

# LAURA INGRAHAM'S CATHOLICISM UNDER FIRE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article by Joe Lapointe that was published by the Observer:

It is hardly a secret that many on the Left are militant secularists who hate religion, saving a special loathing for Roman Catholicism. The latest evidence appears today online by Joe Lapointe.

I had to look him up. He was a "segment producer" for the always-fired Keith Olbermann, which means he did not have a full-time job. He also "taught journalism" at New York University, which means he did not have a full-time job. No matter, this struggling part-timer has now caught our eye at the Catholic League.

Ingraham's new show on Fox News started last night. Lapointe begins his screed calling her "The Church Lady." He says she "appeared before us in purple vestments that highlighted the gleaming gold cross on her chest."

The cross. That is what set him off. Had Laura been a Jew wearing a Star of David he would have said nothing about it. But the cross is different—radical extremists have killed over it, and are doing so again today.

Lapointe expressed his anger at Laura for telling White House Chief of Staff John Kelly that there are "very few Christians" being helped by U.S. immigration policy. The gypsy scholar did not dispute her statement, because he could not. So he called her a "fundamentalist Catholic extremist." Why? The cross. It's the cross that drives him mad.

Today is Halloween. Good time to recall that the only thing that scared Dracula was the cross. Which in my book makes

Lapointe Son of Dracula.

Watch out for the bats tonight—it could be Lapointe in disguise.

Contact: [editorial@observer.com](mailto:editorial@observer.com)

---

## **GOP LEADERS ADDRESS ANTI-CATHOLICISM**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks made yesterday by Republican leaders who spoke against anti-Catholicism:

Senate Republicans, joined by three Democrats, stopped a filibuster of the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett to the 7th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals; the vote was 54-42. Final confirmation is due soon.

It was two Mormon Republicans, Senator Orrin Hatch and Senator Mike Lee, who made the most impassioned defense of Barrett's nomination.

The Notre Dame law professor's religious convictions were attacked recently by Senator Dianne Feinstein and Senator Dick Durbin, thus teeing up a response from those supporting her. Both Democrats questioned her suitability to be seated on the federal bench given her strong Catholic beliefs. Neither has apologized for their bigoted remarks.

Senator Hatch did not hold back in his statement. "I have to say that we stoop pretty low if we start to raise questions of religious beliefs before somebody can serve on the federal judiciary. Now I hope that that type of questioning will hit

the dustbin of history, where it belongs.”

Senator Lee was just as pointed. He said “the fact of her religious beliefs or religious affiliation have nothing to do with her qualifications to serve as a federal appellate court judge.”

Lee also took a shot at those Democrats who made snide remarks about her Catholicism. “They were asking, ‘Do you actually believe that stuff? Do you actually believe the doctrine of your church? Do you believe it deeply, sincerely?’ Suggesting that if so, that is somehow a problem.”

Feinstein, who is Jewish, tried to deflect charges of anti-Catholicism by referencing her attendance at a Catholic school. Durbin, who is Catholic, referenced his Catholic status. But credentials do not matter: What matters are words. On this count, both of them came very close to invoking a religious test against Professor Barrett, something which is barred by the Constitution.

Hopefully, Barrett’s confirmation proceedings will continue absent any more of these invidious outbursts. Kudos to Senators Hatch and Lee, two devout Mormons, for standing on principle and against anti-Catholic bigotry.

---

## **ATTACK ON BISHOP MORLINO IS SCURRILOUS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on recent attacks on Bishop Robert Morlino of the Diocese of Madison (Wisconsin):

Catholics in the Diocese of Madison are very fortunate to have such a brilliant and courageous leader in Bishop Robert Morlino. He is currently under attack by dissident Catholics, ex-Catholics, and those who never were Catholic, for merely upholding the teachings of the Catholic Church.

The uproar is wholly unjustified, and is indeed scurrilous. It was occasioned when the vicar general of the Diocese of Madison, James Bartylla, recently told his priests how to handle funeral rites for persons known publicly to have been involved in a homosexual relationship. His remarks were not meant as “official diocesan policy,” though they certainly had the backing of the bishop.

One would think from the reaction by DignityUSA, an organization that has long been in open defiance of the Church’s teachings on sexuality, and Faithful America, a left-wing group frequently at war with the bishops, that Bartylla had condemned homosexuals, barring them from a Catholic burial. That is a lie. He did nothing of the sort.

The vicar general’s comments were entirely measured. To begin with, he was not talking about the burial of homosexuals, *per se*; rather, he was addressing those instances where a homosexual was involved in a *public union* with his partner. What should a priest do when confronted by the family of the deceased about a person who was in such a relationship? Bartylla instructed them to “think through the issue thoroughly and prudently.”

The micro issue involved in this matter is the funeral rites for homosexuals known to be engaged in a public relationship. The macro issue is scandal.

Citing canon law, Bartylla said that “ecclesiastical funeral rites may be denied for manifest sinners in which public scandal of the faithful can’t be avoided...” Scandal, as defined by the *Catechism*, is “a grave offense if by deed or

omission another is deliberately led into a grave offense.” In other words, causing scandal—inviting others to believe that it is morally acceptable to engage in sinful behavior—is the big issue.

The *Catholic Herald* offered a cogent statement on this subject two years ago. “Canon law makes it clear that funerals should be refused to manifest sinners to whom a Church funeral could not be granted without public scandal to the faithful.”

In 2014, Pope Francis illuminated the macro issue involved when he excommunicated members of the Mafia: their public profile made them “manifest sinners,” thus offering “public scandal to the faithful.” The central concern for the pope had nothing to do with crime—never mind public declarations of homosexuality—it had to do with sending the wrong signal to the faithful by acquiescing in the deeds of “manifest sinners.”

I know Bishop Morlino as a kind person who holds no animus against any person or group of persons. He deserves our support. Shame on those agenda-ridden activists who are out to smear him.

Let Bishop Morlino know of your support:  
[officeofbishop@madisondiocese.org](mailto:officeofbishop@madisondiocese.org)

---

## **HALLOWEEN'S RELIGIOUS COSTUMES LACK DIVERSITY**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on religious Halloween costumes:

Every Halloween we are treated to an extensive array of Catholic costumes, usually featuring priests and nuns. Some of the selections are cute; some are borderline offensive; and still others clearly cross the line. This year is no different.

Regarding the three categories, we never object to cutesy or borderline garb: political correctness has gone too far and we all need to lighten up. The only time we complain is when (a) the costumes are offensive and (b) similar costumes depicting non-Catholic religious figures are not available.

There are many companies that sell religious Halloween costumes on the Internet. Some are quite good. Our favorite is Costume Supercenter: nothing it sells crosses the line. By crossing the line we mean costumes that feature a priest sporting an erection and a pregnant nun in habit.

The offensive priest and nun outfits can be found on several Internet sites, but the website that boasts "The biggest selection of costumes in the world!" is simply called Halloween Costumes. The Minnesota-based company lists its phone number on its website, so I decided to give them a call.

I was number seven in line waiting for an agent, and when some nice woman answered, I told her how impressed I was with their huge selection. I then told her that I noticed that they had a costume of a priest with an erection, and wanted to know if they had any minister, imam, or rabbi costumes featuring the clergyman with an erection. She said she didn't think so.

Then I asked about their Native American costumes. I asked if they had any Indian costumes with an erection. She said she didn't know.

Then I asked if the failure to have costumes of clergymen from other religions with an erection was a function of demand. She said that is probably the case.

So I told her I could fix that problem: I said I would buy 100 rabbi costumes, providing the figure was shown with an erection. She said she didn't know if they had any in their warehouse, and did not know if they would make any for me. I reminded her that she said such costumes were not sold; she did not disagree.

I then said I was really looking forward to seeing what a costume of a Muslim cleric with an erection would look like.

Finally, I told her who I was. She got a little nervous, so I ended the call.

Whatever happened to diversity? Don't these people believe in inclusion? Why aren't minister, imam, and rabbi costumes made that mimic the priest one? I think we know why, and so do they.

*Contact Halloween Costumes CEO Tom Fallenstein:*  
[tom.fallenstein@fun.com](mailto:tom.fallenstein@fun.com)

*Ask him why he pulled an "Anne Frank" costume when Jewish groups complained, issuing an apology. What is he going to do about his aroused priest and pregnant nun costumes?*

---

## PELOSI SEEKS TO RESTORE HHS MANDATE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks made by Rep. Nancy Pelosi on October 26:

Rep. Nancy Pelosi spoke at the Congressional Pro-Choice Caucus on October 26 urging her colleagues to overturn President Trump's rollback of the Obama administration's Health and

Human Services (HHS) mandate. She supports a new bill, the Protect Access to Birth Control Act, that restores funding for services provided by the HHS mandate.

Pelosi called the Trump rollback “outrageous,” saying it was a “cruel decision.” She did not say why it was cruel to make women pay for their own birth control pills.

She even went so far as to say that “No women should be made to choose between obtaining contraceptives and paying for groceries.” Why not? More to the point, why is it “outrageous” to require women to choose between buying pills or potatoes? They do that now, don’t they?

More important, Pelosi once again misrepresented the HHS mandate.

Pelosi focused her entire statement on birth control. She never once indicated that the HHS mandate forces the public to pay for abortion-inducing drugs. She also personalized the subject, bringing her children into it.

“I have five children,” she said. “When I took my baby home from the hospital, my fifth child, my oldest child was turning six that week—that week. God blessed us, it was glorious and the rest. That doesn’t mean that is the way it should go for anybody else. Women and families should have that determination.”

It is nice to know that Pelosi opted to allow her children to be born. Regrettably, as a public policy matter she is not prepared to extend that right to all children.

Pelosi’s enthusiasm for abortion is objectionable enough, but she throws more coals on the fire every time she invokes her religion. Pelosi is a dissident Catholic: she rejects the Church’s teaching on an issue branded “intrinsically evil” by the Catechism. Now, in her statement attacking the president, she added to her assault on the religious liberty rights of



the Little Sisters of the Poor. Don't those women's rights count?

Pro-abortion and anti-religious liberty. Those are two of Nancy Pelosi's most defining characteristics.

---

## **TRUMP OFFERS NEW HOPE TO MIDDLE EAST CHRISTIANS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Trump's decision to begin providing direct assistance to persecuted Christians in the Middle East:

Vice President Pence's Wednesday night announcement is welcome news indeed. As he pointed out, while "radical Islamic terrorists" continue to wage a campaign of genocide against Christians throughout the Middle East, the UN has been woefully ineffective in providing help to the terrorists' Christian victims. A number of faith-based groups with proven track records stand ready to help, the Vice President said, but "the United Nations too often denies their funding requests."

So now the United States will provide assistance to these faith-based and private groups directly, rather than funneling U.S. funds through the United Nations, where they are too often misdirected or misused.

For far too long, persecuted Christians in the Middle East have waited in vain for the world community to come to their aid. And for far too long, the world community has failed to provide even adequate humanitarian assistance. Now, as Vice President Pence said, "those days are over." America will take

the lead in helping these beleaguered people.

This action should give new hope to all those suffering Christians, and to all who believe in the sacred cause of religious freedom. The president continues to deliver on his promise to fight religious persecution and to defend religious liberty, both here at home and around the world.

---

## **CENSORING HALLOWEEN**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on efforts to censor Halloween:

No place in America is supposed to be a bastion of free speech more than a college campus, but it gave up that mantle long ago. Next week it will go into high gear—it has already begun—banning Halloween costumes deemed offensive. Offensive to whom? Liberal sensibilities, of course.

Last month, Disney pulled its “Moana” costume after charges of racism surfaced. No one should read this as a statement against bigotry: Disney has a long history of making anti-Catholic movies and television shows.

When Jewish groups complained about a new costume for girls, “Anne Frank,” it was quickly taken off the Internet. The apologies were plentiful.

Amazon was selling its Oscar Pistorius “Blade Runner” costume until, that is, it was accused of insensitivity.

Typing “Halloween priest costumes” in the Yahoo search engine yields pages and pages of listings. Typing “Halloween transgender costumes” yields practically nothing, save for complaints about them.

This is political correctness run amuck. More to come on priest costumes.

---

## NUNS GET TRASHED IN “NOVITIATE”

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on “Novitiate,” a limited-release movie that opens October 27:

There is a reason why “Novitiate” will open in only two cities this Friday, New York and Los Angeles, even though it has Sony money behind it: the appetite for Catholic-bashing movies is greatest in those two cities.

Hollywood, fresh off a sex scandal involving women and children, is a bastion of liberalism, a place where stereotypes of blacks, Hispanics, Indians, homosexuals, Jews, and Muslims are universally condemned. But Hollywood does make one exception: Catholics. Ditto for New York.

A story about young nuns would not be tolerated in Hollywood unless it trashed them. This explains why “Novitiate” scored big time at the Sundance Film Festival earlier this year. The *New York Times*, no stranger to anti-Catholicism, is offering a preview Thursday night for those who belong to its Film Club.

Stereotypes about nuns *always* involve sexuality and cruelty. “Novitiate” does not disappoint. Naturally, all the nuns are in habit—a film about progressive sisters in skirts wearing makeup and earrings will *never* be made; there is no audience for it. Unlike the “Sound of Music,” this film is rated R for language, sexuality and nudity.

Maggie Betts is the genius behind the movie. Neither Catholic nor religious, she says she read a book about Mother Teresa and was impressed. So what did this director and screenwriter do next? Read more about the saintly nun? No, she decided to read one book after another written by embittered ex-nuns who bolted after Vatican II.

The movie centers on two nuns, Cathleen and the Mother Superior. In the movie, Cathleen's mother is an agnostic who is not too happy about her daughter becoming a nun. Betts chose Margaret Qualley to play Cathleen. It was a good choice—Qualley is an atheist.

Cathleen desperately wanted to become a nun, but unfortunately for her she entered the convent at a time when Vatican II reforms left many parts of the Church in crisis. Not only did poor Cathleen get caught up in the changes, so did Sister Evelyn, Sister Emily, and Sister Margaret.

Hollywood cannot make a movie about young nuns without portraying them as sexually repressed, and on this measure, "Novitiate" is a home run. Not only are the gals horny beyond belief, they all suffer from sexual impulses *during the consecration*. That's right, at the most sacred part of the Mass, the nuns are depicted as orgasmic. The fact that virtually all the reviewers missed this only proves their ignorance of all matters Catholic.

"Novitiate" wouldn't fulfill stereotypical expectations unless it featured a wicked Mother Superior. This one is a grand slam: the tyrannical nun is easy to hate.

Some of the early reviews are precious. Proving once more that even Catholic-hating liberals do not want to be called a bigot, they bend over backward to show how sophisticated they are. One lout said the movie "isn't anti-religion but it certainly doesn't pull its punches when showcasing how cruel its leaders can be." Another wizard said, "This isn't an

overly-religious film, nor does it attempt to proselytize or convert the viewer.”

Notice that they do not say it is a movie about Catholicism—it’s merely a “religious film.” The latter reviewer wins first prize. But it is debatable whether it should be for stupidity or lying: In actual fact, “Novitiate” strains in its attempt to proselytize and convert. It’s just that its goal is to get the audience to hate the Roman Catholic Church.

Contact Sony Pictures Classic: [Lauren\\_DeAngelis@spe.sony.com](mailto:Lauren_DeAngelis@spe.sony.com)

---

## **“SPOTLIGHT” CREW GIVES WEINSTEIN A PASS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the reaction of the “Spotlight” crew to Harvey Weinstein:

“Spotlight” won an Oscar for best picture in 2016 for its portrayal of the clergy sexual abuse scandal in the Archdiocese of Boston. At least nine of those associated with this film have worked with Harvey Weinstein, yet eight have said nothing about his sexual abuse, and all nine refuse to indict Hollywood the way they have the Catholic Church.

No one who worked on “Spotlight” was more condemnatory of the Catholic Church than actor Mark Ruffalo. On the day the movie won the Oscar, he participated in a rally with SNAP (Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests), a fully discredited band of lying anti-Catholic activists. He took the occasion to blast the Catholic Church.

It is telling that Ruffalo has not sought center stage registering his outrage at his buddy, Harvey Weinstein. Ruffalo starred in two Weinstein films, "Begin Again" and "Can a Song Save Your Life?" The best he could do was to issue a two-sentence tweet saying that it was "horrible" what Weinstein did. How brave.

Unlike the Catholic Church, which Ruffalo blamed for not posting the names of sexual abusers, he has said nothing about the breadth and depth of Hollywood's culpability in sexual abuse and child rape. Moreover, if Hollywood were to list the names of all the predators and perverts in Tinseltown, it would take an army of researchers to compile.

When "Spotlight" won the Oscar, producer Michael Sugar did not pass up the opportunity to lecture the pope. "Pope Francis," he bellowed on TV, "it's time to protect the children and restore the faith." But when it comes to his friend Harvey, whom he knows well, Sugar goes mute. Why isn't he shouting about Hollywood's need to protect *women and children* from the claws of those who work there?

"Spotlight" director Tom McCarthy also joined the SNAP rally attacking the Catholic Church. He worked with Weinstein in the film "Good Will Hunting." He has been totally silent on Weinstein's unseemly conduct, and wouldn't be caught dead in a rally against Hollywood abusers.

Peter Lawson, the executive producer of "Spotlight," bragged how the movie was "getting these guys [miscreant priests] up in front of the Vatican." He is a close associate of Harvey Weinstein, having been executive vice president of acquisitions and co-productions at The Weinstein Company. He has said nothing about Weinstein's behavior, and has shown no interest in "getting" Hollywood predators.

John Slattery, who starred in "Spotlight," did not shy from making sweeping generalizations about priests as abusers. "Ask

anyone—it was someone they knew, someone they went to school with, some teacher, or the priest, and it was kept under wraps,” he said.

Well, I would like to ask Slattery—he is currently in production for a Weinstein movie, “The Romanoffs”—one question: Why have you said not a word about your boss? Also, is he going to deny that if we asked the housekeeping staff who work in Hollywood studios that they couldn’t tell us endless tales of sexual exploitation? “Ask anyone,” Slattery.

Another actor in “Spotlight” was Stanley Tucci. He hollered that “if it’s happening in Boston, you know it’s happening all over the place. If it’s that systemic in one city...the Catholic Church, it’s all connected.” Imagine how much Tucci could tell us about the systemic sexual abuse that defines Hollywood! But he won’t address that. And even though he was in the Weinstein film, “Shall We Dance?”, he has said absolutely nothing about Weinstein.

Liev Schreiber was in “Spotlight” and, like the others, spoke out against the Church. He starred in four Weinstein movies, “The Butler,” “Scream,” “Scream 2,” and “Scream 3.” But he is not screaming about Weinstein’s indefensible conduct, and indeed has not said a word.

Actor Billy Crudup was in “Spotlight,” and he lobbied to end the statute of limitations for priestly sexual abuse. He had a role in the Weinstein film, “Dedication.” But he has never uttered a word about either Weinstein’s behavior or the need to rid Hollywood of civil liberties.

Rachel McAdams is my favorite. She starred in Weinstein’s “Southpaw” and “The Time Traveler’s Wife.” She can’t bring herself to slam Weinstein but she sure made a spectacle of herself speaking about priests. Young men, she said, “go into the priesthood when they’re nine years old *or even younger*, and they’re raised by men who are not necessarily sane.” (My

emphasis.) Only someone who is not necessarily sane is capable of making such a remark.

So there we have it. These people are much worse than the typical phonies who work in the entertainment industry. They are quick to point fingers at priests, quick to make wild generalizations about the Catholic Church, quick to join demonstrations against the Church, and quick to moralize about Catholicism. But when it comes to their sick friend, the only thing they are quick to do is run away.

Hollywood's moral capital was never in big supply, but now it is shot altogether. We don't need one more lecture about cover-ups and sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. When it comes to deceit, lying, and sexual deviance, Hollywood has no rival.

---

## **LAWRENCE O'DONNELL RIPS IRISH CATHOLICS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks made by Lawrence O'Donnell on his MSNBC show last night:

When a person makes a mean-spirited bigoted comment, he is not exculpated if he is a member of the group he disparages. What matters is not the biography of the bigot: what matters is the bigoted comment.

Lawrence O'Donnell proved once again that he, as an Irish Catholic, is not immune from charges of anti-Catholicism. Here is what this embittered man said on October 19:

"In John Kelly's neighborhood, in the Catholic parish that he



grew up in, in the Catholic parish that I grew up in, women were getting beaten by their husbands, their drunken husbands as a normal weekly occurrence.”

Perhaps O'Donnell's drunken father beat his mother. I don't know. If so, it would explain why he projected his own abusive experience onto others. But even if that were true, it is no excuse. If his father was not a violent drunk, and did not savage his mother, then O'Donnell's remark is even more indefensible.

O'Donnell owes all Catholics, especially Irish Catholics, an apology.

Contact: [msnbctvinfo@nbcuni.com](mailto:msnbctvinfo@nbcuni.com)