

# WALMART'S CATHOLIC PROBLEM



Bill Donohue comments on the way Walmart is responding to complaints about its Halloween wear:

“Fat Girl Costumes” sold by Walmart were the subject of a deep apology and a pledge to rid the store’s inventory of such demeaning garb. Yesterday, when Catholics who are on our news release list complained to Walmart about three offensive Catholic costumes—a Virgin Mary with blood dripping from her eyes, a nun outfit with a skeleton head, and a costume that mocks the confessional—they got a different response.

“We apologize if we offended you. Because we have multiple buyers of customers, we try to provide them with plenty of options. However, we have documented your concern in order to improve our inventory at Walmart.com and in stores.”

Here is what Walmart said about its “Fat Girl Costumes” earlier in the week: “This never should have been on our site. It is unacceptable, and we apologize. We are working to remove it as soon as possible and ensure this never happens again.”

In other words, when plus-size women are offended, it demands an unequivocal response and the offensive item is withdrawn. When Catholics are offended, the apology extends only to the complainant, and nothing is done about it. That’s because Walmart wants to give its “multiple buyers” the “option” of purchasing a grotesque costume that demeans Jesus’ mother.

This is not the first time we have experienced Walmart’s

corporate arrogance. With the busiest shopping days of the year upon us, we hope Catholics look elsewhere this Christmas season.

Contact: [help@walmart.com](mailto:help@walmart.com)

---

## WALMART'S HALLOWEEN BAGGAGE



Bill Donohue comments on Halloween costumes sold by Walmart:

I would like to dress as an imam on Halloween, but Walmart won't let me. Nor can I come as Muhammad. The online selections also carry no Muslim costumes. What gives? Where is Walmart's sense of humor?

When it comes to Jews, Walmart has a sense of humor: it sells rabbi costumes and one that features Moses. But Jews are not nearly as much fun as Catholics. Here is a list of Catholic Halloween costumes that can be purchased from Walmart:

Jesus; Joseph; Mary; Virgin Mary; Monk; Cardinal; Priest; Nun; Saint; Joan of Arc; Pope; Angel; Adult Confessional; Adam and Eve; Catholic School; School Girl (the last two feature "Sexy Miss Prep School Girl" costumes).

Most of these costumes are in good taste, though there are three that cross the line: "Scary Mary Adult Halloween Costume" comes with a mask of Our Blessed Mother showing blood

dripping from her eyes; “Adult Evil Religious Nun Scary Men’s Halloween Costume” shows a nun in habit wearing a mask with a skeleton’s face; and, “Adult Confessional Costume” features a priest with a mock confessional unit over his head extending to his waist (his face is shown in the middle of the confessional box).

Just this week, Walmart apologized for labeling plus-size Halloween wear as “Fat Girl Costumes.” So upset was the mega-store that its representative said, “This never should have been on our site. It is unacceptable, and we apologize. We are working to remove it as soon as possible and ensure this never happens again.”

Perhaps Walmart can work to remove the offensive Catholic costumes from its website as well.

Contact: [help@walmart.com](mailto:help@walmart.com)

---

## SETH MEYERS TRASHES EUCHARIST



Bill Donohue comments on last night’s edition of “Late Night with Seth Meyers” on NBC:

“A church in Seattle has filed a lawsuit claiming that the legal marijuana retailer next door is too close to a church,” Meyers said. “‘It’s causing some problems,’ said the priest, through a giant mouthful of Communion wafers. [Talking as if his mouth is full, and acting as if he is stuffing more food in his mouth], Meyers continues, “It’s like super close to the

church. I mean, sometimes it seems like it's coming a little closer" [he acts as though he is taking a big drink].

There is a Seattle church that has filed a lawsuit protesting the licensing of a legal marijuana retailer next door, but it is not a Catholic church: Mount Calvary Christian Church Center filed the lawsuit. But those who write script for Meyers are not interested in attacking Protestants—it's much more fun mocking Catholics. That they stooped so low as to trash the Catholic celebration of the Eucharist shows the depth of their disorder.

Contact Lauren Roseman, director of NBC Entertainment Publicity: [lauren.roseman@nbcuni.com](mailto:lauren.roseman@nbcuni.com)

---

## SHARI SONG UNFAZED BY BIGOTRY



Bill Donohue comments on how Shari Song, the Democratic candidate for a state senate seat in Washington, is reacting to bigotry:

Shari Song's tolerance for intolerance is stunning. The man she is running against, Mark Miloscia, is the victim of rank anti-Catholicism, and she is taking it in stride.

Some Democratic operatives tried to whip up anti-Catholicism by posting a doctored photo of Miloscia on a website: it shows him dressed as a bishop holding a rosary, including captions that depict him as a stooge for the Vatican. It's a throwback to the days when the Know Nothing Party of the 19th century

challenged the loyalty of American Catholics, portraying them as giving their allegiance to Rome, not the nation.

Instead of condemning this bigotry, the best Song could do was to say that the website was “a little bit misguided.” She literally defended those responsible for this anti-Catholic statement saying, “I don’t believe they are anti-Catholic or intended it to be that way.” So just what would it take, Ms. Song, for you to brand someone anti-Catholic?

One Democratic activist is trying to walk it back, saying, “A couple of local Democratic legislative district members got together and did it on their own. I don’t know all the names of who’s involved...We’ve had to talk to them to try to get them to fix it.” Nice to know this guy is comfortable giving advice to strangers. More important, the local media continue to miss the many facets of this remarkable story.

There’s more. On October 22, Song and Miloscia were at an event hosted by the *Federal Way Mirror*, the local newspaper. Held at the Twin Lakes Country Club, stacks of the anti-Catholic flyers were placed on a table set aside for each candidate’s literature; they were placed alongside Song’s material. Neither she, nor anyone from her staff, objected.

Public officials who cannot honestly represent all the people have no legitimate role to play in a democratic society.

---

## **TAKING LIBERTIES WITH JESUS’ MOTHER**



Bill Donohue comments on last night's episode of the CW show, "Jane the Virgin":

It was too hard for Hollywood to resist. After delivering a subtle pro-life message in earlier episodes, the writers for "Jane the Virgin" got around to exploiting Our Blessed Mother in the third installment.

The show is based on the premise that Jane became pregnant through artificial insemination and remains a virgin. But last night Jane decided she is going to have sex with her boyfriend. In church during Mass, Jane's grandmother speaks to her about honesty, making her feel guilty. Hallucinating, Jane pictures the choir singing to her. Here is what follows:

Choir: "Tonight's the night you'll lie in bed. You should tell the truth, but you'll lie instead. Don't have sex, Jane, don't have sex."

Grandmother: "Can you really lie to my face?"

Choir and Congregation: "Can you really lie to her face?"

Statue of Virgin Mary: "Virginity for you and me if you keep your legs closed."

Choir and Congregation: "Keep them closed! Keep them closed! Keep them closed!"

When the scene ends, Jane is still in church. She is shown telling her mother and grandmother she was going to have sex with her boyfriend. Jane's mother says, "Halleluiah," shocking the grandmother.

Now I know this show is plain stupid, and only morons would think it funny, but the sad fact is there are plenty of morons around. They count. Of course, the show's writers could have chosen Islam to dump on, but then Jane might have been the object of an honor killing.

Contact the publicity director: [Kellie.Kulikowsky@cwstv.com](mailto:Kellie.Kulikowsky@cwstv.com)

---

## ANTI-CATHOLIC POLITICAL AD IN WASHINGTON ST.

[click here for more info about Mark Miloscia...](#)



**Republican Mark Miloscia came from the Deep South... with plenty of baggage.**

"Mississippi Mark" has always worn his church on his sleeve. Rather than represent the people of Federal Way, he has best represented the people of The Vatican:

- ✦ Against women's freedom over their own health choices
- ✦ Against equal rights for same-sex couples
- ✦ Proposed a six tax on Playboys and marital aids
- ✦ Proposed a statewide DNA database of law-abiding citizens
- ✦ Lobbied for the Catholic Church
- ✦ Against comprehensive sexual education in schools

**Mark Miloscia. Bad for Washington. Bad for Federal Way.**

Bill Donohue comments on an anti-Catholic political ad in the state of Washington:

Mark Miloscia is a former Democratic state legislator in Washington who switched to the Republican party because of his dismay with the way Democrats treat people of faith. The former Southerner had no idea just how hateful some in his former party are, but now he knows.

A website that opposes Miloscia posted a cartoon of him that is vintage Catholic bashing. It shows him wearing a bishop's miter holding a rosary. The inscription alongside the doctored photo reads as follows:

"Republican Mark Miloscia came from the Deep South...with plenty of baggage.

"'Mississippi Mark' has always worn his church on his

sleeve. Rather than represent the people of Federal Way, he has best represented the people of *The Vatican.*”

Below this statement is a list of six positions attributed to him, including one that says, “*Lobbyist for the Catholic Church.*”

It is not certain who posted this anti-Catholic political ad. We will do what we can to get to the bottom of this. While his opponent has distanced herself from this despicable ad, we need to hear from state Democratic leaders about it.

---

## **MARRIAGE AMENDMENT NEEDED NOW**



Bill Donohue calls for a constitutional marriage amendment:

In 2004, Barack Obama said, “I am not a supporter of gay marriage as it has been thrown about...I think that marriage, in the minds of a lot of voters, has a religious connotation.” Four years later he commented, “I believe that marriage is the union between a man and a woman. Now, for me as a Christian, it is also a sacred union. God’s in the mix.”

God got thrown from the mix in 2012. That’s when President Obama, running for reelection, endorsed gay marriage. But even as late as last year, he was still on record respecting the

religious rights of dissenters. “How religious institutions define and consecrate marriage has always been up to those institutions. Nothing about this decision [the Supreme Court’s ruling overturning the Defense of Marriage Act]—which applies only to civil marriages—changes that.”

God got tossed again this week when Obama called for homosexual marriage to be recognized as a constitutional right. In doing so, he teed up a confrontation between our long-established constitutional right to religious liberty and this newly invented right to gay marriage.

Contrary to what many have said, this issue is not over. Were it not for unelected judges overturning the express will of the people—in state after state—attempts to subvert marriage, properly understood, would not have succeeded. We need to return power to the people by considering a constitutional amendment.

The time is ripe for Catholics to support the efforts of Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone, the bishops’ point man on marriage. In February, he called for support of the federal Marriage Protection Amendment.

As any astute political science undergraduate knows, there is no constitutional right to gay marriage. But now that this issue has been thrust upon us by our constitutional law professor president, we need to affirm marriage between a man and a woman in the U.S. Constitution.

---

**DE BLASIO OKAY WITH ANTI-**

# SEMITIC OPERA



Bill Donohue comments on New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio's position on "The Death of Klinghoffer," which debuted last night at the Metropolitan Opera:

De Blasio defends "The Death of Klinghoffer" on free speech grounds, as if that empties the issue. After all, nothing stops him from also condemning the opera. Others, including the Catholic League, saw it as a free speech issue, but also hammered it as anti-Semitic; we brought a contingent to the protest last month and again last night.

Yesterday, de Blasio defended himself saying, "I think the American way is to respect freedom of speech. Simple as that." Really? Then why did he try to censor the free speech of an African-American pro-life group, Life Always, in 2011? He was the City's Public Advocate at the time, and what he advocated was government censorship of speech.

Life Always displayed a huge billboard in SoHo showing a picture of a young black girl with the inscription, "The most dangerous place for an African-American is in the womb." De Blasio used his public office to pressure the group to take it down. "The billboard simply doesn't belong in our city. The ad violates the values of New Yorkers." Not sure what is worse—his ignorance or his arrogance.

No sooner had de Blasio been elected mayor when he demonstrated his fondness for censorship by picking Khalid Latif to be on his advisory team. Latif is the same Muslim chaplain who led a campaign to censor the Danish cartoons

depicting Muhammad in an unfavorable light from being displayed at New York University.

De Blasio's enthusiasm for censorship is a defining element of his character. He raised money in Nicaragua for the repressive Sandinistas, and he and his wife showed their love for muzzling free speech by honeymooning in Castro's Cuba.

De Blasio's refusal to condemn "The Death of Klinghoffer" has nothing to do with free speech; rather, it has to do with his ideology.

---

## **SYNOD COVERAGE FIXATED ON GAYS**

Bill Donohue comments on media coverage of the Synod of Bishops:



Media coverage of the second week of the Synod of Bishops was extensive. To the media, the number one issue was homosexuality.

Over the past week, Lexis-Nexis posted 278 stories taken from U.S. newspapers and wires on the subject of the synod. Here is the breakdown of the coverage:

- 80 percent mentioned gays or homosexuals
- 65 percent mentioned divorce or divorced

- 47 percent mentioned cohabitation
- 19 percent mentioned contraception

As the Centers for Disease Control recently disclosed, homosexuals are 1.6 percent of the population. But given the media obsession with this issue, a visitor from Mars might conclude it is more like 98 percent.

---

## SYNOD BISHOPS COMING TOGETHER



Bill Donohue comments on the unofficial summary of the reports issued by the ten working groups that comprise the Synod of Bishops:

The working groups expressed their dismay at the false impression that was given by the interim report. This was understandable given that almost none of them were consulted about it; the document was leaked to the press behind their backs. This explains why they took the opportunity yesterday to say that the midterm report “does not express a univocal opinion shared by all the Synod Fathers.” They also called for a more definitive statement in the final report, to be presented tomorrow, affirming the Church’s teachings on marriage and the family.

The interim report was deficient, the bishops said, in not addressing such issues as adoption and the challenges to the family presented by biotechnology and the Internet. They also said that greater attention should be given to the plight of women and children who are being sexually exploited.

On the subject of homosexuals, the bishops accepted the need

to respect their dignity “without however implying that this may indicate a form of approval, on the part of the Church, of their orientation and way of life.” By explicitly calling attention to the “way of life” of homosexuals—a clear reference to the gay lifestyle—the bishops took a courageous stand.

Moreover, the working groups counseled against giving “the impression of a willingness on the part of the Church to legitimise irregular family situations.” Thus did they reject the interim report’s embrace of the “positive” aspects of cohabitation. On the issue of divorced and remarried Catholics, there is a clear split between those who want to perfect current practices and those who want to amend them. It was suggested that this issue be given further study.

It will be interesting to see how the final report measures up with the working groups’ input, or whether it mirrors the divisive interim report.