomatic relations with the Holy See.

Just today, Pope Francis called on Catholic universities to be "uncompromising" in their defense of the Church's "moral teachings." Too bad some nuns are working overtime to subvert his plea.

---

## NEW CONVERTS TO THE WAR ON RELIGION?



**PHONIES**

Bill Donohue comments on how so-called victims' advocates are participating in the war on religion:

Freedom From Religion Foundation is an atheist organization. BishopAccountability.org and the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests monitor clergy sexual abuse. On the surface, the former has nothing in common with the latter two, but what joins the three of them at the hip—indeed what really motivates all of their work—is their hatred of Christianity.

Hobby Lobby is a Christian-owned private business that is contesting the constitutionality of the Health and Human Services mandate in a brief before the U.S. Supreme Court. Its

lawsuit has absolutely nothing to do with either atheism or priestly sexual abuse, so why are the aforementioned entities challenging Hobby Lobby? It can't be because the owners of Hobby Lobby don't want to pay for abortion-inducing drugs, contraception, and sterilization in their insurance plan. What do these matters have to do with atheism and clergy sexual abuse?

If we ever needed more evidence that the war on religion is real, this is it. The mask is off: the amici really haven't strayed from promoting atheism or combating sexual abuse; rather, they are just validating their *raison d'être*. No wonder they chose "victims' advocate" Marci Hamilton to write their brief: she perfectly represents their true cause.

---

## ROLLING STONE LIKES THE POPE



Bill Donohue comments on the Feb. 13th cover story in *Rolling Stone*:

The lengthy piece by Mark Binelli on Pope Francis is respectful, though hardly without flaws. Like so many of the pope's new fans, Binelli's bouquets come at the price of exaggerating the Holy Father's uniqueness, and unfairly characterizing his predecessors.

Binelli likes it that Francis smiles a lot in public, but anyone who is objective would extend the same compliment to both Pope Benedict XVI and Blessed Pope John Paul II. Francis is praised for saying "go without fear." Yet "Be Not Afraid" was John Paul's signature statement. The new pope is applauded for reaching out to liberation theologian Gustavo Gutiérrez, yet a bolder move was made when Benedict invited dissident theologian Hans Küng to meet with him. Francis wins points for kissing the feet of AIDS patients, yet such acts of kindness are hardly unique—the late Cardinal John O'Connor emptied their bed pans.

Binelli says that Francis "still considers abortion an evil." Still? I bet the pope "still" regards all forms of unjust killing to be evil. Binelli is so excited by the pope's words, "Who am I to judge?", that he mentions them twice. But like so many others, he fails to cite what the pope really said: "If someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge?" The pope's qualifiers should tell Binelli something.

To build Francis up, the others must be knocked down. John Paul was a "reactionary," and Benedict was a "dour academic" who had a "disastrous papacy." It's amusing to read that bad-guy Benedict described homosexuality as an "intrinsic moral evil," as if good-guy Francis thinks otherwise. Binelli should reread his closing remark where he rightly quotes Francis as saying that his positions on gay marriage and abortion are "That of the Church."

Binelli says "petrified Catholic traditionalists" objected to priests who "actually took up arms" in Latin America in the 1980s. But if liberal Catholics are truly horrified by violence, why didn't they feel the same way?

---

# “PHILOMENA” CATHOLICISM

# SMEARS



Bill Donohue comments on a movie that has been nominated for four Oscars:

Owing to many false impressions about Catholicism that have been generated by the movie, “Philomena,” I decided to write an extensive review of the film, and the book upon which it is based.

The film and the book maintain that cruel Irish nuns stole Philomena’s baby in 1952 and sold him to “the highest bidder.” In reality, Philomena’s widowed father found the nuns—the only persons willing to accept the teenager’s out-of-wedlock baby—and they subsequently found a home for him in the United States; no fee was charged.

The film and the book also maintain that Philomena went to the United States to find her son, but this is patently untrue: she never set foot in America looking for him.

Copies of my analysis of the controversy surrounding “Philomena” are being sent to the bishops, many in the media (in the United States, England and Ireland), those in the entertainment business, various Irish organizations, and friends of the Catholic League.

To download a copy of it, click [here](#).

---

# DE BLASIO DEFENDS CUOMO'S RANT



Bill Donohue comments on the latest flap over Governor Andrew Cuomo's rant:

One week ago today, Governor Cuomo railed against what he called "extreme conservatives" who are "pro-life, pro-assault weapons, anti-gay." He said such persons "have no place in the state of New York, because that's not who New Yorkers are."

Yesterday, Mayor de Blasio said he agrees with Cuomo's comments "100 percent." He explained, "I interpret his [Cuomo's] remarks to say that an extremist attitude that continues the reality of violence in our communities or an extremist attitude that denies the rights of women, does not represent the views of the people of New York State."

The spin won't work. Who is Cuomo, or de Blasio, to say which New Yorkers have a place in New York? Since when has ideology become a condition for residence? Such talk is demagogic and divisive.

This is not the first time de Blasio has illegitimately abrogated the authority to speak for New Yorkers about abortion. In February 2011, a pro-life group, Life Always, displayed a huge billboard in the SoHo section of New York that showed a picture of a young black girl with the inscription, "The most dangerous place for an African American is in the womb." Prominent African Americans endorsed the

billboard; it was displayed during Black History Month.

This was enough to send de Blasio into orbit. As New York's Public Advocate, he was not satisfied to criticize the billboard—he wanted it banned (he succeeded). “The billboard simply doesn't belong in our city. The ad violates the values of New Yorkers.”

The lust for abortion that these two men have is disturbing enough, but it is their arrogance and censorial approach that is most obscene.

Contact: [pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov](mailto:pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov)

---

## **SARAH SILVERMAN EXPLOITS JESUS**



Bill Donohue comments on a video posted two days ago on YouTube by Sarah Silverman:

Sarah Silverman is a champion of abortion rights, but that hardly makes her a bigot. What makes her an anti-Christian bigot is her video that features her talking to a Jesus character about abortion. The language she uses is so vulgar—she ends with the “c” word about women—that it cannot be repeated on broadcast television, or republished in any respectable newspaper.

Silverman exploits Christianity by hijacking Jesus in support

of killing kids in the womb: he is shown making fun of unborn babies, saying “fertilized eggs aren’t people. People are people.” He also announces that he is, “Jesus F\*\*\*ing Christ.”

Christians who are pro-life, Silverman says, are un-American. She says that “using religion to dictate legislation is un-American.”

Toward the end of the video, the Jesus character is shown rubbing her while they are sitting on a couch. She says, “Oh, that’s my spot.” To which he replies, “I know where your spot is...that’s a good little Jewish girl.”

I expect most Jews will not be too thrilled with the remark about being a “good little Jewish girl.” It would be great if Jewish leaders spoke up about this taunt: If a Catholic girl trashed Jews, branding them un-American for dictating their pro-abortion values on society, and closed with a quip about being “a good little Catholic girl,” we would hear about it. Silverman is not being comedic: this is hate speech with a smile.

---

## NEW YORK TIMES SHOWS ITS BIAS



Bill Donohue comments on bias at the *New York Times*:

There is no newspaper in the United States that is more extreme in its defense of abortion-on-demand and homosexual rights than the *New York Times*. It regards the defense of



partial-birth abortion to be a “moderate” position, and its reporters have openly bragged about the record number of homosexuals who write feature stories. Today’s edition offers more support to the accusation that it is biased in its coverage on these issues.

There is a front-page story about a homosexual vice principal in Seattle who was asked to step down when it was learned that he was married to a man. The 1351-word story does not focus on the man’s violation of a contract he voluntarily signed (Catholic employees are expected to abide by Catholic teachings); rather, it focuses on students who are rallying to his side. The story features four photos: the one on the front page is in color, and one of the three pictures on p. A16 is quite big (9”x6”).

On the opposite page, p. A17, there is an average-size picture of the March for Life that was held yesterday in Washington, D.C. There is no story. Yet there could have been a great one: hundreds of thousands of marchers, overwhelmingly young, braved the bitter cold; many had traveled through a snow storm the day before to get there (the federal government shut down because of the bad conditions).

A handful of young people from Seattle who support their fired vice principal merits big coverage, but a massive pro-life march in a winter storm is all but ignored. And the motto of the *New York Times* is, “All the News That’s Fit to Print.” I guess pro-life news is not fit to print.

Contact Margaret Sullivan, NYT’s public editor:  
[public@nytimes.com](mailto:public@nytimes.com)

---

# LYING FOR CUOMO



Bill Donohue comments on the response by New York State Governor Andrew Cuomo's spokesman to criticism over his statement about "extreme conservatives":

Governor Cuomo continues to give legs to the controversy over a remark he made last Friday on the radio. Instead of apologizing, he has dug himself in deeper.

In the radio interview, Cuomo was speaking about New York Republicans who voted against the SAFE Act, a gun control law. Here is what he said: "Their problem is not me and the Democrats; their problem is themselves. Who are they? Are they these extreme conservatives who are right-to-life, pro-assault weapons, anti-gay? Is that who they are? Because if that's who they are and they're the extreme conservatives, they have no place in the state of New York, because that's not who New Yorkers are."

After Timothy Cardinal Dolan, the Archbishop of New York, criticized Cuomo on Tuesday, the governor's spokesman, Matt Wing, complained yesterday that Cuomo's comments had been "repeatedly taken out of context—what he actually said was that the state is a moderate political state with all views welcome."

Wing's defense is stunning. Not only is New York one of the most liberal states in the nation, more important, Cuomo manifestly did not say that the Empire state is a place where "all views [are] welcome." He expressly said that those who disagree with his policies on abortion, gun control, and marriage, "have no place in the state of New York, because that's not who New Yorkers are." There is no welcome mat

there.

In other words, Wing lied. He lied for Cuomo.

Contact Wing: [matthew.wing@exec.ny.gov](mailto:matthew.wing@exec.ny.gov)

---

## U.N. PANEL PROBES HOLY SEE



The United Nation's Committee on the Convention on the Rights of the Child held a hearing today on the Holy See's handling of sexual abuse. Commenting on it is Bill Donohue:

The U.N. Committee that was charged with probing the Holy See's response to the sexual abuse of minors is composed of 18 "independent experts," from as many nations. Some of the committee members who profess an interest in the rights of the child, such as Hiranthi Wijemanne of Sri Lanka, say that human rights should not extend to nascent human life; a child in the first trimester, she said in an interview, should not be considered a child.

Many of the "experts" on human rights come from nations that are known for oppression, not liberty. Just this week, the Pew Research Center released a report on religious oppression worldwide. Nations with "experts" on the U.N. panel that earned a "High" rating are Bahrain, Sri Lanka, Ethiopia and Tunisia. Even worse are those nations that merited a "Very High" rating: Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Russia and Malaysia.

Freedom House listed Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and Ethiopia as

among the most oppressive places on earth. Open Doors listed the same nations as the Pew study (save for Russia) in its top 50 nations known for persecuting Christians.

Female genital mutilation has not stopped in Egypt, a nation where more than 90 percent of women have been subjected to it. This same barbaric practice is going on today in Ethiopia. Ghana, which also has an “expert” on the panel, is now witnessing a spike in female cutting, despite a ban on it.

So these are some of the nations that are sending their “experts” to question a delegation from the Holy See about human rights. No wonder the U.N. continues to lose credibility. It would be as if a panel appointed by the heads of baseball, football, basketball, and hockey chose Alex Rodriguez to investigate cheating in professional sports.

---

## PARSING THE POPE’S WORDS



Bill Donohue comments on media coverage of the pope:

Not a day goes by without a pundit or editorial writer opining on what Pope Francis said about some controversial issue. While every pope, as well as every religious and secular leader, properly has his remarks subjected to scrutiny, Pope Francis is having his words sliced and diced far beyond

anything his predecessors were accustomed to. Quite frankly, the goal of many commentators is to make the pope's statements appear to underscore their own ideological agenda.

Nothing excites the passions of those on the left today more than gay rights. Their obsession is shown with Pope Francis' comment, made over the summer, "Who am I to judge?" Indeed, it appears today in an editorial posted on the website of the *New York Times*, and in a Huffington Post piece written by an Episcopal gay priest. But that is not what the pope said.

What Francis said was, "If someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge?" The difference between what he is quoted as saying, and what he actually said, is not minor. Those who parse his words agree, which is why they parse them. It is important to note that the pope did not offer two sentences: his one sentence was chopped to alter his message.

A Lexis-Nexis search discloses that there are 907 articles that cite the phrase, "Who am I to judge" and "Pope Francis." When letters to the editor and duplicates are filtered out, the final tally is 799. Of that number, 494, or 62 percent of the total, contain just the words, "Who am I to judge?" Only 305, or 38 percent, report the entire sentence. Moreover, it is becoming more common to distort what he said, not less.

The willingness of Pope Francis to reach out to homosexuals who are searching for the Lord is commendable. But attempts to parse his words are not.