

THE POLITICS OF HATE CRIMES

Bill Donohue comments on the role the Southern Poverty Law Center plays in politicizing hate crimes:

After Hillary Clinton lost the election, she, her staff, and her supporters were sent reeling. Many have yet to recuperate.

In times past, such distraught persons would be attended to by priests, ministers, and rabbis, but today they have been replaced by grief counselors and puppies. Coloring books and playdough were given to soothe the anguish of law students at the University of Michigan, and therapists of every shade of grey were summoned to talk to the afflicted.

Others rioted. They baited the police, beat up Trump supporters, destroyed property, and tied up traffic. Some were pros—veterans of Occupy Wall Street and Black Lives Matter. Others were brats: affluent young men and women so bored with life that they spend most of their waking hours microanalyzing perceived microaggressions against them. For relief, they take to the streets, providing it is not raining or too chilly.

We are now in the third stage of this post-election trauma: the weeping and the violence have given way to hysteria. It is being led by left-wing activists, left-wing politicians, and left-wing media outlets. They are laboring to convince Americans that we are witnessing an unprecedented increase in bigotry, all traceable to Donald Trump.

Since the election, no organization has done more to promote the myth that bigoted offenses are spiking than the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC). That its data are weak is incontestable, but that hasn't stopped the mainstream media from treating its claims as gospel.

On November 28, the SPLC released a report, "The Trump Effect: The Impact of the 2016 Presidential Election on Our Nation's

Schools.” It is being touted by the media as proof positive that Trump has triggered an avalanche of bigotry. But a more sober judgment reveals that the report is so methodologically flawed that it would not receive a passing grade in any second-tier graduate school.

The SPLC says that over 2,500 educators described “incidents of bigotry and harassment that can be directly traced to election results.” The survey, however, is scientifically invalid. To be specific, it was not a random sample of educators; rather, it was a self-selected, and therefore spurious, online survey. Worse, only those educators who subscribe to the SPLC newsletter, “Teaching Tolerance,” knew of it.

“The Trump Effect” is short on hard data and long on anecdote. It lists one uncontested observation after another, most of which undercut its own thesis about the gravity of current conditions. For example, a high school teacher in New Jersey writes, “The day after the election I had a group of Hispanic girls in my homeroom targeted by a boy who told them Trump was going to deport their families.”

If this is proof of how out-of-control matters are—one boy voicing his ignorance—the reporting teacher has nothing to worry about. In Chicago, black kids live in fear of being killed every day, and bigotry has nothing to do with it.

The SPLC is also sounding the alarms over an alleged increase in hate crimes. It says that in the first 10 days after the election, there were 867 “hate-related incidents” across the nation. Not surprisingly, it blames Trump. In actual fact, that number represents offenses submitted by SPLC supporters, all of which lack independent verification. Yet these “findings” are being passed off by sympathetic journalists as if they were dispositive. The SPLC even admits that “many” of the incidents reported “remain anecdotal.”

It is not just journalists who are following the lead of the SPLC, many in government are as well. For example, New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman recently held a press conference with civil rights leaders imploring the public to “stand up to hate.” What made his effort such a failure was his decision to enlist the support of Al Sharpton’s National Action Network, an organization known more for promoting hate than combating it.

So where are they getting their evidence, besides the SPLC? Hotlines help. They have recently been set up in New York and Massachusetts, as well as in some cities on the west coast. Who’s calling the authorities? In most cases, it is precisely those demographic groups that have been instructed by educators, over and over again, that they constitute an exploited minority, victimized by white, Christian, heterosexual males.

What exactly are they reporting? Intimidation.

The FBI hate crime statistics for 2015 lists intimidation as the number-one reported offense—it counts for over 40 percent of all such crimes. Yet nowhere does the FBI offer a precise definition of what constitutes “intimidation”; they rely on reporting precincts for the numbers. A standard legal definition says, “Intimidation means to make fearful or to put into fear.”

Given the elasticity of what constitutes intimidation, it is not surprising that hate crimes are reportedly increasing at a time when cultural and political divisions are worsening. What is most striking about this subject, however, is the dishonesty that marks the conversation: the same persons who say that obscenity laws are suspect because they rely on subjective judgments are quick to elevate intimidation to a mantle of objectivity. But if obscenity is in the eye of the beholder, and therefore meaningless, what makes judgments about intimidation meaningful?

The left is very good at playing these games, and no one is better at it than the SPLC. It has perfected the politicization of hate crimes.

CHRIS HARDWICK EXPOSES HIMSELF

Bill Donohue comments on remarks made last night by Chris Hardwick on Comedy Central:

Chris Hardwick exposed himself last night as an illiterate. Here is what he said on “@Midnight with Chris Hardwick.”

“Thanksgiving is over and that’s good because f*** Thanksgiving. I’m all about Christmas! Where [sic] my Christmas people at? Suck my d***.”

The third sentence has no verb. Only an illiterate would leave it out. Hint Hardwick: the verb is not “is.”

Contact: Maribel.Giraldo@viacom.com

HIJACKING CHRISTMAS TURNS UGLY

Bill Donohue comments on three examples of Christmas being hijacked to make a cultural statement, some of which are offensive:

Those who want a new twist on the traditional crèche can buy a 10-piece Hipster Nativity scene that features Joseph sporting a lumberjack beard taking a selfie; baby Jesus and a peace-flashing Mary, holding a Starbucks cup, are included. The three wise men show up on Segways holding Amazon boxes full of presents; there is also a cow draped in a sweater with a “100% Organic” seal on it.

This depiction is more trendy than it is offensive.

A gun-rights activist in Columbia, South Carolina has hijacked Christmas to make his case defending the Second Amendment. It is the work of the Palmetto State Armory. Billboards are being displayed in several South Carolina cities, all of which feature assault weapons or shotguns, cribbing from Christmas themes and songs. “Do you hear what I hear?” and “All I want for Christmas is you” are two examples.

This depiction is more offensive than it is trendy.

Reality TV star Brandi Glanville posted a Facebook picture of herself squatting over baby Jesus, posing as if she were giving birth to him. It didn’t go over with the public, which is why she deleted it from her Facebook and Instagram accounts.

However, Glanville refused to apologize. Instead, before she deleted the photo, she said, “Why is everyone so butthurt? I guess cause I’m an Atheist this doesn’t bother me in the least bit. But seriously why should people need to ‘respect’ this religion while this religion is so disrespectful to everyone else? Get over yourselves. Seriously.” She then tweeted, “People need to chill the f*** out and take a joke.”

There is nothing trendy about this depiction, but it is egregiously offensive. It is also quite revealing. Glanville reasons that because she is an “Atheist” [notice she capitalizes her master status], it doesn’t bother her that Christians are offended. Why would it? After all, that was

exactly her point.

Not all atheists, of course, are haters, but increasingly many are. Glanville's stunt, and her response to critics, move her toward the top of the line.

Contact Glanville's agent: alec.shankman@abramsart.com

“BAD SANTA 2” IS A CULTURAL MARKER

Bill Donohue comments on “Bad Santa 2”:

It's a hard call which is worse: “Bad Santa 2” or its juvenile fans. By any measure, the movie, and its reception in many quarters, is proof positive that American culture is witnessing a race to the bottom.

When the first “Bad Santa” was released in 2003, I described Santa as a “chain-smoking, drunken, foul-mouthed, suicidal, sexual predator. He is shown soiling himself in Santa's chair, vomiting in alleys, having sex with a woman bartender in a car, and performing anal sex on a huge woman in a dressing room.”

The sequel is just as immature. The script was written by Johnny Rosenthal and Shauna Cross, two geniuses who never outgrew their adolescence—or learned how to write. Don't take my word for it.

Nick Schager, writing for The Playlist, notes the “narrative purposelessness” of the film. Similarly, Colin Covert of the *Chicago Tribune* says “the plot is so muddled it seems to have been stitched together from the dregs of multiple ditched

drafts.”

But to some critics, the banality of the script matters less than fantasizing how normal people might react to this crud at Christmastime.

The *Hollywood Reporter* likes the movie because it is “Raunchy, rude and politically incorrect.” The latter observation, which was made by many reviewers, is factually incorrect: it is *politically correct* to trash Christian teaching, values, symbols, and holidays. It is politically incorrect to trash Judaism or Islam, which is why it is rarely done.

Juliana Roman of movieweb.com is happy that “Bad Santa 2 is as gloriously raunchy as the original. Bravo to the filmmakers for having the guts to make it just as ribald and patently offensive.” Sorry, Juliana, it takes no guts in Hollywood to offend Christians, especially this time of the year. Once Hollywood makes a movie doing to the LGBTQ community what it does to Christians—it should be released during Gay Pride Month—then Tinseltown can be heralded for its courage.

“‘Bad Santa 2’ is vulgar, nasty and offensive, but it has flawed aspects also.” It would be hard to beat this inane comment, courtesy of Kyle Smith of the *New York Post*. The movie is not flawed because it is vulgar, nasty and offensive, he says, but for other reasons. Evidently, the gutter talk is its only saving grace.

April Wolfe of the *Dallas Observer* begins her review by saying the country just elected a Nazi. After exposing her political acumen, she notes that “liberals and people of color” were in the audience previewing the film, and were “eager to be offended.” She does not say what they took offense to. The bigotry? The violence? The misogyny?

“I don’t pretend to know everything about what hurts marginalized communities,” Wolfe says, “but I do know a lot of us are hurting right now. This film is far from perfect, but

it made me and some other terribly frightened folks laugh for a while in the dark, and I'll be damned if I'm gonna let some bigots tell us we don't have a sense of humor."

Can anyone top that? I hope these "terribly frightened folks" have a Happy Thanksgiving, but I get the feeling they won't. Their natural step is to bask in cynicism, self-righteousness, and arrogance. Which is why they sulk.

SHOPPERS BEWARE OF MACY'S SEX POLICY

Bill Donohue has advice for Macy's shoppers this holiday season:

It's Christmastime, and that means trying on clothes before and after the holiday. If you shop at Macy's, please beware that your daughters and nieces may run into a strange looking man dressed as a woman in the store's bathrooms and fitting rooms. More important, you should know that they have no rights.

Indeed, a security guard, Javier Chavez, was fired from his job at a Macy's store in Queens, New York, simply because he responded to a complaint by a woman and her daughter that a man dressed as a woman was in the women's restroom. It's actually worse than this: He agreed to abide by Macy's sex identity policy—if a man says he is a woman, he must be treated as such—yet because he expressed his religious misgivings (he is Catholic), he was fired anyway.

The Macy's Thought Police have given much consideration to the rights of men who claim to be a woman. Here is their actual

policy:

- ***Restrooms & Fitting Rooms.*** Privacy in restrooms and fitting rooms is of foremost concern in all situations, regardless of an individual's gender identity or gender expression. Sex-segregated facilities (such as restrooms and fitting rooms that are designed for use by women and men separately) exist in most locations. In some locations there may be unisex facilities that are intended for use by either sex, such as single occupancy restrooms or family restrooms.

Generally, sex-segregated facilities are for use by adults and teens of the identified gender (and by small children of either gender who are accompanied by an adult). Transgender persons identify with a physical sex that is different than their physically manifested sex at birth. Therefore, **transgender persons may use the restroom or fitting room that is consistent with their gender identity/presentation, that makes them feel least vulnerable, and that they believe will result in the least interest and notice from others.** (Their emphasis.)

If an associate or customer expresses extreme discomfort with the possibility of meeting a transgender person in a restroom, the associate or customer expressing discomfort should be directed to a unisex restroom (if available). Similarly, if an associate or a customer expresses discomfort with the possibility of meeting a transgender person in a fitting room, the associate or customer expressing the discomfort should be given information regarding the location of other fitting rooms in the store and/or should be advised that he or she can purchase the item, try it on at home and return it if needed.

If an associate is asked the location of a restroom and is unsure of the person's gender, the associate will either (i) provide information regarding the location of a unisex

restroom (if available and nearby), or (ii) provide information regarding the location of a nearby restroom for men and a nearby restroom for women. The associate should not assume the question relates to a restroom for a specific gender unless the request is phrased that way.

- **Photo Identification.** If a customer presents photo identification that resembles the customer but does not represent the gender the customer presents, and if the associate believes the customer may be a transgender person, the associate will accept the document at face value, as long as the address is current and the name is correct for the account. The associate will not discuss the customer's transgender status with anyone.
- **Names & Pronouns.** It is important associates use the appropriate pronoun (him/her, she/he) and title (Mr./Ms, Sir/Ma'am) when addressing a transgender person. The pronoun and title must relate to the person's gender identity/expression. Further, a transgender person may elect to use a preferred name that is consistent with his/her gender identity. Associates must be respectful and adhere to this choice at all times.

Prospective customers should also know that Macy's instructs its employees to resist "the impulse to judge the person by his/her appearances." That's right. If a person has a beard, he may be a woman. How can this be? We need to understand that "sex and gender are not the rigid categories that we may assume them to be."

They are anything but rigid at Macy's. So if a man says he is a woman—or a duck for that matter—he/she/it is exactly that.

Of course, you can bypass this insanity altogether by bypassing Macy's this holiday season. Cheers!

Contact Macy's Group VP: holly.thomas@macys.com

"HAMILTON" ACTOR SHOWS HIS REAL COLORS

Bill Donohue comments on remarks made by the star of "Hamilton" that deserve a response:

Over the weekend, Brandon Victor Dixon, the actor who plays Aaron Burr in the musical, "Hamilton," scolded Vice-President Elect Mike Pence on the need to "uphold our American values and to work on behalf of all of us." He cited respect for diversity as one of those key values.

Dixon is a phony: he has no moral ground to stand on. This is what he tweeted on St. Patrick's Day 2012: "St. Patty's day weekend is like Christmas for black dudes who like white chicks. Happy holidays boys."

I guess we Irish Catholics can take solace in the fact that Dixon didn't refer to these "white chicks" as "ho's"—that's what he calls black women.

Looks like the list of persons Dixon needs to apologize to is growing.

Contact Dixon's publicist: eileen@nobletalentmanagement.com

GOOD FRIDAY AXED BY INDIANA

MAYOR

Bill Donohue comments on Good Friday being censored by the mayor of Bloomington, Indiana:

Bloomington, Indiana Mayor John Hamilton stuck his middle finger in the face of all Christians by taking his axe to Good Friday. And he did so in the name of tolerance, diversity, and inclusion. He also nixed Columbus Day.

The name Good Friday offends the censorial mayor, and that is why he renamed it "Spring Holiday"; Columbus Day offends him as well, which is why it will forever be known as "Fall Holiday." He did not say why Martin Luther King, Jr. Day would not be renamed "Winter Holiday."

Let's be honest. Hamilton would not rename Martin Luther King, Jr. Day "Winter Holiday" because he does not want to offend blacks. He opted to rename Good Friday "Spring Holiday" because he doesn't mind offending Christians. Yes, it is just that simple.

"These updated names for two days of well-merited time off is another way we can demonstrate our commitment to inclusivity," Hamilton said. Inclusivity is a ruse—it is a multicultural weapon used to foster intolerance of our Judeo-Christian heritage. In actual fact, Christians are being excluded by denying recognition of a central day in their religious calendar.

If Hamilton were honest, he would simply cancel Good Friday and make it a workday. Instead, he exploits a Christian holiday so that government workers can freeload off the taxpayers in the name of celebrating springtime. There is no "well-merited" meaning to that contrived argument.

Mayor Hamilton comes from a home where religious bigotry is not only tolerated, it is celebrated. His wife is Dawn

Johnsen, an Alt-Left extremist and anti-Catholic activist.

In 2010, the Catholic League waged a successful battle against her: Johnsen was forced to withdraw her name from nomination to head President Obama's Office of Legal Counsel. As I explained, "we have been on a relentless PR campaign alerting the public, and U.S. senators, to her anti-Catholic record. On April 9, our wish came true: she withdrew her name from nomination."

Why did we oppose her? On March 4, 2010, I wrote to every member of the senate asking just one question: "Are you aware that Dawn Johnsen, who will be voted upon by the full Senate, sought to strip the Roman Catholic Church of its tax-exempt status in 1988?" At that time, Johnsen supported an attempt by the ACLU and others to rescind the Catholic Church's tax exempt status because of its pro-life position.

The radical secular assault on our religious ethos must be fought every time the religious cleansers rear their ugly head. Now is the time to send Mayor Hamilton a message.

Contact him at: mayor@bloomington.in.gov

"O'NEALS" IS CRASHING

Bill Donohue comments on "The Real O'Neals":

"The Real O'Neals" draws fewer viewers on Tuesday nights during prime time than any other show on ABC. Here's the proof.

- 8:00 "The Middle" draws 6.16 million viewers
- 8:30 "American Housewife" draws 5.24 million
- 9:00 "Fresh Off the Boat" draws 4.26 million

- 9:30 “The Real O’Neals” draws 3.56 million
- 10:00 “David Blaine: Beyond Magic” draws 5.13 million

In other words, 700,000 viewers who watched “Fresh Off the Boat” either turned off the TV or turned to another channel when the “O’Neals” came on. Yet when the “O’Neals” went off the air, more than 1.5 million viewers turned on ABC.

The “O’Neals” is crashing not simply because of poorly written scripts, but because there is less tolerance for Catholic bashing in the general population than there is at Disney/ABC.

It’s just a matter of time until this Dan Savage-inspired show is finally cancelled.

Contact Disney/ABC chief: ben.sherwood@abc.com

CHRISTMAS FILMS PAST AND PRESENT

Bill Donohue

The corruption of American culture is evident in many ways, but few markers are more telling than the way Hollywood entertains us at Christmastime.

It was 70 years ago when “It’s a Wonderful Life” was released. NBC describes it as “a holiday classic and remains the movie people associate with Christmas more than any other. Frank Capra’s definitive film is a tearjerker that proves that, even in our darkest hours, the human spirit can and will rise triumphant.”

Today, we are being treated to obscene lyrics, raw sex,

misogyny, and violence. Not one of the four Christmas-themed films released this season is worthy of being described as a family movie. There are no guardian angels directing the lead characters to consider how the world would be without them; no triumph of self-sacrifice; no statement against greed; no childhood sweetheart to marry; no inspiration of any sort. Just filth.

The first of the Christmas-themed flicks opened on November 11. "Almost Christmas" is proudly touted as another one of those "dysfunctional-family holiday movies." Danny Glover brings the whole family together for Thanksgiving, hoping to quell the in-fighting. It doesn't work: family members start attacking each other with fire extinguishers and shotguns.

The movie depicts a crude, hard-drinking female showing how much respect she has for children. Speaking about a young boy, she says, "I got vibrators older than that child." Then there is the gal employee in the grocery store who pulls the back of her panties up above her pants, asking one of the male family members, "Did you find everything you need?"

There is another scene where a woman is outside the house and sticks her head in the window, only to have it close on her. Stuck, a man comes up behind her to help. He puts his hands on either side of her while trying to open the window, appearing to neighbors as if he's having sex with her.

In another scene, Santa's head is severed and it comes tumbling down from the roof, scaring one of the little girls. All throughout the movie, women call each other bitches. Nice lesson for teenage boys.

"Why Him?" opens December 23. It features an overprotective dad who meets his daughter's socially retarded Silicon Valley billionaire boyfriend. It doesn't go well. The boyfriend greets the family with a slew of "F-words." He says of their daughter, Stephanie, "Remember when we made love in the hot

tub? Steph just opened up like a flower. You should have seen it." The mother replies, "No, I shouldn't have seen it, but now I feel like I did." Most parents would have upbraided him, but there is no fun in that.

Jennifer Aniston stars in "Office Christmas Party," which opens December 9. She plays a CEO who wants to close the failing company branch run by her brother. His employees insist on a Christmas party.

In the course of the party, Jesus is mocked, and Santa yells, "Merry Christmas, bitches." A female employee unloads with the following (poorly constructed expletive) remark, "It's f-word Christmas b-word let's get motherf-word drunk." Santa is also seen sledding down the stairs in the office, crashing into the nativity scene.

This is curious. When was the last time a nativity scene was displayed—or even allowed—at an office Christmas party? Why didn't Santa crash into a "holiday tree"?

By far the most vulgar Christmas movie this season is "Bad Santa 2." It is a sequel to the 2003 original.

When the first "Bad Santa" appeared, I described Santa as a "chain-smoking, drunken, foul-mouthed, suicidal, sexual predator. He is shown soiling himself in Santa's chair, vomiting in alleys, having sex with a woman bartender in a car, and performing anal sex on a huge woman in a dressing room. And commentary in front of kids is replete with the 'F-word.'"

Who would be drawn to such a film? "The movie will be a hit with college drop-outs, toilet-humor buffs and those who think like the Weinstein brothers." The latter was a reference to Bob and Harvey Weinstein of Miramax, a subsidiary of Disney.

Miramax is one of the production companies behind "Bad Santa 2," though the Weinstein boys have since gone their own way.

As expected, this movie is ever faithful to the original. Here's a sample, taken from the trailer, of what's in store; it opens November 23.

A child sits on Santa's lap (played by Billy Bob Thornton) and asks, "Why do you have two beards?" The hard-drinking Santa replies, "That's none of your f***ing business." The audience is treated to a string of "F-words" and other obscenities. When Santa sees a cute redhead, he says to himself, "I bet that p**** got lips like an orangutan." Santa, an elf, and others repeatedly shout the "F-word" at children.

When a child makes a Christmas donation, Mrs. Santa comments, "Cheap little f*****." Scatological commentary is commonplace, and Santa is shown having anal sex with the redhead, laughing how "pretty f***ing dirty" it is. When a man complains about the foul language used in front of children, Santa turns to him and says, you can "suck my f***ing d***."

Only a Christian holiday would be trashed this way by the Hollywood moguls. Islam and Judaism are out of bounds, but Christianity never is. None of this is by accident. If anyone thinks I exaggerate, read what those responsible for these movies have admitted.

Bob Weinstein recently commented on why he accepted the script for the original "Bad Santa." He did so after Universal Studios decided not to pick it up. "I asked a Universal executive," Weinstein said, "Why'd you guys pass on it?" The executive replied, "It was the most foul, disgusting, misogynistic, anti-Christmas, anti-children thing we could imagine." To which Weinstein said, "That's exactly why I bought it."

Weinstein, as I have pointed out many times, has a history of making anti-Catholic movies, so his reply is simply an honest account.

Billy Bob Thornton was attracted to doing "Bad Santa 2"

precisely because the original was so vulgar. “I think part of it was that there hadn’t been a movie that profane and unapologetic about itself. I think it’s the alternative to the real syrupy Christmas movies.”

In other words, Christmas films are entirely too wholesome, so much so that they are considered offensive by these people. No wonder that even *Variety* notes that since the 1980s, “there’s been a *how low can you go?* quality to the annual rite of the megaplex Christmas flick.” (Italics in the original.)

But it’s not just Hollywood executives who feel it is their cultural duty to degrade Christmas, it’s some movie reviewers as well.

One prominent website lists “Bad Santa 2” as among the “Best Christmas Movies 2016 for Kids & Family.” It must upset them to no end that the film is rated R.

Even more revealing is what amc.com has to say about the original. It listed it as one of the “Top 20 Christmas Movies” of all time. Why? “Full of expletives and sexual innuendos, Bad Santa upends the feel-good tradition of holiday movies—and it was about time.”

They like dirt. They like Christian bashing. And they especially like to attack the sensibilities of children at Christmastime. It’s who they are. They are the heart and soul of Hollywood.

COLUMBIA AND HARVARD DISCOVER

CIVILITY

Bill Donohue comments on recent events at Columbia and Harvard:

Columbia University's wrestling team has been accused of making offensive comments about blacks, women, and gays. Harvard's men's soccer team has been accused of making offensive comments about women. In response, both universities have cancelled the rest of the season. But why?

Why were these schools upset with offensive remarks made by their male athletes? After all, both have a record of tolerating offensive events targeting Catholics. Moreover, both celebrate sexual deviance.

In 2002, Fordham and Columbia faced off against each other in a football game held on the Ivy campus. During half-time, the Columbia game announcer shouted, "Fordham's tuition is going down like an altar boy." The crowd loved it. The offending student, Andy Hao, did not fly off the handle: his bigoted remarks were approved by an administrator, Catherine Webster.

I later met with Columbia president Lee Bollinger, who apologized. Did it do any good? The next year, the Columbia band performed during a half-time game against Dartmouth; it invited the crowd to join them in their "celebration of partial-birth abortion."

In 2010, "XMAS!" was performed at Columbia. The play depicted the Virgin Mary begging for sex.

In 2012, Harvard hosted a "Black Mass," the work of the Satanic Temple. The express purpose of this event was to denigrate the Mass by inviting students to participate in Satanic worship. The initial response of Harvard was to distance itself from the attack on Catholics; it stressed the independent status of the student group that made the

invitation. Under pressure by the Catholic League and others, President Drew Faust condemned the stunt and led a protest against it. I commended the president for her response.

Christmas on the campus of Harvard has been neutered for years. "Holiday trees" are allowed, but not without resistance: Students at Leverett House have compared the tree to a "Trojan horse." Jewish religious symbols are permitted, but not Christian ones. In fact, some students say that allowing a nativity scene might occasion the display of swastikas.

If this isn't perverse enough, consider that both Columbia and Harvard—now horrified by sexist language—have been encouraging sexual depravity for decades.

On the website of Columbia, prominently featured under "Sex Week," is an article titled, "A Woman's Right to be Spanked." The author describes a movie that features a secretary who is interrogated by her boss about her sex life. She is told to "bend over the boss's desk to receive a spanking for making repeated spelling errors." That's just for starters.

"At one point," the female writer says, "she is seen delivering the mail to her boss while crawling on her hands and knees, with the letters clutched in her mouth. In another instance she is gussied up as a horse on his desk complete with a bridle and a saddle." And so on.

The author's conclusion is telling. "While this may sound like a definitive extreme case of sexual harassment, in fact it is the plot to a love story." Romeo and Juliet, move over.

Harvard's idea of "Sex Week" is just as fascinating. Two years ago, it featured a workshop, "Anal Sex 101." It offered instruction on "anal anatomy and the potential pleasure for all genders, how to talk about it with a partner, basic preparation and hygiene, lubes, anal toys, and safer sex; anal penetration for beginners, and much more!" Unfortunately for

the students, none were told of the dangers to this abnormal sex practice.

If Columbia and Harvard want civility on campus, they need to treat everyone equally—beginning with Catholics—and stop exercises that foster incivility. And if they are really serious about stopping sexually exploitative language, they may want to ask themselves what lessons young men are likely to draw from their “Sex Week” events on campus.