

# BARRY LYNN ATTACKS CARDINAL DOLAN



Bill Donohue comments on a lengthy letter by Barry Lynn in today's New York *Daily News*:

New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan wrote an op-ed this week in the *Daily News* that was critical of Donald Trump's remarks on immigration. He called attention to the history of anti-Catholic nativism, mentioning the role played by Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (POAU); it is now known as Americans United for Separation of Church and State. Barry Lynn, who heads Americans United, is offended that Dolan lumped his organization in with "the violent and hateful actions of groups like the KKK." He makes it clear he is also defending POAU.

Dolan is right about his history and Lynn is in denial. POAU was founded after World War II, and no one played a bigger role in ideologically launching it than Paul Blanshard, the most notorious anti-Catholic bigot in the nation. His screed, *American Freedom and Catholic Power*, is known to this day for its unrelenting bigotry. He warned that "the Menace" was about to take over America, turning it into a theocracy. "The Menace" was the Catholic Church.

POAU's first president, Glenn Archer, drew on Blanshard's ideology when he labeled the Catholic Church "more dangerous and clever than communism." He wrote this *after* Stalin starved millions of Ukrainians in the world's first man-made famine.

Archer also petitioned the FCC to deny TV licenses to the

Jesuits, claiming they were an “alien organization.” If that isn’t nativism, the word has no meaning. Here’s another example: Archer asked the House Un-American Activities Committee to investigate “the intentions, scope and achievements of Vatican espionage here,” charging that the Catholic clergy had learned “American secrets hardly anyone except the president knows.” The paranoia of these bigots was classic nativism.

The KKK was violent and POAU was non-violent—that’s the only difference. Americans United is still blatantly anti-Catholic, making Lynn’s case against Cardinal Dolan positively ignorant.

---

## UPROAR OVER CECIL THE LION



Bill Donohue comments on the uproar over Cecil the Lion:

The killing of a lion, named Cecil, has spawned widespread outrage. Curiously, those who are protesting the loudest seem to have no problem with a doctor who kills little Cecilia in her mother’s womb.

Mia Farrow took to Twitter to register her disgust. In 2002, she spoke at a fundraiser for Planned Parenthood, and in 2008 she addressed another pro-abortion crowd at a Personal PAC

awards event.

Jimmy Kimmel almost choked describing his angst over the lion. In 2012, he had to be persuaded by reporter Jake Tapper not to tell a crude abortion joke at the White House Correspondents Association Dinner.

Former Spice Girl star Geri Halliwell was highly judgmental over Cecil's death, but when asked at a news conference about abortion, she replied, "I believe in pro-choice and non-judgment."

Ricky Gervais exploded over the death of Cecil, but when asked about abortion and euthanasia, he said last year, "I'm pro-choice in everything."

*Newsday* and the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* are both solidly in the pro-abortion camp, and they railed in an editorial today against Cecil's death.

The head of PETA, Ingrid Newkirk, argued that the dentist who killed the lion should be "hanged." She has never raised an objection to abortion in her entire life, and presides over an organization that kills 95 percent of the pets in its care.

The Animal Rights Coalition is furious over Cecil's fate. It has never protested killing babies, but it is against killing flies. "When mosquitoes land on you," it says, "instead of slapping and killing them, simply blow on them and they'll fly away."

I wish to God I could get rid of these people that simply.

---

# U.K. CELEB WANTS EUTHANASIA VANS



Bill Donohue comments on what an English celebrity wants to do to old people:

Katie Hopkins is an English sensation. She is a celebrity, reality TV star, and newspaper columnist; her own panel show starts in August. Because of her high profile, her comments advocating “euthanasia vans” have exploded across the U.K.

She’s serious. “We just have far too many old people. It’s ridiculous to be living in a country where we can put dogs to sleep but not people.” She leaves nothing unexplained. “Euthanasia vans—just like ice cream vans—that would come to your home.”

If this sounds very much like the proverbial ice cream truck making its way down your block with recorded chimes, it’s because Hopkins anticipates just that. “They might even have a nice tune they’d play.” Those who think she’s being facetious are wrong: “I mean this genuinely. I’m super-keen on euthanasia vans. We need to accept that just because medical advances mean we can live longer, it’s not necessarily the right thing to do.”

In 1936, the Soviet Communists were the first to use euthanasia vans. But it was the Nazis who perfected the death vehicle. Ironically, their first victims were Russian: they put their “gas vans” to use in 1941. According to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, they were used to remedy a problem: Nazi soldiers complained that shooting large numbers of women

and children was taking a physical and psychological toll on them.

It is striking that a contemporary celebrity is the first to pick up on where Hitler left off. What does Hopkins have in common with the Nazis? A wholesale rejection of moral absolutes. Add to that a heady dose of narcissism—the signature characteristic of celebrities—and the recipe for “euthanasia vans” is complete.

---

## **WAR ON BOY SCOUTS WILL CONTINUE**



Bill Donohue explains why the war on the Boy Scouts will continue. To read his analysis, posted on Newsmax, click [here](#).

---

## **TRUMP TEAMS WITH ABORTION CHAMP**



Bill Donohue comments on Donald Trump adviser Roger Stone:

On July 25, Judge Jeanine Pirro, on her Fox News show, introduced Roger Stone as a “political strategist and Donald Trump adviser.” On July 19, the *Wall Street Journal* wrote the following: “Trump’s top strategic advisers include longtime political aide Roger Stone, who ran his 2000 presidential exploratory campaign, and a team of relative political neophytes.”

Why should Stone matter to Catholics? In 1989, he and his wife, Ann (they divorced in 1991), announced they were founding Republicans for Choice; it was formally launched the following year. The organization was deemed necessary, Stone said, because the Republicans had just suffered losses in the November 1989 elections: if something didn’t change, he reasoned, the G.O.P. would lose again in 1990.

Stone decided that the time was ripe for Republicans to change their party platform on abortion. Since 1980, the party had supported a constitutional amendment overturning *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court ruling that legalized abortion. “I think you can be pro-choice and respect life,” he said in 1990.

Does Stone still think it is a good idea for the Republicans to join the pro-abortion camp? More important, does Trump, who once was okay with partial-birth abortion, differ with his chief strategist on this issue?

The public needs to know what Trump thinks about Republicans for Choice, the organization his top adviser co-founded.

---

# TRUMP'S FAST FLIP ON ABORTION



Bill Donohue comments on Donald Trump's position on abortion:

Since 2011, Donald Trump has identified himself as pro-life. But in 1999, when he ran for president, he was an abortion-rights advocate, and even defended partial-birth abortion. So what changed him?

On October 24, 1999, Trump told "Meet the Press" host Tim Russert, "I'm very pro-choice." When pressed whether he would oppose a ban on partial-birth abortion, he said, "I would—I am pro-choice in every respect, as far as it goes." Yet less than three months later, Trump was on record saying he would support a ban on partial-birth abortion. He actually made the switch immediately following the show.

On January 16, 2000, Trump's new book was published, *The America We Deserve*. He discussed why he flipped on partial-birth abortion. Here is what he said: "When Tim Russert asked me on *Meet the Press* if I would ban partial-birth abortion if I were president, my pro-choice instincts led me to say no. After the show, I consulted with two doctors I respect and, upon learning more about this procedure, I have concluded that I would indeed support a ban."

Someone in Trump's campaign obviously pushed the alarm button after watching the interview, and then got to his publisher in time to reflect his new position. Until he was educated by two

doctors—right after he walked off the set—he was apparently clueless about this “procedure.” He did not know, he says, that partial-birth abortion entails crushing the skull of a baby who is 80 percent born. What did he think it meant?

I’m not buying it. Even if I did, what does that make Trump? New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and New York City Mayor Ed Koch supported abortion rights, but they drew the line at partial-birth: they properly called it “infanticide.” They didn’t need doctors to tell them that this was a monstrous act.

Trump needs to explain his lightning fast flip flop, and why we should believe him now.

---

## IT PAYS TO BE PRO-GAY



Bill Donohue comments on why it pays to be pro-gay:

The ADL was founded to combat anti-Semitism; the American Jewish Committee was founded to promote Jewish interests; the Southern Poverty Law Center was founded to fight white racism; La Raza was founded to promote Hispanic rights; the NAACP was founded to stand up for blacks; the Satanic Temple was founded to advance Satanism; the National Education Association was founded to support teachers; American Atheists was founded to promote atheism; the American Humanist Association was founded



to advance secularism; the SEIU was founded to defend the rights of service union workers; the Sierra Club was founded to protect the environment.

None of these organizations were founded to fight gay bashing or Catholic bashing. All of them are formally on record supporting gays, and none of them are formally on record supporting Catholics.

Why is this? It pays culturally and economically to promote the interests of gays, but not Catholics. From Wall Street to Wal-Mart, most non-gay organizations across the nation have jumped on the gay bandwagon. Not to do so is to be culturally shunned and individually stigmatized. There is no such penalty for not supporting Catholics, and indeed there is little downside to bashing them. Just ask HBO. It also pays economically: on average, gays earn more than straights, and many lavishly grease these non-gay but gay-friendly groups. Consider the Gawker controversy.

Gawker fired journalists who ran a story about a married man, Timothy Geithner's brother (he is the CFO of Condé Nast) for allegedly soliciting sex from a male porn star. No one was fired for posting excerpts of a video showing Hulk Hogan having sex with a woman who was a friend of his wife (the wrestler is suing for \$100 million). Gawker founder Nick Denton explained why he took down the story about Geithner: "If the post had remained up, we probably would have triggered advertising losses this week into seven figures."

It pays to be pro-gay.

---

# DE BLASIO'S UNMITIGATED ARROGANCE



Bill Donohue comments on a story in today's *New York Times* on New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio:

A Gallup poll this week shows Pope Francis' favorability rating is 59 percent, a drop of 17 percent since 2014. But for what it counts, the pope's popularity with Mayor de Blasio has never been higher. It shouldn't count for much: the mayor is neither a Catholic nor a member of any religious community. Indeed, he is a Marxist.

The *Times* tells us that as a graduate student, de Blasio "traveled to Nicaragua to work with a Catholic social justice group." In fact, he raised money for the Sandinistas, the Communists who impoverished and oppressed their own people. The mayor seems to believe that his support for liberation theology, a failed attempt to wed Christianity and Marxism, means he has something in common with the pope. He is mistaken: Two years ago, Pope Francis said, "The Marxist ideology is wrong."

"He [de Blasio] refers to Francis' remark about homosexuality—'Who am I to judge'—as a 'seismic moment.'" This is twice wrong: the pope's comment was about homosexuals, not homosexuality, and he conditioned his position by saying that *if* a gay person "searches for the Lord *and* has good will," then it would be wrong to pass judgment. (My emphasis.) By the way, the pope broke no new theological ground in making this

statement; his predecessors believed the same. Moreover, the pope is on record saying that gay marriage is the work of the devil.

Rhetorically, de Blasio is a champion of diversity—save when it extends to Catholicism. He told the *Times* that “on the issue of women, there’s a lot more that has be done,” meaning that “as a moral matter,” the Church “has to respect the role of women differently.” Translation: Not until the Catholic Church okays abortion will de Blasio give Cardinal Timothy Dolan a high five. His unmitigated arrogance is his signature characteristic.

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

---

## JEWISH NEWSPAPER CROSSES THE LINE



Bill Donohue comments on an article by Anna Katsnelson, “I Am a Fugitive From a Catholic School,” that was posted online

by the *Forward* on July 19:

If a Catholic newspaper published a cynical, in-your-face, wholly gratuitous article detailing a Catholic’s regrettable experience with Jews, there would be howls of protest. Catholics, as well as Jews, should protest the *Forward*’s decision to run this piece by Anna Katsnelson.

Katsnelson begins by telling us how her Jewish parents elected to place her in a Catholic elementary school in New York. Along the way we learn about the Holy Eucharist, which she

disrespectfully compares to matzo, attendance at Mass, religious instruction, the nuns, etc. She expresses disappointment with her parents for subjecting her to Catholicism, complaining that they should have known more about the Inquisition before sending her to the school.

“Although there was no Judas cradle, Spanish donkey, head crusher or rack in her office,” Katsnelson writes, “the local Torquemada of my junior high school was not below chastising me for chewing gum and interrogating me about my pseudo-Christian identity.” Moreover, the nuns tried to instill chastity, something she says backfired. For good measure, she adds that “Catholic schoolgirls dressed like sluts in training.”

I have never heard of this woman, but I am very familiar with the *Forward*. Well-written and left-leaning, it has occasionally printed articles that are highly critical, sometimes stridently so, of Catholicism. But usually my disagreements are over policy issues, historical matters, or something that a bishop or a pope might have said. I don’t recall finding a trashy piece like this one that sticks it to Catholics—for no apparent reason—written by a theater critic for the newspaper.

An apology is in order.

Contact Adam Langer, culture editor: [lander@forward.com](mailto:lander@forward.com)

---

## HILLARY SAYS ABORTION BAN IS

# DANGEROUS



Bill Donohue comments on Hillary Clinton's objections to Gov. Scott Walker's effort to restrict abortions:

Gov. Walker signed legislation yesterday banning abortions in Wisconsin after 20 weeks of pregnancy. "At five months," he said, "that's the time when that unborn child can feel pain."

When he was president, Bill Clinton said he wanted to keep abortions "safe, legal and rare." His wife, Hillary, has seconded that position on many occasions.

We know that Hillary lied when she said she wants abortions to be rare. To be exact, she opposed the ban on partial-birth abortions: if she is okay with killing a baby who is 80 percent born, there are no instances left for her to register an objection.

Now we know that Hillary lied when she said she wants to keep abortions safe. As soon as Walker signed the law protecting unborn babies from feeling pain, Hillary labeled his decision "dangerous."

Hillary needs to elaborate on this. Why is it not uncomfortable—forget about dangerous—for a sensate human being to be pierced with a surgical knife? Why, for example, do these babies put their fingers up to the knife in an attempt to shield them from more pain? The public has a right to know what's going on in her mind.