

# ACLU “NAZIS” PURSUED HENRY HYDE

Bill Donohue comments on the ACLU's war on Rep. Henry Hyde:

On this day that the pro-life community is honoring the late Rep. Henry Hyde—the Hyde Amendment was passed 40 years ago today—it is worth recalling how the ACLU adopted Nazi-like tactics trying to destroy this great Catholic statesman.

[The following account is found in the first of my two books on the ACLU, *The Politics of the ACLU*; both this book, and *Twilight of Liberty: The Legacy of the ACLU*, were published by Transaction Press.]

In the 1970s, after it became clear that Rep. Hyde was the champion of unborn children, the ACLU stated publicly that his amendment amounted to the enactment of Roman Catholic “dogma and doctrine.”

To gather evidence, it dispatched a lawyer to spy on him. The agent found that Hyde went to Mass on Sundays, where, as the report said, “pregnant women and children” bore “gifts of life.” It also noted that Hyde actually prayed and went to Communion! This was part of a 301-page brief (it was thrown out by a judge).

When Hyde was asked about the ACLU's strategy, he said, “I suppose the Nazis did that—observed Jews going to the synagogues in Hitler's Germany—but I had hoped that we had gotten past that kind of fascist tactic.”

The signature goal of the fascist Left is power, and its preferred means include lying, manipulation, libel, and violence. Rep. Henry Hyde got a taste of some of it, courtesy of the ACLU.

No one, including the ACLU, could stop Hyde. It is up to us to see to it that the Hyde Amendment remains law. Both Clinton and Kaine have pledged to repeal it, so deeply committed are they to killing the unborn.

---

## WHY COSMO AND GLAMOUR LOVE ABORTION

Bill Donohue comments on why *Cosmopolitan* and *Glamour* love abortion:

Today marks the 40th anniversary of the Hyde Amendment, the law that bans federal funding of abortion. Anyone who values life should toast Rep. Henry Hyde today: he was one of the most brilliant and courageous pro-life leaders in American history. Predictably, the pro-abortion industry—Planned Parenthood, NARAL, Feminist Majority, NOW—are all condemning him today. Less predictable, perhaps, is the condemnation stemming from *Cosmopolitan* and *Glamour*.

I say “perhaps” because I never read these supermarket magazines. But when I read about their support for the repeal of the Hyde Amendment, I decided the time had come to do so.

*Cosmopolitan* says the Hyde Amendment has been “hurting women for 40 years.” Similarly, *Glamour* says it has “obstructed women’s healthcare for 40 years.”

According to these magazines, not making others pay for a woman’s abortion “hurts” all women, obstructing their “healthcare.” That prompted me to wonder about the mindset of those who write for these glossy publications, as well as the readers. By perusing the latest editions, I found the answer.

Both magazines appeal to the most narcissistic segments of the female population: those who hate babies and men.

*Cosmopolitan* has a piece online, "Inside the Growing Movement of Women Who Wish They'd Never Had Kids," that is a real eye-opener. Forget the fact that there is no such "movement"—*Cosmo* has a long history of lying about women (see Sue Ellen Browder's book, *Subverted: How I Helped the Sexual Revolution Hijack the Women's Movement*)—what matters are the startling admissions of the author, Sarah Treleaven. Treleaven writes about a 37-year-old journalist, Laura, who hates her child. After her baby was born, she knew she had made a mistake.

"The regret hit me when the grandmas went home and my husband went back to the office and I was on my own with him. I realized that this was my life now—and it was unbelievable. I hated, hated, hated the situation I found myself in. I think the word for what I felt is 'trapped.' After I had a kid, I realized I hated being the mother to an infant, but by then it was too late. I couldn't walk away and still live with myself, but I also couldn't stand it. I felt like my life was basically a middle-class prison."

Annie Davies has a piece in the October edition of *Glamour* that is just as amazing. It is titled, "I Hated Men *Until I Had a Baby*." She doesn't hate men now: she finally concluded that not all of them are lousy. More revealing is the way she decided not to allow the father of her baby the right to raise their child together.

Annie likes to sleep around, so when she became pregnant while visiting Ireland, she had to figure out who the father was. She decided it was Steve. She first met him in Dublin when she was "bored." This explains why she "brought home the man sitting next to me at a bar. In the heat of the moment, condoms were discussed but never used, and although I took a morning-after pill, it didn't work."

When she told Steve she was pregnant, he asked if the baby was his. “Because,” he said, “if the baby were mine, I’d come back to America with you.” She then lied to him. He persisted, asking, “You’re sure I’m not the father?” “Yes,” she said.

Fast forward to the next stage. “Even though the pregnancy had been an accident, I knew from the moment I saw the swimmy ultrasound that I wanted to have the child. I was equally sure that I was going to do it *by myself* (italics in the original), no father involved. I smiled at Steve. ‘I don’t need anyone, thanks.’”

Those who buy magazines about women who hate their own babies, and lie to the father of their own child about his paternity, can be expected to love abortion. Their raging narcissism also allows them to demand that the public pay for it. These are the kinds of themes that *Cosmopolitan* and *Glamour* feature. Not sure who is sicker—the authors or the readers.

---

## ARE CATHOLICS CONFLICTED ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY?

Bill Donohue comments on surveys that probe support for religious liberty:

A new Pew Research Center survey on religious liberty found that the public is split on the question of whether businesses that provide wedding services should be able to refuse same-sex couples if the owner has religious objections: 48% are in agreement and 49% are not. Catholics believe, by a margin of 54% to 43%, that businesses should be required to provide services to gay couples.

Other surveys provide a different outcome. Does this mean the Pew survey is flawed? No. It means that the wording of the question strongly influences the respondent's answer. What also matters is whether self-identification is an accurate measure of reality.

For example, last December an AP and NORC Center for Public Affairs Research survey found that 82% of Americans said religious liberty protections were important to Christians. Similarly, 8 in 10 Americans said that it was very or extremely important for people like themselves to be allowed to practice their religion freely.

So when Americans are asked about their support for religious liberty in general—when there is no competing value they are asked to weigh—their commitment shines through. But in the real world, there is usually a conflict between rights.

Last fall, the Catholic League commissioned Kellyanne Conway of The Polling Company to survey Catholics on a range of issues, one of them being religious liberty. Catholics were asked, “Do you agree or disagree that private businesses with religious objections should be forced to provide services that violate their beliefs?” By a margin of 63% to 30%, they opposed compelling private businesses to provide services that violate their religious beliefs.

What about when the question is narrowed to wedding-related businesses? It makes no difference: 62% say it is mostly unfair and 29% say it is fair.

How can these differences be explained? Americans prize religious liberty but they also support equal treatment. When these values conflict, much depends on whether the respondent is being asked to defend government coercion or support equal treatment: the former is not popular, but the latter is.

In the Catholic League survey, we disaggregated on the basis of several criteria, among them being ideology. For example,

when respondents were asked about whether businesses should be required to provide health coverage that violates their religious beliefs, Catholics in general took the side of the owner. There was one segment that favored coercion: they were identified as being the most liberal Catholics in the sample.

We know from other surveys that the most liberal Catholics are also the most likely to be non-practicing. Yet the Pew survey treated them as equals—no attempt was made to distinguish them from others. Therefore, it is likely that if non-practicing Catholics were factored out of the Pew survey, Catholics would appear less liberal on this issue.

Should non-practicing Catholics be included in samples of the Catholic population? Should Americans who identify themselves as vegetarian be included in a survey of vegetarians even if they occasionally eat steaks or hot dogs? It depends on whether self-identification is seen as a satisfactory measure of reality. To put it another way, if a man has male genitals, is he a woman because he says he is?

Postmodern sages who think truth is a myth are entitled to live in their world of make believe, but they are not entitled to our respect. Reality may be interpreted differently, but not all interpretations are equally valid.

---

## **BLASPHEMY RIGHTS DAY IS A FARCE**

Bill Donohue comments on Friday's International Blasphemy Rights Day. To read his piece on CNSNews.com, click [here](#).

---

# MACY'S SORDID HISTORY: AFRICAN-AMERICANS

Bill Donohue comments on Macy's being sued for discrimination by an African-American shopper:

In December 2013, Halim Sharif, a club promoter from Mount Vernon, N.Y. filed suit against Macy's, saying he was singled out and detained after buying a \$2,400 Louis Vuitton bag. The store's alarm went off as he exited, he said, but it also went off as a half-dozen white customers exited, and they were not stopped. He used his cell phone to record audio and video of the April 19, 2013 incident.

A Macy's spokeswoman, promising that Mr. Sharif's allegation would be thoroughly investigated, stated that "Macy's has a zero tolerance for discrimination of any kind."

Really? That's not what we have found, as we have documented case after case where Macy's has been accused—and often acknowledged wrongdoing or been liable—in its treatment of veterans, police officers, racial minorities, people with disabilities, elderly widows, pregnant women or members of faith groups—including, of course, a Catholic man fired for his beliefs (click [here](#)).

Contact Macy's Group Vice President, Holly Thomas:  
[holly.thomas@macys.com](mailto:holly.thomas@macys.com)

---

# DISNEY IS NOT OPPOSED TO BIGOTRY

Bill Donohue comments on Disney's decision to pull an offensive Halloween costume:

Last week, Disney, responding to complaints, pulled a Halloween costume that was branded offensive. The boy's costume, which depicted Maui, a well respected figure in Polynesian oral tradition, was seen by some Pacific Islanders as akin to blackface; Maui is a character in the upcoming Disney film, *Moana*. The costume featured brown pants and a long-sleeved shirt covered in tattoos (there was also a skirt made of leaves).

Disney quickly apologized and withdrew the items. "The team behind *Moana* has taken great care to respect the culture of the Pacific Islanders that inspired the film, and we regret that the Maui costume has offended some. We sincerely apologize and are pulling the costume from our website and stores."

Disney's decision to "respect the culture of the Pacific Islanders" stands in stark contrast to its decision to disrespect the culture of Roman Catholics. Specifically, its promotion of "The Real O'Neals," via its ABC-TV subsidiary, shows how duplicitous the corporation is. Why is Disney showing sensitivity to Pacific Islanders but not Catholics?

How ironic that Disney credits Pacific Islanders for inspiring *Moana*. And who does it credit with inspiring "The Real O'Neals"? Dan Savage (he is a co-producer of the show). Its second season starts October 11.

As I said in a [New York Times op-ed page ad](#) last February, Savage's "maniacal hatred of Catholicism is so strong that it would be as though David Duke were hired to produce a show



about African Americans.” Indeed, his filthy language—aimed at Catholicism—was deemed so bad by the newspaper that it wouldn’t permit me to even use an asterisk in place of letters; his obscene words are a staple in his work.

Disney is obviously not opposed to bigotry, per se. Its selective interest depends on the creed, culture, and color of its characters.

Contact Disney/ABC chief: [ben.sherwood@abc.com](mailto:ben.sherwood@abc.com)

---

## **MET EXHIBIT STOKES ANTI-CATHOLICISM**

Bill Donohue comments on how an art exhibition is stoking the fires of anti-Catholicism:

The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City will open an exhibition this weekend, “Jerusalem: 1000-1400: Every People Under Heaven.” For the most part, it promises to be an excellent presentation featuring 200 pieces from many international collections. Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, of course, have historical roots in Jerusalem.

There is one part of the exhibition, “Holy War and the Power of Art,” that appears problematic. Holland Cotter of the *New York Times* offers a familiar interpretation of the medieval world that touches on this theme: he states that in the 11th century, it was not a good time for Muslims or Jews.

“In Europe in 1095,” he writes, “Pope Urban II put out the call for Christians to liberate Jerusalem from people ‘absolutely alien to God.’ Accordingly, in 1099, Crusader

armies showed up at the gates and began an ethnic and religious cleansing. They slaughtered Muslims, burned Jews alive in synagogues and cut down Christians who happened to cross their path.”

Cotter’s account cannot go unanswered. Misinformation—mistake of facts—and disinformation—deliberate distortion of facts—are commonly employed in discussions about the Crusades, and this exhibit at the Met is bound to whet the appetite of others who have been drinking the moonshine of the Black Legends.

There are two points of contention: Why the Crusades were launched and who mistreated Jews.

Few know this subject better than Princeton scholar Bernard Lewis. “The Crusade was a delayed response to the jihad, the holy war for Islam, and its purpose was to recover by war what had been lost by war—to free the holy places of Christendom and open them once again, without impediment, to Christian pilgrimage.”

Thomas F. Madden is professor of history and director of the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies at St. Louis University. He is an expert on the Crusades. Here are some of his observations.

- “Christians in the eleventh century were not paranoid fanatics. Muslims really were gunning for them. While Muslims can be peaceful, Islam was born in war and grew the same way. From the time of Muhammad, the means of Muslim expansion was always the sword.”
- “Pope Urban II called upon the knights of Christendom to push back the conquests of Islam at the Council of Clermont in 1095.”
- “Urban II gave the Crusaders two goals, both of which would remain central to the eastern Crusades for centuries. The first was to rescue the Christians of the East...The second goal was the liberation of Jerusalem and

the other places made holy by the life of Christ.”

Jewish author Dennis Prager is exactly right when he says that the Crusades were “wars to retake territories in the Holy Land that Muslims had forcefully taken from Christians.”

What about the way Jews were treated? Prager admits that “the wholesale massacre of Jews in Germany by various Crusaders” took place. “For the record, however, in no instances did the Church order these killings and in almost every case Jews sought and received aid and support from local bishops.”

Sociologist Rodney Stark, who has written extensively on this subject, offers the specifics (see his book, *God's Battalions: The Case for the Crusades*, especially pp. 125-127, from which the following is taken):

“Emicho of Leisingen was a minor Rhineland count who responded to the pope’s call to crusade by assembling a small army of German knights,” writes Stark. He then explains how the bishops reacted when they learned about Emicho’s plans.

- The bishop of Speyer “took the local Jews under his protection, and Emicho’s forces could lay their hands on only a dozen Jews who had somehow failed to heed the bishop’s alarm. All twelve were killed.”
- “Then Emicho led his forces to Worms. Here, too, the bishop took the local Jews into his palace for protection. But this time Emicho would have none of that: his forces broke down the bishop’s gates and killed about five hundred Jews.”
- “The pattern was repeated the next week in Mainz. Here, too, the bishop attempted to shield the Jews but was attacked and forced to flee for his life.”
- “The same again in Cologne, and again in Metz.”

Stark then quotes the distinguished historian of anti-Semitism, Léon Poliakov: “It is important to note that almost everywhere...bishops attempted, sometimes even at the peril of

their own lives, to protect the Jews.”

Stark also quotes Madden who wrote that the pope “harshly condemned” all of these attacks, “but there was little more he could do.”

Furthermore, when Emicho ran up against the Hungarian knights, he more than met his match—he was creamed. The noted English historian, Sir Steven Runciman, said these defeats struck “most good Christians” as “punishments meted out from on high to the murderers of Jews.”

Last December, the *New York Times* ran a splendid op-ed piece by Sara Lipton, professor of history at the State University of New York, Stony Brook, and author of *Dark Mirror: The Medieval Origins of Anti-Jewish Iconography*. Here is what she said about this period in history:

“Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of Jews were massacred in towns where they had peacefully resided for generations. At no point did Christian authorities promote or consent to the violence. Christian theology, which applied the Psalm verses ‘Slay them not’ to Jews, and insisted that Jews were not to be killed for their religion, had not changed.”

Art critics such as Holland Cotter are not expected to be experts on the Crusades. But when they set themselves up as an authority, those who know better have every right to take them down.

---

**LIES ABOUT RAPIST MEXICAN**

# PRIEST GO VIRAL

Bill Donohue comments on a bogus story about a Mexican priest that is being ignored by the mainstream media:

The blogosphere lit up this week with headlines blaring that the Catholic Church in Mexico has exonerated an HIV-infected priest who *admitted* to raping 30 young girls between the ages of 5 and 10.

There was just one problem: According to the Archdiocese of Mexico, this priest doesn't even exist! "There is no record of such a minister," the Archdiocese attests. Even militant atheist blogger Hemant Mehta acknowledges that with no police reports, no victims going public, not even a photo of this priest, "there's no reason to think this is true."

So what we have here is a blatant attempt to smear the Catholic Church with the most vicious of lies. Why? The Archdiocese of Mexico suggests that supporters of same-sex marriage in Mexico are behind it, as they had recently threatened to plant damaging stories about the Church in retaliation for its opposition to a gay marriage initiative.

That seems like a pretty big story in itself. Yet the mainstream media have completely buried it.

Imagine if the opposite had happened—if the Catholic Church had published malicious lies about supporters of same-sex marriage. There would hardly be a newspaper, broadcast outlet or online media site in America that would not have led with the story. But when the Catholic Church is the *target* of such vicious lies, they summarily ignore it. Their silence tells us all we need to know about media bias against the Church.

---

# GAY GROUP INTRUDES ON CATHOLIC TURF

Bill Donohue comments on how a gay group has intruded on the internal affairs of a Catholic church in Rhode Island:

A man accepts a job in the private sector, knowing what the house rules of the organization are, and then intentionally violates them. Subsequently, he is fired. There is no defensible moral or legal argument that can be made on his behalf. Yet that is exactly what the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), a radical homosexual organization, is doing in a case that involves the Catholic Church.

Michael Templeton was fired from his post as music director at the Church of St. Mary in Providence. He was fired for violating employment strictures, rules he voluntarily assented to upon taking the job. To be specific, he was terminated after he violated Catholic teachings on marriage: he married his boyfriend. HRC has now stepped in, saying he is a victim.

HRC has no more business sticking its nose into the internal affairs of the Catholic Church than it has in trespassing on the autonomy of Jewish, Muslim, Mormon, or Protestant houses of worship. Interestingly, HRC is able to dodge the latter criticism: it has no record of attacking non-Catholics—just Catholics.

On its website, HRC lists “Religion & Faith” as an area of interest to the organization. Under that heading it has two generic subtopics, “Coming Home Series” and “Brave Spaces”; it also has one specific subtopic, “Catholic Initiatives.” It does not say why Catholics are singled out, but a look at its activities makes it obvious: HRC is expressly anti-Catholic.

Co-founded by an accused child rapist, Terrence Patrick Bean (the other founder died of AIDS), HRC strongly defended gay

leader Howard Gutman as U.S. Ambassador to Belgium, even though he was accused of soliciting sex from children. In short, its moral credentials are shot, which is why George Soros likes to fund it.

Contact Chad Griffin, president, HRC: [chad.griffin@hrc.org](mailto:chad.griffin@hrc.org)

---

## **SOROS FUNDS PRO-ABORTION MARCH**

Bill Donohue comments on the upcoming March for Choice:

On September 24, there will be a March for Choice in Dublin, and in 16 other cities; events will be held in 11 nations, including Ireland. Its proximate goal is to force the repeal of Ireland's Eighth Amendment that bans abortion; its long-term goal is to secure abortion-on-demand in other Catholic European countries.

The money behind this effort is coming largely from George Soros, the atheist Jewish billionaire who hates Israel—he labels it a [“racist” nation](#)—and loves to fund pro-abortion campaigns. That he likes to interfere in the internal affairs of Catholic nations is indisputable.

His Open Society Foundation funds Amnesty International Ireland, the Abortion Rights Campaign and the Irish Family Planning Association. They are promoting the protest. He also funds Catholics for Choice in the United States, an anti-Catholic letterhead with no members.

Reportedly, Soros has donated more than \$25 million to help Hillary Clinton and other Democrats win in November; one

report says he has given \$9 million to her alone.

The lavish amounts Soros spends on Clinton is something Catholics should know about. After all, she is on record stating that pro-life “religious beliefs” must change. Last year, in reference to abortion, she explicitly said that “deep-seated cultural codes, religious beliefs and structural biases have to be changed.” In other words, it is the duty of elites, such as Soros, to foster the pro-abortion agenda.

An honest media would tell the public what I have just said—it’s all true. But don’t hold your breath.