

# SANCTIONS WARRANTED AGAINST REP. OMAR

Catholic League president Bill Donohue is calling for sanctions against Rep. Ilhan Omar:

I am contacting House Ethics Committee chairman Rep. Ted Deutch (D) and Ranking Member Rep. Kenny Marchant (R) asking them to lead the way in imposing sanctions on Rep. Ilhan Omar (D).

The Somali freshman congresswoman from Minnesota has violated Rule XXIII, Section 1, of the Code of Official Conduct, which says, "A Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, officer, or employee of the House shall behave at all times in a manner that shall reflect creditably on the House."

Rep. Omar violated this stricture when she tweeted the following unsubstantiated accusation against the Covington Catholic High School students.

"The boys were protesting a woman's right to choose & yelled 'it's not rape if you enjoy it'—They were taunting 5 Black men before they surrounded [Nathan] Phillips and led racist chants—Sandmann's family hired a right wing PR firm to write his non-apology."

She has since taken down this vile tweet. The boys from Covington Catholic did not engage in racist rhetoric, never taunted the black activists and, most importantly, did not yell "it's not rape if you enjoy it." Rep. Deutch and Rep. Marchant should demand to see Rep. Omar's evidence. If she had it, she would have released it by now and would not have taken down her lying tweet.

Rep. Omar has libeled these students and in doing so has promoted anti-Catholicism. She is supposed to act

“creditably,” and not just in the House chamber, but “at all times.” Thus does she warrant sanctions.

I am not asking for censure. House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer rejected a plea last week for censuring Rep. Steve King, fearing an onslaught of complaints that have free speech implications. Instead, he moved it to the Ethics Committee. That being the case, the Ethics Committee should now treat Rep. Omar the way they are Rep. King. The two of them have disgraced the House.

*Contact Josh Rogin, chief of staff for Rep. Deutch:*  
[joshua.rogin@mail.house.gov](mailto:joshua.rogin@mail.house.gov)

---

## ASSESSING THE COVINGTON CATHOLIC CRITICS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on critics of the Covington Catholic High School students involved in the fracas on January 18:

Having addressed the events of January 18 (click [here](#)), I now want to assess some of the most prominent critics of the Covington Catholic students. That the students were not the guilty party in the dustup is obvious to every fair-minded person who has seen, or learned about, the second video.

I did not issue a statement on this incident before today, and for good reason: the Catholic League defends wrongdoing committed against individual Catholics and the institutional Church; it does not defend wrongdoing done by either.

Those who weighed in on this story include some members of the

Catholic clergy, Catholic lay leaders, and non-Catholics. Some were temperate in their remarks and some were vicious. Some have issued a full-throated apology, while others have offered less than a complete apology. Others are sticking to their guns. Two persons went off the cliff.

Erik Abriss was fired after he wished the students and their parents were dead. "I just want these people to die. Simple as that. And their parents." The freelance writer for Vulture was terminated by INE Entertainment, a digital company. Comedian Kathy Griffin took second prize. She wants the students hunted down. "Names please. And stories from people who can identify them and vouch for their identity." No wonder the students have received death threats.

It does not please me to say that the most irresponsible voices in this controversy have come from the Catholic clergy.

On the day of the incident, the Diocese of Covington and Covington Catholic High School issued a joint statement saying, "We condemn the actions of the Covington Catholic High School students towards Nathan Phillips specifically, and Native Americans in general...We extend our deepest apologies to Mr. Phillips. This behavior is opposed to the Church's teachings on the dignity and respect for the human person." They promised to "take appropriate action, up to and including expulsion."

What should be condemned is what the Diocese and the school said on January 22. It said that a "third-party investigation" is planned regarding what happened between "Covington Catholic students, Elder Nathan Phillips and Black Hebrew Israelites." What part of the second video does it not find persuasive?

After condemning the students without knowing their side—they did not call for an investigation on Friday—they are now going to probe this "very serious matter that has already permanently altered the lives of many people." It sure has—the

students have been damaged. Sadly, the Diocese and the school have played a major part in this tragedy.

Three of the most pro-LGBT priests in the nation slammed the students. Father James Martin ripped the students for “sham[ing] and disrespect[ing] a man at the Indigenous People’s March,” saying that what they did was “not Catholic, not Christian and not acceptable.”

Martin later said, “I would like to apologize to them for my judgment of them.” He elaborates by saying that “we may never know what was going on inside the hearts of the students.” We certainly don’t know what they were thinking, and that is because the student at the center of the standoff, Nick Sandmann, never opened his mouth. Phillips was the one who walked over to the student and taunted him with his drum.

It is important to note that we have a very clear understanding of what was on the minds of the black Israelites—they bashed whites, blacks, Hispanics, and gays. One might have thought that the gay bashing would have gotten Martin’s back up, but apparently he was unfazed by it. He did not help himself by saying, “despite repeated viewings of all the videos, and reading all the participants’ statements, these actions remain unclear.” He does not disclose the source of his confusion.

Father Dan Horan, a Franciscan, went off the deep end. “I’m so deeply appalled and disgusted by the racist, shameful, disrespectful behavior of the Catholic high school students wearing MAGA (“Make America Great Again”) hats and harassing a Native American elder and Vietnam Vet. I’m so angry and yet not at all surprised at pervasive white supremacy exhibited.”

I am appalled and disgusted that a priest would make such a totally unfounded condemnation of these Catholic students. He even admits in a later tweet that “even if a third party provoked, it doesn’t justify their behavior.” There it is.

Even if the students didn't provoke anything—and we know they did not—they are still guilty.

Father Edward Beck is a Passionist priest with a passion for liberal-left causes. The second video had zero effect on him. He said his “feelings” are “unchanged,” saying the “boys should not have been permitted to wear MAGA hats if they were representing the school.” Would Beck have objected if the students were wearing a pro-Hillary hat? Not on your life.

Among Catholic laypersons, no one did a better job of apologizing, without qualification, than Princeton's Robert George and *First Thing's* Matthew Schmitz. Robbie said, “I apologize to the Covington Catholic boys.” He added, “I jumped the gun and that was stupid and unjust. It is I, not the boys, who needs to take a lesson from this.” Hard to beat that.

Matt Schmitz was also excellent. “It's easy to find fault in others, difficult to admit our own. For what it's worth, I believe that the boys acted in a more moral and Christian manner than those who condemned them and then refused to admit the error.” Honest and thoughtful.

Sobrab Ahmari, a convert to Catholicism and op-ed editor of the *New York Post*, made a commendable statement to the students. “I also failed you. I rebuked you, though more mildly than others did, because I too can sometimes be credulous in the face of a media consensus; lesson learned.” Well said.

Jeannie Mancini, who leads the March for Life, dived into this mess with both feet by condemning the students for their “reprehensible behavior.” Now that she has had time to reconsider her remarks, she refuses to do so. But she did find time to delete her accusatory tweet.

Talking-head Hugh Hewitt has also taken down his offensive tweet about the students. He lectured the students on their need for “respect, forgiveness, courtesy.” It is he who needs

to do so, beginning with an apology to the students whom he has maligned.

CNN's Kirsten Powers is looking more foolish by the minute indicting the students for their "white privilege," a subject that she should know very well. She owns it.

Among non-Catholics, Rod Dreher began walking back two of his harsh tweets, though without offering an apology. But he mostly took the side of the students, noting how irresponsible the media have been. He took them to task for "conveniently ignor[ing] the provocative, racist, foul-mouthed attacks on the boys by one of Phillips's Native American companions." Exactly.

*National Review* has been on both sides of this issue. Rich Lowry criticized the boys but then took down his tweet. He also took down the incendiary tweet by his colleague, Nick Frankovich. "The Covington Students Might as Well Have Just Spit on the Cross. They mock a serious frail-looking older man and gloat in their momentary role as Roman soldiers to his Christ."

With a comment like that, it is clear that Lowry has a loose cannon on his hands. A more recent article by Kyle Smith, which was quite good, was posted on the website of the magazine, suggesting that Lowry got the message.

*New York Times* columnist David Brooks has a mostly fair take on the controversy in the paper's January 22 edition, but it is marred by one key omission. He admits that "The Covington case was such a blatant rush to judgment—it was powered by crude prejudice and social stereotyping—I'm hoping it will be an important pivot point." It would have been helpful had he said that it was Catholic males who were the victims of prejudice and stereotyping. It would have been even better had he told the readers that his first statement on this issue was to criticize the boys.

Author Reza Aslan seemed to invite violence against Sandmann by saying he never saw a more “punchable face” than his. Aslan has taken down his vile tweet though he leaves up some despicable comments he found worthy of retweeting.

Bill Kristol, who has finally found a home with the Never Trumpers at CNN, blasted the students and then took down his tweets. What a class act. He offered no apology.

Howard Dean said he wants the school to close because it is a “hate factory.” He has offered no retraction or an apology for his jackass remarks.

The Catholic League fights anti-Catholicism and, like every organization, we make mistakes as well. But when we do we own up, which is why I am not at the least bit bothered by those who have apologized to the students. For them, it’s over, at least as far as I am concerned.

Why did some really good people make a mistake? I contacted Robbie George about this, and he was frank as always. When he saw the first video clip, it looked like the students were taunting the Native American man. A staunch pro-life intellectual, he said, “I was extremely concerned about how such behavior could give our great movement a bad name. So, much too hastily I issued a condemnation. When I saw the full video the next day, I realized I had been misled by the short clip. I immediately apologized, no ifs, ands, or buts.”

Robbie did exactly that and his reasoning was sound.

What accounts for the most hateful comments? As someone who fights anti-Catholicism, it would be tempting to conclude that it is old-fashioned anti-Catholic bigotry. This is certainly true of the Indians—they tried to crash a Mass on Saturday—and of the black thugs who attacked virtually everyone, but it does not explain everything.

Surely the Diocese of Covington and the school are not driven

by bigotry, so what explains their lame response? Their statement focuses much on Native Americans. It is sad but true that there are some in the Catholic Church today who are more sensitive to the rights of minorities than they are their own people. This is Exhibit A.

What else is in play? Politics. The politics of hate, made manifest in the delirious hatred of President Trump. It is the pro-Trump hat-cited by many—that drove them over the top. They need help.

Will anything be learned from this? For some, the answer is yes, but regrettably such persons are likely to be in a minority.

---

## **VIDEO EXONERATES CATHOLIC STUDENTS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Kentucky Catholic students and what actually happened:

There were three parties to the dustup that occurred on January 18.

Catholic students from Covington Catholic High School in Kentucky, who had participated in the March for Life, assembled on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial waiting for buses to take them home. In the same vicinity were Native Americans; they had come for the Indigenous Peoples Rally. Black Israelites, who believe that black Americans are God's chosen people (they claim to be the real descendants of the Hebrews), were also there.



Initial news reports blamed the students. One of the students, Nick Sandmann, was shown smirking at a Native American man, Nathan Phillips—who was standing very close to the student beating a drum—and it quickly became a social media sensation. Much was made of the Donald Trump hat that Sandmann and other students wore, “Make America Great Again.” The students were shown in a short video laughing and chanting. They were accused of mocking the 64-year-old Phillips.

The Diocese of Covington and Covington Catholic High School issued a joint statement apologizing for what happened and pledged to investigate the matter; they said sanctions would be forthcoming, possibly expulsion.

Politicians, pundits, and bloggers went wild. A second video emerged, one that was much longer, and it shows that the black Israelites were the real thugs. Moreover, interviews given by Phillips show him to be a liar.

Here is a selection of news reports on the second video that was published on January 21.

*The following was taken from [abc.net.au/news](http://abc.net.au/news).*

“The Black Israelites had a spot on the steps where they quoted from the Bible and yelled abuse, some of it racist.

“‘You got all these dirty-ass crackers behind you with a red Make America Great Again hat on,’ one of the Black Israelites said in the video of the event filmed by another of their members.

“Later, the man told another person: ‘I bet you’re a dumb-ass Puerto Rican.’

“He also abused African Americans nearby.

“As the abuse continued, the school students surrounded the Black Israelites and started to sing songs, dance and cheer each other on, drowning them out.

"At one point in the video one of the black men told the students around him, 'You got on the back of the court system 'In God we trust', on the back of the dollar bill it says 'In God we trust', but you give faggots rights.'"

The news story also said "Footage does not show students seeking out Mr. Phillips, or 'attacking' him," thus corroborating the statement by Sandmann that was released to the press. It was Phillips who approached the students.

*The following was taken from CNN Wire.*

"In the new video, another group taunts the students from Covington Catholic High School in Kentucky with disparaging and vulgar language. The group of black men, who identify as members of the Hebrew Israelites, also shout racist slurs at participants of the Indigenous Peoples Rally and other passersby.

"The men [black Israelites] repeatedly use the n-word to refer to the black teens in the group, prompting cries from the group. The men ask the students if the water they're drinking 'tastes like incest' and call the students 'young Klansmen.'

"The teens listen for a few minutes longer, accusing the men of being racist and booing when the main speaker uses the word 'faggots' when talking about equal rights.

"Then, the students get a signal from off camera to leave. They cheer and wave, chanting 'let's go home' as they run off.

"The video continues for another 20 minutes as the men turn their focus to a prayer circle that formed while they were talking to the students. The lead speaker shouts denunciations of the Catholic church, calling its members 'child molesters' and quotes scripture."

*The following is from the New York Times.*

Speaking of the first video, the paper notes that the students

were widely criticized. "But on Sunday, Mr. Phillips clarified that it was he who had approached the crowd and that he had intervened because racial tensions—primarily between the white students and the black men—were 'coming to a boiling point.'

"In his statement, Mr. Sandmann said he did not antagonize or try to block Mr. Phillips. 'I did not speak to him. I did not make any hand gesture or other aggressive moves,' he said.

"I did smile at one point because I wanted him to know that I was not going to become angry, intimidated or be provoked into a larger confrontation," he said. 'I am a faithful Christian and practicing Catholic, and I always try to live up to the ideals my faith teaches me—to remain respectful of others, and to take no action that would lead to conflict or violence.'"

*The following is from the Washington Post:*

"The Israelites and students exchanged taunts, videos show. The Native Americans and Hebrew Israelites say some students shouted, 'Build the wall!' although that chant is not heard on the widely circulated videos, and the Cincinnati Enquirer quoted a student at the center of the confrontation who said he did not hear anyone say it.

"At one point, the Hebrew Israelites began arguing with Native American activists, telling them the word 'Indian' means 'savage,' according to the video."

Regarding Phillips, the Native American told the *Washington Post* that he sought to act as an intermediary between the white students and the black provocateurs. But peacemakers don't taunt, and that is what he did: he taunted Sandmann by beating his drum in his face. More important, he told the *Detroit News* that the white boys provoked the black men, which is (a) not true and (b) does not square with what he told the *Post*.

The critics of the students have a lot of explaining to do. I

will address them in a separate statement.

---

# **ABORTION IS DANGEROUS FOR WOMEN**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how abortion endangers women:

Honest men and women know that abortion kills, but what about the dangers to women who elect to have one?

Last month, the CEO of Planned Parenthood Advocates of Ohio argued that “abortion is one of the safest medical procedures.” Not for the child it isn’t, but that was not her point: Iris Harvey was talking about women who undergo an abortion.

On January 16, the far-left wing website, [rewire.news](#) (it is cheering the end of the “anti-Christ,” meaning President Trump) called abortion “extremely safe,” maintaining that it “does not cause mental or physical health problems.”

The truth of the matter can be found by listening to what doctors who work in the Emergency Room have to say about abortion, not by swallowing the moonshine of pro-abortion activists.

Last year, I was contacted by Dr. W. Matt Zban, a well-respected emergency room physician from Charlotte, North Carolina. He relayed some disturbing news about his encounter with women who have had an abortion. Here is his first missive.

“I am an emergency room physician and see complications of

abortion several times a year. Endometritis (uterine infection), sepsis (blood stream infection), pelvic pain, heavy vaginal bleeding, and death are all complications of legal abortion. Occasionally hysterectomies have to be performed following these complications."

These women may very well die in New York State if Gov. Andrew Cuomo gets his way. He wants to allow non-physicians to perform abortions. None will be able to help women the way Dr. Zban has.

Here is Dr. Zban's second email correspondence, sent to me on December 14, 2018.

"Approximately one week ago a young woman was sent to ER (from abortion clinic) as she was given too much sedation resulting in depressed consciousness, slow breathing and low blood pressure. Narcan was given to reverse the effect of the narcotic. She was approx. 15 weeks pregnant. She came w/no records from the clinic and when we called to get info on the patient and what happened the clinic would not respond. They created a complication and 'washed their hands of it.' We didn't even know if the baby was still in her, or not.

"Their website said they closed at 2:00 p.m. and we started calling them at 12:45 p.m. Our nurse was on hold for 30 min w/o answer. We called more times and from different numbers (cell) and they did not answer.

"That said, this could happen at any medical office that performs sedation. It seems to occur notoriously more often from these clinics. It aggravates me when abortion advocates state that women don't suffer physically and emotionally from abortion...not to mention the babies that are killed."

Almost 40 years ago, Stanley Rothman from Smith College and others studied the media elite. They found that almost all the senior members of the elite media were abortion-rights advocates. If anything, matters have gotten worse. So don't

expect “60 Minutes” to interview Dr. Zban. The code of silence on this subject is astounding.

---

## **CUOMO RIPS OFF THE POPE**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo’s State of the State and Budget Address:

On January 15, New York Governor Andrew Cuomo cited a quote by Pope Francis that he said offered support for the Child Victims Act; Cuomo’s remarks were included in his State of the State and Budget Address. In doing so, he seriously misrepresented what the pope said. Indeed, he exploited the pope to serve his own political interests.

The Child Victims Act would amend the statute of limitations, making it easier for alleged victims of sexual abuse to bring suit, even if the offense took place decades ago.

Cuomo began his statement on this issue by rolling out his Catholic credentials. He was an altar boy, he said, and his religion is important to him. But it is obviously not that important: if it were, he would not have taken the occasion to inform the audience of his disagreements with the Catholic Church.

The New York Governor said it has been “painful” for him to differ with the Church’s teachings on marriage and abortion. Unlike the Catholic Church, Cuomo supports the right of two men to marry; he also believes that the unborn child should have no rights.

Cuomo also mentioned his disagreement with the Catholic Church on the Child Victims Act—meaning in this instance his

disagreement with New York State bishops, especially New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan.

What Cuomo did not say is that the bishops support holding every institution, public and private, to the same standard with regard to all future cases of sexual abuse. With good reason, the bishops do not support the “look back” provision which allows for the adjudication of old cases: most of the alleged offenders are either dead or out of ministry.

Cuomo told the crowd that he is “fully aware of the position of the Catholic Church, and of the opposition of the Catholic Church” to the Child Victims Act. This was deceitful.

He knows that the Catholic Church does not stand alone in opposing this legislation: Jewish groups, the Boy Scouts, and the insurance industry are all opposed to it. Why did Cuomo single out the Catholic Church? In doing so he sowed the seed in the minds of lawmakers that the Church opposes justice for victims, which is a cruel distortion of reality.

Worse was Cuomo’s total misrepresentation of what the pope said.

Here is the quote that Cuomo cited. (Initially, he did not attribute the quote to the pope, saying only that these were the words of a “wise man.”)

“The abuse of minors is an offense so brutal. The Church cannot remain indifferent to this, and the Church must punish such priests, and that includes support for legal action. There is no other way out of this, because it’s a crime. No, worse! It’s leaving them alive, but destroyed.”

Immediately following Cuomo’s recitation of these remarks, he told the audience that these were the pope’s words. “We stand with Pope Francis and we [must] pass the Child Victims Act this year, because if you believe in justice for all, then you believe in passing the Child Victims Act and follow the

leadership of Pope Francis.” A huge photo of the pope was shown on a screen at this point, allowing Cuomo to further exploit the Holy Father.

Cuomo stands with the pope? Not on cohabitation. Not on marriage. Not on abortion. Not on transgender issues. Not on school choice. Not on drug legalization. And no, not even on the Child Victims Act. *There is nothing the pope has ever said that could be interpreted as justifying the singling out of the Catholic Church for legal redress.* Nor has the pope ever spoken to the issue of suspending statutes of limitation for old cases.

Cuomo’s Catholicity is his business, but it is our business to call him out when he hijacks Catholicism to buttress his agenda.

---

## OXFORD UNION SPONSORS STAGED DEBATE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest game played by the Oxford Union:

Is the Oxford Union committing suicide? It is one thing to [lie to me](#) after being disinvited from participating in a debate on February 28, quite another to knife itself by staging a phony debate on the Catholic Church.

“This House Believes That England Can Never Pay For Its Sins Against Irish Catholics.” Imagine a debate on this subject with representatives of the Irish Republican Army on one side and Sinn Fein (the political arm of the IRA) on the other. This is what the Oxford Union is doing by stacking the deck



against the Catholic Church on the motion, "The House Believes The Catholic Church Can Never Pay For Its Sins."

The three defending the House motion are Mitchell Garabedian, Elizabeth Coppin, and Thomas Reilly.

Garabedian is a good choice. Last year he appeared on WGBH (PBS) in Boston arguing that the Catholic Church should be stripped of its tax-exempt status. In 2011, he was accused by a reporter for the *Boston Globe* (not exactly a Catholic-friendly source) of maligning the good name of an exonerated priest whom the attorney was hounding. When I called Garabedian to see if he had any regrets about trying to destroy Father Charles Murphy, he went berserk, screaming like a madman. He fits in with this circus like a glove.

I do not know Elizabeth Coppin, but since she is there to give voice to alleged victims of the Magdalene Laundries, perhaps someone from the audience will ask her why the McAleese Report (the official Irish government study) on this institution found that most of the horror stories were pure bunk. For example, there is zero evidence that *any woman was sexually abused by the nuns*. That's not my opinion—it is the testimony of women who lived in the laundries, as recorded in the report.

The third person making the case against the Catholic Church is also a splendid choice. He showcased his contempt for separation of church and state when he was the Massachusetts Attorney General: He said he wanted his office to be involved in the recruitment, selection, training, and monitoring of priests.

If a Boston bishop, acting on reports of corruption in the state government, said he wanted the Church to police public officials and their staffs, he would be accused of trampling on the First Amendment. Indeed, he would be called a fascist. Perhaps Reilly can be asked why he never returned a single

indictment of a Boston priest in 2003, and why he thinks he was justified in wasting a colossal amount of public funds on a wild-goose chase (he knew the statute of limitations had long run out on miscreant priests).

The side that was selected to defend the Catholic Church is even better. It includes only two persons, one of whom, Dr. Jay R. Feierman, is a former psychiatrist who treated offending priests. Perhaps someone can ask him how he feels about all the glowing reports that the psychiatrists fed the bishops for decades—telling them how they “fixed” these men—knowing now how wrong they were.

The big prize is Marci Hamilton. For the Oxford Union to treat her as a champion of the Catholic Church is analogous to selecting a supporter of the Klan to defend African Americans.

To begin with, Hamilton and Garabedian are one and the same. They have jointly sued the Holy See, unsuccessfully, and have served on the same panels at anti-Catholic conferences for years. She has quite a resume.

- Hamilton’s career attacking the Catholic Church began when she was sought out by Jeffrey Anderson, the most anti-Catholic, Church-suing lawyer in the U.S. His goal, he once said, is to “sue the s\*\*\* out of the Catholic Church.” He has made good on his promise.
- A few years back, Hamilton teamed up with Anderson to sue the Holy See. They lost.
- Hamilton is opposed to the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the seminal bill protecting religious liberty that was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress and signed into law by President Bill Clinton.
- Hamilton falsely accused Cardinal Timothy Dolan, Archbishop of New York, of hiding \$55 million from victims when he was the Bishop of Milwaukee. She has never apologized.
- In 2013, Hamilton said that the Catholic Church’s

objections to having Catholic non-profits pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plans was proof of its “all-out war on women.”

- Hamilton always seeks to rescind state laws on the statute of limitations so that she can sue the Catholic Church for decades-old offenses, while at the same time arguing that such legislation *should not apply* to the public schools. She made this case in her 2008 book, *Justice Denied: What America Must Do to Protect Its Children*, and worked to implement her ideas in Colorado and other states.
- In 2016, Hamilton told the press that the U.S. bishops pay my salary. I emailed her on May 5, 2016 calling her a liar. She had no response.
- When discussing the Muslim terrorists involved in the Danish cartoon issue, Hamilton said, “There is no meaningful difference between the reasoning of imams and the Catholic League on these issues,” thus maliciously claiming the Catholic League engages in, or promotes, violence against its critics.

There we have it. The Oxford Union is in free-fall. It is hosting anti-Catholic bigots to defend the Catholic Church, making a mockery of its once stellar reputation.

If any of these haters would like to debate me, I will arrange it and pay for all the expenses. But I won't hang by the phone. At least Christopher Hitchens, whom I debated many times, was honest, which is more than I can say for the Oxford Union and its stooges.

Contact Oxford Union president Daniel Wilkinson:  
[president@oxford-union.org](mailto:president@oxford-union.org)

---

# BIGOTED ARTIST ANGERS CHRISTIANS IN ISRAEL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an artistic controversy in Israel:

A crucified sculpture of Ronald McDonald, called "McJesus," is on display in the Haifa Museum of Art. Christians have protested, and some of them have turned violent.

While the violence must be condemned, it is encouraging to see Christian leaders speaking out against this in-your-face exhibit. Leaders of the Greek Melkite Catholic Archeparchy of Akko have been especially outspoken in denouncing this insult.

The man responsible for the "McJesus" sculpture, Finnish artist Jani Leinonen, is no stranger to controversy. In January 2011, he led a group called the Food Liberation Army to crash a McDonald's restaurant in Helsinki: they were protesting the company's ethics. They walked away with a life-size statue of Ronald McDonald, threatening to "decapitate" the figure. He and his thuggish friends were later arrested.

Leinonen is not content to simply offend Christians: he is driven by hatred of Jews.

Leinonen is a rabid supporter of the BDS movement (Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions), an effort to hurt Israel's economy. It has attracted many left-wing activists, penetrating higher education and, more recently, the Democratic Party. Because of his allegiance to the BDS movement, Leinonen said he objects to his work being displayed in Israel.

"I joined the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement, that upholds the simple principle that Palestinians are entitled to the same rights as the rest of humanity," Leinonen said. If we ignore what the BDS cause is, there is no

trace of hatred there. But he was not finished. “Israel overtly uses culture as a form of propaganda to whitewash or justify its regime of occupation, settler-colonialism and apartheid over the Palestinian people.” There is there, and plenty of it.

To believe this is to believe that there is an orchestrated attempt on the part of the Israeli government to manipulate the culture—poisoning the minds of the people—so that it can justify its oppressive agenda. This is the voice of hate, one in service to crippling the nation in the name of liberation.

Israel is not the enemy—those who seek to disable it are.

---

## **OXFORD      UNION      DISINVITES DONOHUE**

Last month, Catholic League president Bill Donohue was invited by the president of the Oxford Union to participate in one of their storied debates. Donohue was to speak to the motion, “The House Believes The Catholic Church Can Never Pay For Its Sins.”

The debate was slated for February 28. On January 9, Catholic League director of communications Rick Hinshaw sought to firm up some remaining details. He was told that they offered Donohue’s spot to someone else.

To read Donohue’s letter to Oxford Union president Daniel Wilkinson, click [here](#).

To read the correspondence, click [here](#).

Here is what Donohue said about this issue today:

*I have been lied to by the Oxford Union. Either no one will debate me or someone got to Wilkinson and nixed the invitation. Either way, it shows what a fraud these people are. They speak endlessly about the virtue of free speech and their commitment to honest debates, yet their public pronouncements are belied by their actions.*

*That Wilkinson chose not to reply to my letter—I gave him two days—makes him doubly delinquent. It does not speak well for the Oxford Union that they have people like him in senior positions.*

**Contact Wilkinson:** [president@oxford-union.org](mailto:president@oxford-union.org)

---

## **SLASHING THE NECKS OF ANIMALS AND BABIES**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today's *New York Times*:

Is it morally acceptable to slash the neck of an animal? Is it morally acceptable to slash the neck of a baby? The *New York Times* waffles on the former but agrees with the latter.

“Balancing Animal Welfare and Religious Rites” is the title of an editorial in the January 9 edition of the *New York Times*. It would have been just as accurate to use “Rights” instead of “Rites,” but that would have cast the issue in terms of religious liberty, instead of anthropology, and that is not something the *Times* is ordinarily disposed to supporting.

The occasion for the editorial is a new Belgium law prohibiting Muslims and Jews from slaughtering animals by

slashing their necks (a staple in halal and kosher preparation). The law mandates that such a practice amounts to animal cruelty and cannot be carried out without first stunning the animal (e.g., using electric shock).

Most observant Muslims and Jews are not happy with the new law and see it as an infringement on their religious liberty. The *Times* understands their concerns, saying, “dietary laws are of enormous importance to people of the Jewish and Muslim faiths.” But it also sees the merit in the animal rights argument: killing the animals with a single cut is inhumane.

Which side does the *Times* embrace? It wimps out. It calls for a new “conversation on balancing” the two rights. It attributes its agnosticism to concerns that “right-wing politicians” have taken the animal-rights side because they are really anti-Jewish and anti-Muslim. Somehow we knew the right-wingers would get into the act.

Ironically, and sadly, the *Times*’ sudden interest in balancing religious liberty interests with the humane treatment of animals does not extend to human beings. The newspaper is midway through publishing a [series of editorials on abortion](#) that are as radical as anything ever found in the mainstream media. Never once is there even a genuflection to the competing rights of unborn children, throughout all nine months.

The *New York Times* is an enthusiastic defender of partial-birth abortion, which, as National Right to Life describes, involves slicing and dicing the baby. To be exact, “The abortionist punctures the base of the baby’s skull with a surgical instrument” before using a “powerful suction machine.”

If only unborn kids were cows. Then the *New York Times* wouldn’t be so energetic about slashing their necks.

Contact James Bennet, editorial page editor:

# CARDINAL BRANDMÜLLER UNFAIRLY MALIGNED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the way critics of German Cardinal Walter Brandmüller have reacted to his remarks on priestly sexual abuse:

The recent statements by Cardinal Walter Brandmüller on the subject of clergy sexual abuse have been unfairly characterized. He made four key points, all of which are eminently defensible.

1. *The former head of the Pontifical Committee for Historical Sciences noted that “80% of the cases of sexual assault in the Church affected male youths, not children.”*

Brandmüller is correct. We know from the John Jay study that 81% of the victims were males and 78% were postpubescent. That is why it is fair to say that homosexuality is the problem, not pedophilia. Indeed, less than five percent of the cases of sexual abuse involved pedophilia. The time has come to stop denying this verity. It is factually incorrect to maintain otherwise.

2. *Brandmüller said that “only a vanishingly small number” of priests have been predators.*

This is also true. In the U.S., recent data show that .005% of the clergy have had a credible accusation made against them in the last two years for which we have data. No institution can match this level of success: the Dallas reforms have worked in



the U.S.; other nations have shown similar progress.

*3. It is "hypocritical" for society to condemn clergy sexual abuse, Brandmüller said, while not condemning the same problem in other quarters. He observed that "the real scandal is that the Catholic Church hasn't distinguished herself from the rest of society."*

He nailed it. I would go further. Among those screaming the loudest about the sexual abuse scandal are those who have rejected Catholic teachings on sexual ethics: they find them too restrictive. Yet it was libertinism, not sexual reticence, that caused the scandal. Moreover, it was libertinism, deeply ingrained in Western nations, that brought about moral decay in the dominant culture. The Church should not have followed this cultural vector—it should have stood against it.

*4. Brandmüller expressed concerns about homosexuals in the priesthood.*

Pope Francis and Pope Benedict XVI have both warned about preventing men with "deeply-seated homosexual tendencies" from entering the priesthood. This is just common sense: Brandmüller was simply echoing what they said.

Cardinal Walter Brandmüller is to be commended for speaking the truth. In doing so, he joins an increasing number of bishops and cardinals who refuse to be intimidated by those whose politics trump their ability to see things clearly.