


SCHOOLS SHOULD CELEBRATE CHRISTMAS



To read Bill Donohue's article defending religious expression in public school Christmas celebrations (already posted on Newsmax) click [here](#).

CHURCH INVASIONS IN LAS VEGAS



Bill Donohue comments on church invasions in Las Vegas:

Catholic churches in Las Vegas are being stormed by an organized band of crazed evangelicals known as Koosha Las Vegas. They invade churches during Mass, shouting at parishioners to repent. "Pope is Satan!" "Mary is a Satan!" "Stop worshipping the idols!" "Idols are not going to save you!" "You need Jesus Christ!" Police have confirmed at least

three incidents.

Catholic school students are also being harassed. "If you look at the Catechism of the Catholic Church and you look at the Scriptures," the bigots scream, "you know why God hates this religious system."

The cops have thus far not made any arrests, claiming no law has been broken. They are mistaken.

The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees religious liberty. If that means anything, it means that people of faith must be free to practice their faith. Moreover, these Nazi-like tactics are prohibited by the Nevada Constitution, the second ordinance of which reads as follows: "That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of said state shall ever be molested, in person or property, on account of his or her mode of religious worship." There are also laws against trespassing, as well as hate crimes statutes.

We are asking the Office of The Sheriff at the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department to arrest any person who storms a Catholic church, or any house of worship. They need to be prosecuted with the full force of the law.

Contact the Sheriff: Sheriff@lvmpd.com

JAMES MADISON UNIV. CENSORS CHRISTMAS



Bill Donohue comments on Christmas celebrations at Virginia's

James Madison University:

"Mary Did You Know" is a song that cannot be tolerated at James Madison University. Lyrics include, "Mary, did you know that your baby boy would save our sons and daughters?" It also contains lyrics which note that when Mary kisses her baby, she has "kissed the face of God."

This song was to be sung on Dec. 11 at the annual "Unity Tree" [read: Christmas tree] lighting ceremony. But after the song was banned, the students who were to sing it refused to sing any songs at this event.

Bill Wyatt, associate director of communications at the school, explains the decision to muzzle the free speech of these students. "JMU is a public university, so because it was a school-sponsored event, the song choice needed to be secular." He is wrong. The following events have either taken place, or will take place, at other Virginia public institutions:

George Mason University: On Nov. 29, "A Chanticleer Christmas" concert was held that featured "ancient hymns" and "venerated sacred music." On Dec. 18, the Vienna Boys Choir will offer a "Christmas in Vienna" concert that includes "sacred hymns."

Virginia Military Institute: On Dec. 8, it held an event, "Carols in the Courtyard" that included, "God Rest Ye Merry Gentlemen."

Radford University: On Oct. 23, the Madrigal Singers performed "Hail Mary."

University of Mary Washington: On Dec. 4 and 5, a faculty member sang "Ave Maria" and "O Holy Night" at the Holiday Pops Concert. No one was arrested.

Censoring Christmas is obscene, but lying about it is even worse. There is no law banning religious songs from being sung

at public schools.

[Contact Wyatt: wyattwj@jmu.edu](mailto:wyattwj@jmu.edu)

UNIV. OF TENNESSEE STEPS UP



Bill Donohue comments on steps taken by the University of Tennessee following a controversy over Christmas celebrations on campus:

On Friday, I sent a [letter](#) to all members of the Tennessee state legislature who are responsible for education issues requesting that they establish a panel to “critically assess the policies of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion at the University of Tennessee.” I made this appeal in response to that office’s edict effectively banning Christmas celebrations on the campus. That decision drew the ire of local and federal public officials, students, faculty, and alumni. From my perspective, it was not only offensive to Christians, it was constitutionally suspect.

Chancellor Jimmy G. Cheek announced today that the offensive “suggestions” have been taken down; they no longer appear online. In addition, the person who wrote them, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion Rickey Hall, has been “counseled” by his superiors. Furthermore, he will no longer be permitted to write any guidelines for this office.

This announcement makes sense, but it is disingenuous of Chancellor Cheek to maintain that the problem was purely a matter of “poorly worded communications.” It was not. The

problem is deeper—it stems from a mentality that is common to all university offices that are charged with advancing diversity and inclusion. To be specific, there is a built-in intolerance for Christianity, in particular, and for Western Civilization, in general.

The steps taken by the University of Tennessee today are reassuring, but more needs to be done. I stand by my call for a probe of the Office of Diversity and Inclusion.

MUSLIMS EARN RESPECT DENIED PRIESTS

RESPECT FOR ALL

Bill Donohue discusses elite reaction to criminal Muslims and priests:

In his Sunday night address from the Oval Office, President Obama warned us not to make sweeping generalizations about Muslims in the wake of the San Bernardino massacre. The killers, he said, “account for a tiny fraction of more than a billion Muslims around the world.” Hillary Clinton went further saying she objects to the term “radical Islam.” Attorney General Loretta Lynch critically noted a “very disturbing rise in anti-Muslim rhetoric.” While Clinton’s remark was inane, the positions voiced by Obama and Lynch made good sense.

If it is wrong to make sweeping generalizations about Muslims based on the criminal behavior of a small percentage of

Muslims, why is it acceptable to make sweeping generalizations about priests based on the criminal behavior of a small percentage of priests? From studies done by researchers at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, we know that from 1950 to 2002, 4 percent of all Catholic priests had an accusation of molestation made against them. Of that number, roughly half—2 percent—were ever substantiated. We also know that 3.5 percent of priests accounted for 26 percent of all the victims. Furthermore, Philip Jenkins notes that “Out of 100,000 priests active in the U.S. in this half-century, a cadre of just 149 individuals—one priest out of every 750—accounted for a quarter of all allegations of clergy abuse.” Consider more recent data: In the last 10 years, an average of 8.4 credible accusations have been made against roughly 40,000 priests in any given year.^a

Negative generalizations about priests are back in vogue thanks to all the attention given the movie, “Spotlight.” While the film itself may not be anti-Catholic, it has clearly given rise to the most condemnatory statements about priests, as well as the Catholic Church, in general. Indeed, wild statements claiming the Church has not changed are being made by everyone from those connected to the movie to film reviewers and pundits. That they are doing so with impunity cannot be denied.

If priests were Muslims, elites would be rushing to their defense. Their silence gives cover to the haters.

BANNING CHRISTMAS IN THE

SCHOOLS



Bill Donohue comments on banning Christmas events in the schools:

For the last three decades, students at an Indiana high school have included a live Nativity scene in the annual Christmas show. This year the scene was censored by a federal judge. He acted on a complaint from two anti-Christian organizations, the ACLU and Freedom From Religion Foundation, and they, in turn, responded to the beckoned call of a bigot. The judge's decision, like those who made the complaints, flies in the face of directives announced 20 years ago on the subject of religious expression in the schools.

When Bill Clinton was elected president in 1992, he asked his Secretary of Education, Richard W. Riley, to work with the Attorney General to "provide every public school district in America with a statement of principles addressing the extent to which religious expression and activity are permitted in our public schools." The [memo](#) by Secretary Riley, which was sent to all public school superintendents in 1995, is a clear and fair statement on the subject. Regrettably, it has been ignored.

Here is the paragraph that is particularly operative at Christmastime:

"Official neutrality regarding religious activity: Teachers

and school administrators, when acting in those capacities, are representatives of the state and are prohibited by the establishment clause from soliciting or encouraging religious activity, and from participating in such activity with students. *Teachers and administrators are also prohibited from discouraging activity because of its religious content, and from soliciting or encouraging anti-religious activity.*" (My italics.)

This last sentence is being ignored in many schools throughout the nation. Indeed, it was ignored by the federal judge in the aforementioned case. The principle of neutrality cuts both ways—it does not give officials the right to discourage activity *because of its religious content!*

PAPAL PICTURES POSTED ONLINE

We have posted online pictures taken on September 23 when Bill Donohue and vice president Bernadette Brady-Egan met with Pope Francis in Washington, D.C. They are grateful that Cardinal Donald Wuerl extended the invitation.



To see the pictures, click [here](#).

UNIV. OF TENNESSEE ABRIDGES CHRISTIAN RIGHTS



Bill Donohue has written a letter to all members of the Tennessee legislature whose responsibility it is to monitor education. He is calling upon them to empanel a committee that would critically assess policies initiated by the Office of Diversity and Inclusion at the University of Tennessee. This request is being made in light of morally offensive, and constitutionally suspect, policies that abridge the rights of Christian students on the campus.

To read Donohue's letter, click [here](#).

BANNING CHRISTMAS



Bill Donohue comments on the latest War on Christmas:

The school superintendent in Marlborough, New Hampshire, Robert Malay, has banned use of the word "Christmas" from all Christmas events, including celebrations at the local American Legion post. He says he is constitutionally obligated to censor Christmas. This, of course, is a lie.

Instead of pleading with Malay to reconsider his decision, I contacted him yesterday asking him to follow through on his

convictions. I suggested that he contact the United States Congress and demand that it rescind Christmas as a national holiday. Not unexpectedly, he has not gotten back to me.

Contact Malay: rmalay@sau29.org

DID CHRISTIANITY INSPIRE ABORTION KILLER?



Bill Donohue comments on the Planned Parenthood killer:

In today's *New York Times* there is a front-page story, "Religion, Abuse and Rage in Colorado's Suspect's Trial," that tries very hard to establish a connection between the Planned Parenthood killer, Robert Dear, and Christianity. But most of the article describes his multiple abuses of women. This explains why today's *Washington Post* story on Dear is titled, "Colo. Shooting Suspect Has Long Trail of Abuse Allegations."

Dear's three wives say that he believed in the Bible. But they also acknowledge that he was never a practicing Christian. Indeed, there is no evidence that he ever belonged to a church congregation in his entire life, or that he was ever involved in a Christian community. This is significant: When survey researchers seek to measure religiosity, or how religiously committed someone is, the first question asked is how often the respondent attends church services.

Yesterday, the *Times* ran a front-page story on Abdelhamid Abaaoud, the Muslim ringleader who masterminded the Paris killings. But there was a glaring omission—he was never identified as a Muslim (his role in the Islamist State’s hierarchy is the closest the story gets to identifying his religion). In fact, the only religion mentioned is Catholicism: the story says he was “sent to an exclusive Catholic school.” It did not say what was mentioned in a previous *Times* story, namely, that he lasted only one year; he either flunked out or was dismissed for bad behavior.

Now consider this: The *New York Post* reports that Abaaoud was raised in a Brussels neighborhood known as “a hotbed of Islamic extremism—before joining ISIS and embracing its war against the West.” More important, yesterday’s *New York Times* failed to report what Abaaoud said in a video just last year: “I pray that Allah will break the backs of those who oppose him...and that he will exterminate them.”

So which killer was more motivated by his religion? Dear or Abaaoud?

Contact Maggie Sullivan, NYT’s public editor:
public@nytimes.com