

BOGUS LAWSUIT ENDS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a lawsuit brought against him and the Catholic League:

At every step of the way, a lawsuit filed by Rebecca Randles against me and the Catholic League was knocked down by the courts. I never libeled anyone, and she knows it. She lost in the U.S. District Court, and then lost again in the 8th Circuit Court of Appeals. She wisely decided not to appeal her bogus lawsuit to the U.S. Supreme Court, though it would have been fun to watch her lose again.

Randles tried to silence me, and she failed. She should have known better.

Her penchant for misleading the public goes way beyond me. For example, her bio, listed on her website, says she is a “trustee for *Southwest* Baptist University.” (My italics.) There is no such school.

Many thanks to Erin Mersino for representing us—she did a splendid job. Thanks, too, to Richard Thompson, president of the Thomas More Law Center, for accepting this case. They are two committed Catholics, persons whose courage is matched only by their brilliance.

To read the statement by the Thomas More Law Center, click [here](#).

To read my letter to Rebecca Randles, click [here](#).

TRUMP WAS RIGHT TO BLAME BOTH SIDES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the events of Charlottesville and what they mean:

President Trump was right to call out the extremists on both sides of the Charlottesville tragedy, but more needs to be said about those on the Left who helped to bring it about.

The crazies on the Right—the KKK, the Neo-Nazis and the White Supremacists—have been justly condemned by virtually everyone, save for their sick sympathizers. But we will not make progress if the role of the Left is ignored. Their censorial agenda is wide ranging.

It is the Left that has led the fight to scrub the public square free of religious symbols. From banning Christmas songs in school events, to lawsuits against the display of nativity scenes and the Ten Commandments on public property, the Left has been waging war on our Judeo-Christian heritage for decades.

The multicultural agenda, with its express animus against Western Civilization, is another expression of this pernicious uprooting of our past. Very much linked to this phenomenon are the speech codes on college campuses. It is not conservatives who are promoting gag rules, it is the Left that wants to muzzle the free speech of those who defend American traditions and our religious heritage.

Now the Left has seized upon Southern historical persons and symbols to attack and destroy.

The media have done a superlative job in creating the impression that what happened in Charlottesville was purely the work of right-wing lunatics. That is why they are so angry

with Trump—he unmasked them. More unmasking is in order.

Even normally astute commentators such as Charles Krauthammer took the media's bait. He put 100% of the blame on the far Right, saying "the riots began over a Nazi riot." But it was not a neo-Nazi who put a cord over the neck of a 1924 statue of a confederate soldier, smashing it to the ground—it was members of the Workers World Party.

There was no mention of the Workers World Party at the Charlottesville event on ABC, CBS, NBC, or PBS. The *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and a few other newspapers cited its role. AP said nothing. That was it. It was close to a media blackout.

Even this account is too generous. Though the *Washington Post* reported on the Workers World Party, its front-page story on August 16 simply noted that "left-leaning protesters" were there. It did not refer to the Klan or the neo-Nazis as "leaning" Right.

The Workers World Party is not "left-leaning": it is a Communist organization. Since being founded in 1959, it has taken up the cause of Mao Zedong, who killed 77 million Chinese people, the Soviet invasion of Hungary, and the mass slaughter of innocents by Saddam Hussein. In America, it has supported the Black Panthers and the Weather Underground.

When not endorsing violence, the Workers World Party is busy attacking the Catholic Church's teachings on sexuality. When Pope Francis was elected, he was cast as the pawn of capitalists. Israel is accused of promoting genocide against the Palestinians, and now the U.S. is charged with waging war on North Korea, a nation the Communists proudly defend. It also supports the left-wing dictatorship in Venezuela.

The media have said nothing about any of this. Nor will it report that the Workers World Party mapped out a violent agenda for Charlottesville several days before the Nazi rally.

It also pledged to work with Black Lives Matter to “disrupt” it.

Instead of fairly reporting on the violent pedigree of both sides, the media rely on the notoriously unreliable Southern Poverty Law Center—it treats the Family Research Council as a hate group alongside the KKK—for source material.

The truth is that this left-wing organization does not track “hate groups,” per se. The Southern Poverty Law Center explicitly limits its interest to “the American radical right.” This explains why the Workers World Party is given a pass: it is too busy monitoring Tony Perkins.

If we are going to bring the country together, more needs to be done than to condemn all of these hate groups. We need to answer the president. He asked the right question. “Where does it stop? I wonder, is it George Washington next week? And is it Thomas Jefferson the week after?”

Krauthammer has given us his answer. He would prefer to leave such statues up, but he will not object if they are taken down. He did not say just how far his “tolerance” might extend. All he said was that “if they become symbols and centers for racism and neo-Nazism and the KKK, then there’s a case for bringing them down.”

Krauthammer did not mention that those most responsible for associating Southern historical persons and symbols exclusively with racism—it is certainly not the Southern people—belong to violent, anti-American Communist entities such as the Workers World Party.

Censoring speech, religion, and traditions is the mark of a totalitarian society, not a democratic one. But as Tocqueville instructed, there are times when the passion for equality in democratic nations turns to “delirium,” and when that appetite is abetted by administrative centralization, it inexorably leads to despotism.

That is the conversation we should be having.

NJ COURT UPHOLDS CHURCH AUTONOMY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a ruling granted on August 14 that affirms Church autonomy:

A few months ago, the parents of two female students enrolled in St. Theresa's School in Kenilworth, New Jersey sought to force the school to reinstate their children after they were denied admission to the school this fall. They lost in Superior Court yesterday, as well they should have.

Judge Donald A. Kessler read his decision for three hours from the bench, so chock full of detail was this bizarre lawsuit.

It all began last December when the girls' father, Scott Phillips, filed a lawsuit to get his daughter, Sydney, on the boys basketball team after the season for the girls was cancelled. He succeeded in arranging for her to play in the last game of the boys team in February.

Two months later, the school said the girls were not welcome to return for the next school year. That's when Phillips sued the school, and the Archdiocese of Newark, seeking to force the school to reverse its decision.

"The court does not have the authority to meddle in this decision," said Judge Kessler. The judge was not sparing of the parents, noting how they went public with their complaint, causing undue commotion in the community. To be specific, he cited threatening letters sent by the girls' mother, Theresa

Mullen.

Judge Kessler noted that the parents have a record of lodging complaints whenever they don't get their way. In 2016, when the older son of the parents was not named the eighth grade valedictorian, both parents sounded off. Scott Phillips was so enraged that he called the female principal a "son of a b****." The archdiocese intervened to help restore order, but to no avail—the parents remained publicly indignant.

The issue of Church autonomy is fast becoming one of the most contentious matters in the nation. Separation of church and state obviously doesn't mean much to those who advocate state control of Catholic institutions, but if the Church cannot decide its own internal strictures, it is no longer Catholic. That is exactly what the activists want, which is why they must be fought at every turn.

This also goes to show how vacuous the mantra of diversity is. Those who truly believe in pluralism do not seek to access the heavy hand of the state to force sectarian institutions to march to the beat of its secular drum.

ISLAMIC NATIONS KILL RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new study of religious liberty:

"Respecting Rights? Measuring the World's Blasphemy Laws" is a comprehensive report on the status of religious liberty throughout the world. Issued by the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, its findings are illuminating

on several counts.

Its definition of blasphemy is straightforward: it is defined as “the act of insulting or showing contempt or lack of reverence for God.” Of the world’s 195 countries, 71 have such laws. Two of them, Malta and Denmark, repealed their blasphemy laws after the data were collected by the Commission.

There were some surprises and some predictable findings. Regarding the former, the following countries sanction imprisonment for blasphemy: Canada, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, and Poland. Not surprisingly, the five nations with the most oppressive blasphemy laws are Iran, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, and Qatar. They all are Islamic states.

The official religion in Iran is Islam. Article 513 of its Penal Code says that anyone who insults Islam “should be executed if his insult equals to speaking disparagingly of Prophet Muhammad. Otherwise, should be imprisoned from one to five years.”

Pakistan is formally known as the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, with Islam as its state religion. Chapter XV, Section 295-C authorizes death for “innuendo” of an insulting nature. “Whoever by words, either spoken or written, or by visible representation or by any imputation, innuendo, or insinuation, directly or indirectly, defiles the sacred name of the Holy Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) shall be punished with death, or imprisonment for life, and shall also be liable to fine.”

Islam is the state religion of Yemen. Those who ridicule Islam can be imprisoned. Article 260 of its Penal Code authorizes “Punishment with imprisonment for a period not exceeding five years or a fine” for anyone who “distorts willfully the Holy Quran in a manner which changes its meaning with the purpose of harming the natural Religion.”

Somalia is an African nation that practices slavery. It is run

by Muslims; Islam is the official religion. Article 2 of the Constitution says that “No religion other than Islam can be propagated in the country.” Anyone who insults Islam shall be imprisoned. Also, “No law which is not compliant with the general principles of Shari’ah can be enacted.”

Qatar is another Islamic state. Article I of its Constitution says “Islam and Shari’a law shall be a main source of legislation.” Insulting the state religion results in imprisonment. Moreover, Article 256 of the Penal Code says offenders can get up to seven years for “Insulting any of the prophets in letter and spirit, in writing, drawing, gesturing or in any other way.” This includes those who use “disks, computer programs or magnetized tapes” to offend Islam.

In the United States, it is not uncommon for pundits, activists, talk-show hosts, comedians, and professors to contend that Christianity is no different from Islam—both are oppressive. Yet these sages can only voice such nonsense in Christian-majority nations. In Muslim-majority nations, they would either be imprisoned or executed.

HILLARY’S PREACHER PROSPECTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue assesses the prospects of Hillary Clinton becoming a preacher:

Hillary Clinton is back in the news, but for reasons that are confounding her supporters and her detractors alike. She is [reportedly](#) weighing a decision to become a Methodist lay preacher.

There are good reasons why her fans and foes are befuddled: it is out of character for almost any Democrat these days to

evinced a serious interest in Christianity. Quite simply, it will not be easy for her to make the jump to preacher status given all the hostility to traditional Christian moral values that she and her Party have expressed for decades.

“God talk” has never come easily to Hillary. Her former press secretary, Mike McCurry, admits that “Hillary finds it hard to talk about religion a lot. She comes from the Methodist tradition, which, like many more liberal, mainstream Protestant denominations, is a little more buttoned up.”

That is an accurate, yet incomplete, explanation. It must also be said that mainline Protestantism has been crashing for decades, precisely because its positions on moral issues are indistinguishable from secular liberal thought. Therefore, trying to get a religious handle on such issues as abortion and marriage will not be easy. Is Hillary prepared to pivot on these matters? Not likely, which is why this is a heavy lift.

It's even more profound than this: Hillary's preference for discussing freedom to worship, which is a privatized understanding of religious liberty, is emblematic of her reluctance to speak about freedom of religion, which implies a more public, and robust, conception of religious liberty.

So if Hillary is going to become a preacher, she will either have to do a 180 or continue to secularize her lexicon on matters religious. The latter, however, is not likely to inspire anyone.

An even bigger problem for Hillary is the association of her Party with secularism, something that virtually every survey has confirmed. It began in 1972 and has only grown more extreme. It's even worse than this: Religious bigotry has marked the Democrats for a long time.

In 2003, the Democratic National Committee (DNC) aligned itself with Catholics for a Free Choice (now Catholics for Choice). This is a Catholic-bashing entity funded by

establishment players such as the Ford Foundation and George Soros.

On September 16, 2003, the *New York Times* published an op-ed page ad I wrote, "Why Are The Democrats Insulting Catholics?" Subsequently, the DNC dropped all association with the pro-abortion dummy Catholic group, but the damage had already been done.

In 2004, presidential candidate John Kerry hired Mara Vanderslice as his Director of Religious Outreach. After I outed her—she was associated with anti-Catholic causes—Kerry silenced her.

Then the DNC hired Rev. Brenda Bartella Peterson as its Senior Advisor for Religious Outreach. I outed her as well: she had filed an amicus brief with other clergy members supporting atheist Michael Newdow's attempt to excise the words "under God" from the Pledge of Allegiance. After I kept pounding her for days, she quit.

In 2007, presidential candidate John Edwards hired Amanda Marcotte and Melissa McEwan to work in his 2008 campaign. I outed them for their anti-Catholic writings, forcing them to quit.

In 2012, the Democratic Party deleted the word "God" from its Platform. God was reinstated after much pushback, but everyone knew what the Democrats' real preference was.

In 2016, Hillary stood by the anti-Catholic rhetoric of her communications director, Jennifer Palmieri, and the anti-Catholic machinations of her campaign chairman, John Podesta.

A Wikileaks document showed that Podesta was instrumental in creating phony Catholic organizations, Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United: they were launched for the express purpose of creating a "revolution" in the Catholic Church.

Just recently, Democrats went into a tizzy when Rep. Ben Ray Luján, chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, said that pro-life Americans were welcome to join the Democrats. Also, the head of Catholic Democrats smeared the premier Catholic TV network, EWTN, as a rogue entity.

If Hillary wants to become a Christian preacher, she will have to clear many hurdles, some of which she erected. Good luck. If she succeeds, she will have no shortage of potential converts to work with—her Party is chock full of them.

HIJAB ARTWORK SPARKS CONTROVERSY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the reaction to a controversial portrait of the Statue of Liberty:

Occasionally, a controversial issue will arise that draws inane comments from all sides. Such is the case of artwork hanging in the Santa Ana office of Rep. J. Luis Correa: The painting depicts the Statue of Liberty wearing a hijab.

A group of local conservatives, We the People Rising, is demanding that it be removed, saying it violates separation of church and state.

A conservative pundit, Katherine Timpf, replies that the painting does not violate the First Amendment, arguing that “trying to use the Establishment Clause to remove this painting is far more egregious than trying to use it to remove someone’s office nativity scene.”

The liberal congressman, Rep. Correa, defends the portrait

saying that determining “what is proper [and] what is not” would violate the First Amendment guarantee of freedom of speech.

A liberal pundit, Chelsea Hassler, defends the portrait saying it is a “display of multiculturalism and tolerance.”

The Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) branded criticism of the artwork “Islamophobic.”

All five are mistaken.

The artwork does not violate the Establishment provision of the First Amendment. Indeed, it does not come close to being a state-sponsored religious exhibit. We the People Rising ill serve the conservative cause by trying to make this a constitutional issue.

Timpf is correct to contend that the position adopted by We the People Rising is flawed, but so is her position. To say that invoking the First Amendment to remove this painting is far worse than seeking to remove a nativity scene from a congressman’s office is astounding. Not to Christians it isn’t. Her interpretation of this artwork as a political statement, rather than a religious one, is irrelevant: there are plenty of good reasons why this painting does not belong in a congressman’s office.

Rep. Correa’s notion that judgments over “what is proper” would violate the First Amendment is ludicrous. He has a right to decide what pictures he wants in his office, but no artist has a right to have his work hung there. Denying a submission is not a constitutional violation.

Hassler’s remark that the painting is an expression of “multiculturalism and tolerance” is just as risible. To reconfigure a universal patriotic symbol to have a sectarian message is a demonstration of intolerance.

CAIR's labeling of the artwork's critics as suffering from Islamophobia is nonsense. Those who object to playing games with our national symbol—they would include millions of veterans—are acting rationally when they express their dissatisfaction. There is nothing phobic about objecting to offensive fare.

Rep. Correa's legal right to have the hijab-adorned Statue of Liberty is only part of this issue: reasonable Americans have every right to question the moral propriety of hijacking our national symbol to make a cheap point. Whether that point is religious or secular does not matter. Tampering with the Statue of Liberty is what matters.

UNMANLY CATHOLIC LEFT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today's *National Catholic Reporter*:

"Time for a Dialogue on Sexual Ethics." That is the dishonest title of an editorial in today's *National Catholic Reporter*. It's dishonest because the media outlet does not want dialogue—it wants the Church to drop its teachings on sexuality, mostly to satisfy the homosexual agenda.

This is classic doublespeak for the Left, secular and religious. When they ask for dialogue on matters important to them, they mean change, not discourse. For example, they don't want dialogue on capital punishment: they believe they've won that one, so there is no need to revisit this teaching. Gay marriage, which is of paramount importance to the *Reporter*, is different.

In one sense, there is no real news here. The *National*

Catholic Reporter, a dissident media outlet that has drawn the wrath of many bishops, has long rejected the Church's teachings on sexuality. In 2002, I confronted one of its senior editors, Tom Roberts, about this issue in a TV debate.

"Now guys like Roberts, the *National Catholic Reporter*, they don't believe in anything the Catholic Church says on sexuality anyhow, so of course he doesn't want to talk about homosexuality," I said. Mike Barnicle, sitting in for Chris Matthews on *Hardball*, interrupted me: "Wait, Bill, please. Tom, take it up. I mean, you just got whacked across the face. Take it up." To which Roberts replied, "I'm not going to take that up."

A real man would have defended himself. But he didn't. And real men don't pen editorials like the one today in the *Reporter*. The statement ends by citing two of their favorite theologians, Charles Curran and Margaret Farley: their unequivocal rejection of Church teachings on sexuality led them to be censured by the Vatican.

The editorial says, "perhaps it is time for the Vatican to engage these Catholic theologians and ethicists in a constructive dialogue about the fruits of their ethical inquiries. Until the church is willing to engage in a deep re-examination of its doctrine on sexuality and sexual relationships, any dialogue around LGBT inclusion or divorce and remarriage will only be stymied."

In other words, the Vatican has a moral obligation to listen carefully to those whom it has sanctioned for their insubordination. A more manly thing to do would be to insist that the Church adopt the editorial preferences of the *New York Times*, and throw Scripture and Tradition overboard.

Perhaps the *Reporter* will lead the way in showing how fruitful dialogue can be by inviting me to be on its editorial board. My first request would be to say that any media outlet with

the word “Catholic” in it ought to pledge fidelity to Church teachings. Dialogue anyone?

WHY THE LEFT DEFENDS ISLAMISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue explains why the Left supports radical Islam:

It continues to confound liberals and conservatives alike: Why would the Left defend Islamists?

The latest victim of this fascinating alliance is Richard Dawkins, the English left-wing atheist who was disinvited by a Berkeley left-wing radio station after it was discovered that Dawkins said Islam is the world’s “most evil” religion.

It did not matter to KPFA that Dawkins has made a career out of bashing Christianity, especially Catholicism—that was laudatory—but it did matter when he ripped Islam. Why did that bother the Left?

On the surface, it makes no sense for the Left to embrace Islamists. After all, the Left counsels a sexual free-for-all, and Islamists want a sexual noose on women and gays. How can libertinism and sharia be squared?

Scratch beneath the surface and it quickly becomes apparent that what unites the Left and Islamists is hate: hatred of the West. They hate America, they hate Europe, and they would like to destroy Israel.

It is that animus that commits the haters to targeting the Judeo-Christian ethos, upon which the West was built. That is

why they want to gut it. The Left will support *any* movement that seeks to disable the West. Even after 9/11, the Left attacked Christianity, not Islam.

Dawkins finds it ironic that a Berkeley radio station is silencing him, noting that Berkeley is home to the Free Speech Movement of the 1960s. If he were an independent thinker, he wouldn't be so shocked. A closer look at that event reveals how little the activists valued free speech.

Sol Stern was involved in the Free Speech Movement on the campus of Berkeley. Like so many other young activists at the time, he later evolved into a neo-conservative: his writings at the Manhattan Institute, on a range of social issues, are some of the best in the nation. Three years ago, he wrote a splendid piece in *City Journal* on the 50th anniversary of the Free Speech Movement.

In 1964, the administration at Berkeley made a boneheaded decision to limit student clubs from setting up tables at the entrance to the campus; it should have left well enough alone. Radicals on the campus seized on this infraction and set off the alarms, demanding an expansion of free speech rights.

Today, as Stern observes, Berkeley now "exercises more thought control over students" than ever before. But as he points out, this is less a perversion than a perfection of what the activists actually sought.

Stern says the idea that the students were fighting for free speech "was always a charade." Indeed, "the struggle was really about clearing barriers to using the campus as a base for radical political activity." No wonder they cheered the gag orders of Fidel Castro and the terrorism of Che Guevara.

In other words, the Free Speech Movement activists hated liberalism, properly understood: they had no use for free speech—their sponsorship of it was nothing but a useful tool to advance their radical politics.

Dawkins doesn't get it. He makes the mistake of attributing to his left-wing censors the belief that Islam is a race, not a religion. As he sees it, this allows them to think that critics of Islam are racists. Wrong—they are not that stupid—they know the difference.

The Left is the secular wing of totalitarianism; radical Islam is its religious wing. Once this verity is grasped, their apparent differences dissolve. What they both seek is total control, and total decimation of the West.

WORDS CAN KILL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the conviction and sentencing of Michelle Carter for her role in the death of her boyfriend:

Michelle Carter has been sentenced to 2 1/2 years in prison for encouraging her boyfriend, Conrad Roy III, to kill himself. Her lawyer argued this was, at least in part, a free speech case, but Judge Lawrence Moniz was not persuaded: he ruled she was guilty of involuntary manslaughter after texting dozens of messages beckoning Roy to commit suicide.

There are several moral and legal issues involved in this case; they have grave implications for the First Amendment and right-to-die matters. From a Catholic perspective, the latter issue is the most crucial. But free speech is also important, and cannot be breezily dismissed.

Can words kill? Some civil libertarians say it is preposterous. Indeed, Carter's lawyer, Joseph Cataldo, said, "This is clearly just speech. There was no physical action taken by Michelle Carter in connection with the death. It was

just words alone.”

Here’s a scenario worth considering. A white racist speaks at a rally, getting his angry followers all ginned up. He spots a black man walking by, and then urges his audience to “get that guy and kill him.” They do.

Is this free speech? No. It constitutes incitement to riot. No competent judge would ever say that this speech is covered by the First Amendment. So, yes, words can kill.

Treasonous speech may also kill. Moreover, there is no constitutional right to solicit a murder over the Internet.

The question in the Carter case is whether her words were responsible for Roy’s suicide.

Carter did not simply send one text to Roy encouraging him to kill himself: She spent two weeks laboring him to do so. He finally complied, driving to a mall parking lot, filling his truck with carbon monoxide from a generator, and waiting for it to overwhelm him.

We know that Roy called Carter while the truck was filled with fumes. At one point he had second thoughts and exited the car, but Carter pleaded with him to get back in and finish the job. Judge Moniz noted that she “can hear him coughing and can hear the loud noise of the motor.” That is why he said her role “constituted wanton and reckless conduct...where there was a high degree of likelihood that substantial harm would arise to Mr. Roy.”

The texts Carter sent are chilling. Here is an excerpt (no grammatical changes have been made). The exchange begins after Conrad Roy confesses that he is hesitant about ending his life.

Carter: “You are so hesitant because you keeping over thinking it and keep pushing it off. You just need to do it, Conrad.

The more you push it off, the more it will eat at you. You're ready and prepared. All you have to do is turn the generator on and you will be free and happy. No more pushing it off. No more waiting."

Conrad: "You're right."

Carter: "If you want it as bad as you say you do it's time to do it today."

Conrad: "Yup. No more waiting."

Carter: "Okay. I'm serious. Like you can't even wait 'till tonight. You have to do it when you get back from your walk...Always smile, and yeah, you have to just do it. You have everything you need. There is now way you can fail. Tonight is the night. It's now or never...[D]on't be scared. You already made this decision and if you don't do it tonight you're gonna be thinking about it all the time and stuff all the rest of your life and be miserable...You're finally going to be happy in heaven. No more pain. No more bad thoughts and worries. You'll be free."

Is there freedom in death? To the proponents of euthanasia, this is certainly true. Was it really true for Conrad, a clinically depressed young man? Does it matter that vulnerable people like him can easily be seduced by such appeals? Was not Conrad exploited?

This case involves issues that transcend these two persons. Does society have a right to intervene by dissuading those who are suicidal from succeeding? Cops, representing the public, involve themselves all the time: some are trained to stop jumpers. Indeed, we put up with traffic snarls on bridges to allow these cops to do their job. Why? Because we, as a society, believe that suicide is wrong. If this is the case, how can we blithely disregard the role of suicide enablers?

The ACLU is smart enough to know that Carter's conviction may

work against its efforts to support euthanasia. The Massachusetts chapter director, Matthew Segal, knows what is at stake. "If allowed to stand, Ms. Carter's conviction could chill important and worthwhile end-of-life discussions between loved ones across the Commonwealth."

From a Catholic perspective, Carter's conviction may also put the brakes on doctors and insurance agents, as well as family members and friends, who have an extrinsic motive to put down a troubled person. In this case, Carter's role was so obvious that it is hard to write her conduct off as purely a matter of free speech.

Martin W. Healy is the chief counsel of the Massachusetts Bar Association. Here is what he had to say about this case. "The defendant's fate was sealed through the use of her own words. The communications illustrated a deeply troubled defendant whose actions rose to the level of wanton and reckless disregard for the life of the victim."

Interestingly, Carter herself agrees. Three months after Conrad's death, she sent a text to a friend saying, "his death is my fault, like honestly I could have stopped him. I was on the phone with him and he got out of the car because it was working and he got scared and I f***ing told him to get back in [the truck]." He did, and that is why he is dead.

Words matter. They can even kill.

ATHEISTS SHOULD SUE SUPREME

COURT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a church and state complaint made by an atheist organization:

Most atheists are not terrified by religion, but the activists in their ranks are in a state of hysteria these days. Prominent among them is the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF).

FFRF has written a threatening letter to Dan Hughes, mayor of Henderson County in Tennessee. The issue? A biblical verse from Psalms etched in the wall of the local county courthouse; it has been there for more than a half century.

It's time for FFRF to do the manly thing and sue the U.S. Supreme Court.

If the militant atheists were to visit the Supreme Court, they would be apoplectic before entering: Moses and the Ten Commandments are inscribed near the top of the building.

Assuming they survived this indignity, their sensibilities would be assaulted again—even before they actually entered—by noting the Ten Commandments engraved on the lower portion of the two oak doors.

EMS personnel would have to be summoned next: inside the high court, right above where the Justices sit, is another display of the Ten Commandments.

If the atheist fundamentalists think they can escape God by walking around Washington, they are wrong: the federal buildings and the monuments will give them no relief—Christian proverbs and images are everywhere, so much so that they pose a clear and present danger to their health.

Congress needs to authorize warning signs in the D.C. airports, alerting atheist lunatics of the need to guard their

health before walking the halls of government. That would be the Christian thing to do.