

“FAMILY GUY” ASSAULTS CATHOLICS AND JEWS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest episode of the Fox TV show, “Family Guy” (Fox entertainment is owned by Disney):

I wrote today to the ten members of the Walt Disney Company Board of Directors about the November 8 episode of “Family Guy.” This episode featured a scene where two Catholic sacraments, Baptism and Holy Communion, were mocked. It also maligned priests and disparaged rabbis. The offensive scene involved a Christening.

Meg (The Daughter): “Where’s the priest?”

Lois (The Mother): “Oh, the Church ran out of priests months ago because of all the diddling. Now they just have a rabbi fill in.”

The scene then cuts to a rabbi at a baptismal font where he makes this comment while doing the baptism.

Rabbi: “Welcome to the Christening. Now, before the child goes in the water, has it been at least 20 minutes since she ate?”

Joe (Father of Girl being baptized): “Yes, rabbi.”

Rabbi: “Let’s dunk this kid like a doughnut. I hereby Christen this child in the name of Jesus Christ, who was killed by we-don’t-know-who, it’s not important. The last thing we want to do is point fingers.”

After the Baptism, the rabbi makes a joke about the Eucharist.

Rabbi: “Congratulations, sweetie, you’re a Christian. From now on, every Sunday you get to eat a hard cookie and

pretend it's a guy."

I asked Mr. Robert Iger, the Executive Chairman of the Walt Disney Company, and the other members of its board of directors, four questions: "Why are so many in Hollywood bent on disparaging our Judeo-Christian heritage? Why do they single out Catholics? Why can't they treat us the way they treat Muslims and gays? Why is Fox muddying the name of Walt Disney?"

I asked him to "call off the dogs," pledging that "If I have to write again, the content of my communication will be strikingly dissimilar.

Contact Robert A. Iger: robert.a.iger@disney.com

EDUCATION ELITES NIX CHRISTMAS AD

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a pro-Christmas ad that has been nixed by elites:

The Catholic League became the latest victim of the cancel culture when education elites refused to run an ad with a pro-Christmas message. This is a story that should upset all Americans, not simply followers of the Catholic League. Everything that follows is documented.

In early September, I asked the policy staff to research the nation's leading elementary and secondary school publications and organizations. The goal was to send its subscribers and officials a short ad on the legal issues governing Christmas celebrations in the schools. By reaching a wide audience, it

was hoped that we might persuade some in the education establishment to allow more Christmas events this year.

In late September, we sent the ad that I wrote to the marketing and advertising departments of *Education Week*, the National Association of Education, *Scholastic* magazine and the *American School Board Journal*. None of the four got back to us. *Education Next* offered us a spot in its quarterly publication, but that was not practical given our desire to affect decision making in time for Christmas celebrations. One publication, *Education Leadership*, simply rejected the ad.

On September 29, we received promising news from the American Association of School Superintendents and Administrators (AASA).

"The content of your E-blast is subject to AASA review and approval. We often have minor feedback once the team reviews, so I would anticipate a round or two of edits before the message deploys. We will ensure ample time to do so and we have never had an instance when E-blast was prevented from deploying on schedule."

I asked our director of communications, Mike McDonald, to contact the agent at AASA and ask whether we could pay the fee by credit card, and what the chances of it being accepted are. "To pay via credit card, I will send you a payment link. As far as the ad goes, we only invoice when ads run, so yes, *your ad has been approved and will not be rejected.*" (My italics.)

The ad was scheduled to be digitally distributed on November 13. But on the afternoon of November 6, we received the following email. "I am very sorry to share this news, but, per our Media Kit, AASA has rejected your ad for the **DEDICATED EBLAST on November 13, 2020**. I regret to share we are ***officially cancelling this contract*** for that reason." (All the emphasis is in the original.)

We asked our members in October to pay for the ad, which they

did, anticipating its publication. I will explain to them in the December issue of *Catalyst*, our monthly (ten times a year) journal, what happened. The Catholic League has been officially cancelled by the public school establishment.

Having spent 20 years in education, teaching every grade from the second through graduate school, I am not shocked by the outcome. As I have said on many occasions, there is more free speech allowed in local pubs than there is on local college campuses.

The schools are quick to celebrate the alleged achievements of Muslims and so-called Indigenous peoples, but they want nothing to do with celebrations of Christians, and this certainly includes Christmas. So the censorship continues.

To read the ad the education elites cannot stomach, click [here](#).

Contact Daniel A. Domenech, executive director, AASA: ddomenech@aasa.org

NOT ALL PROTESTERS ARE THUGS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on this week's protests:

The difference between the pro-Trump and the pro-Biden protesters in the aftermath of the election is stark. The former were peaceful; the latter were violent.

Nothing symbolizes the difference between the protesters more than what happened on November 5th in Phoenix and Portland. In Phoenix, Trump supporters gathered outside of Arizona's Maricopa County Elections office to pray; they did so the

night before as well.

In Portland, the protesters (they were certainly anti-Trump if not necessarily pro-Biden) vandalized a Catholic church, one known for its outreach to the poor and homeless. Even Oregon Gov. Kate Brown couldn't believe what happened. "They shattered the windows of a church that feeds Oregonians in need."

The violence that left-wing activists engaged in has been going on all year. But this week, they kicked it up a notch.

On election night, several arrests were made in Seattle when left-wing activists took to the streets. They left nails in a roadway and destroyed property. That same night in Washington D.C., Trump supporters were stabbed near the White House and a police van was vandalized. In Minneapolis, police were attacked, fires were set, and property was damaged; fourteen were arrested for creating a riot. In Los Angeles, more than 40 people were arrested for creating havoc.

On November 4th, Portland exploded, necessitating the presence of the National Guard. Loaded rifles were taken, as were explosive devices, knives and spray-paint. That same night, left-wing protesters took over downtown Minneapolis and Interstate 94.

Also on November 4th, New York City was the scene of dozens of arrests. Fires were set, the head of the NYPD was attacked, and another officer was assaulted. Devina Singh, a crazed woman with an arrest record, spat in the face of a police officer, taunting him with obscenities.

On November 5th, a protester choked a police officer with a chain and many arrests were made.

Now contrast the Trump haters with the Trump supporters. On November 5th, they showed up in Philadelphia and Milwaukee waving American flags. In Las Vegas, 400 protesters gathered

outside of Clark County Election Department blasting patriotic anthems over loud speakers while waving American flags.

Not all protesters are thugs. For the most part, conservatives are prayerful and patriotic. They do not attack the police, set fires, loot and vandalize churches. It is those on the left who act like savages, the ones that Joe Biden and Kamala Harris find it hard to condemn.

VOTERS SPLIT ON STATE ABORTION LAWS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the way voters decided abortion laws:

Voters in Colorado and Louisiana considered abortion legislation on election day and went in opposite directions. The voters not only have nothing in common on this issue, their preferences are rooted in their religious values, or the lack thereof.

Louisiana voters passed an amendment to the state constitution that forbids the right to an abortion or the public funding of it. This means that even if *Roe v. Wade* were overturned, abortion rights cannot be established in the state. The measure passed by a wide margin. It was sponsored by a black female Democrat, State Sen. Katrina Jackson; she is a Baptist.

A pro-abortion activist told CNN that “we must keep fighting because women—not just those of means but all women *and all people who can become pregnant*—deserve the basic right to bodily autonomy....” (My italics.) She did not identify who, other than women, can get pregnant. Nor did the reporter ask

her what creature, or creatures, she was talking about. No matter, she wins a gold star for inclusivity.

Colorado has one of the most relaxed abortion laws in the nation. Indeed, it is one of seven states that permits women to terminate their pregnancy any time they want, right up until birth. Some residents said that was a bridge too far and managed to place a proposition on the ballot to ban abortions after the 22nd week of pregnancy. They lost. Approximately 6 in 10 voters rejected the ban.

Why are the voters in these two states so different? Much of the divide can be explained by looking at their religiosity profile, namely the extent to which they differ on religious beliefs and practices.

In terms of an overall religiosity scale, a Pew Research study placed Louisiana at number 4; Colorado ranked 41st. For example, 75% of Louisianans believe in God and 71% consider religion important; the figures for Coloradans are 55% and 47%, respectively.

At first glance, it seems surprising that when it comes to asking whether there are “clear standards of what is right and wrong,” or whether “right and wrong depend on the situation,” there is no difference between the two states. The figures for the two questions for those who live in Louisiana are 38% and 59%; they are 37% and 59% for residents of Colorado.

A closer look reveals that what matters is the source of one’s notions of right and wrong. Religion is the source of right and wrong for 43% of Louisianans, yet it is only 29% for Coloradans; the other two categories are philosophy/reason and common sense.

There is a profound difference between looking to God-based determinants of right and wrong and determinants of a more personal kind. The former for Christians would be the Ten Commandments; for the latter it would be their own moral

compass. Thus, the content of our moral values is necessarily reflected in their source.

To put it another way, those in Louisiana are more likely to see abortion as the killing of innocent human beings, something which is proscribed by the Ten Commandments. Those who look to their own values are more likely to make decisions based on what they want, or feel, not on what God ordains.

It should come as no surprise that given the low levels of religiosity in the lives of Coloradans that they would not countenance restrictions on their sexual liberties any more than they would put up with restrictions on their drug use: marijuana was legalized a decade ago. Unfortunately, five years after they did so they had a three-fold increase in pot heads being admitted to the emergency rooms. Vomiting, racing hearts and psychosis are the most common ailments.

In other words, the hospitals in Louisiana and Colorado are very different. In the latter, they kill babies in the third trimester and flood their wards with drug abusers. In Louisiana, these problems are minimal. It all depends on the source of our moral values.

THE ACLU AT 100

The American Civil Liberties Union was founded by Roger Baldwin on January 20, 1920. The ACLU scheduled a Centennial Gala for March 31, 2020, but had to cancel it because of Covid restrictions.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wrote a Ph.D. dissertation on the ACLU as well as two books: *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union* (with a preface by Aaron

Wildavsky) and *Twilight of Liberty: The Legacy of the ACLU*. The former was published in 1985 and the latter in 1994 (new material was published in the 2001 edition).

Both were published by Transaction Press and both were chosen as the Book of the Month by the Conservative Book Club.

The ACLU brands itself as the nation's most non-partisan defender of civil liberties and as an indispensable force for freedom. The truth is that while the ACLU has done some important work, its record is one of duplicity. From its founding in 1920, its goal has never been civil liberties for everyone: it has always been the legal arm of the liberal-left (the exception being during the 1940s and 1950s).

In more recent years it has become increasingly politicized. Moreover, its unbridled defense of radical individualism has wreaked havoc in American society.

To set the record straight, earlier in the year Donohue published a 25-page booklet, *The ACLU at 100*, that was mass mailed to thousands of legal and advocacy organizations, the nation's top 200 law schools and departments of political science, the media, and others. It contains nearly 100 endnotes, detailing his sources.

We are now making this booklet available online to the public. To access it, click [here](#).

HIGH COURT TO HEAR KEY RELIGIOUS LIBERTY CASE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an

important First Amendment case before the high court:

On November 4, the United States Supreme Court will hear oral arguments in one of the most important religious liberty cases in recent years. At stake is the right of religious social service agencies to follow their own religious prerogatives, rather than yield to the secular values of the state.

Catholic foster care programs seek to place children in Catholic homes where there is a mother and a father. This was regarded as wholly unexceptional, up until recently. But in the age of an aggressive gay rights lobby, this time-honored tradition is now before the Supreme Court. It will issue its ruling next spring.

The case before the high court, *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, involves the City of Philadelphia's decision to stop referring children in need of foster care to Catholic Social Services (CSS). Miami Archbishop Thomas Wenski, who is also the chairman of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' Committee for Religious Liberty, noted on November 2 that "The Church pioneered foster care in Philadelphia 150 years before the government got involved." But because CSS, following Church teachings, will not place children with homosexual couples, the government is seeking to force it to get into line with its amoral values.

It is important to recognize that *no one* has ever charged that CSS discriminates against anyone. No homosexual couple has ever sought to secure foster children from CSS. This is an entirely contrived case, designed to strip CSS of its religious rights. Before assessing the merits of the Catholic Church's foster care programs, consider how this case began.

On March 9, 2018, a reporter from the *Philadelphia Inquirer* called the Philadelphia Human Services department complaining that CSS, and a Protestant-run child care agency, would not work with homosexual couples as foster parents. Four days

later the newspaper ran a piece on this story. Cynthia Figueroa, the Commissioner of Human Services, called officials at the Catholic and Christian agencies seeking to verify the paper's claims. James Amato, Secretary of CSS, confirmed the veracity of the story.

Figueroa and Amato met to discuss this issue. Amato explained that he was only following the teachings of the Catholic Church, and that CSS had been doing this for over 100 years. Figueroa then showed her true colors, which, despite her Jesuit education (some might say because of it) allowed her to argue that the Church had better get with the times. That is where she crossed the line.

Figueroa went further than that. She told Amato that "it would be great if we could follow the teachings of Pope Francis." According to Amato, she chided him for following the lead of Archbishop Charles Chaput (who recently retired): he defended the CSS policy as sound Catholic thinking.

This alone should sunder the case made by the City of Philadelphia. Here we have an agent of the state telling a Catholic social service agency that it is not being faithful to the Church's teachings! And because of that, it must be punished by the state.

First of all, nothing that Pope Francis has ever said about homosexuals wanting to adopt children should ever be construed as affirming their desire to do so.

Secondly, what right does a municipal employee have in lecturing a religious institution about its doctrines, telling them that they are wrong in their interpretation of them? Imagine a bishop lecturing a government official on his need to get up to speed with the latest interpretations of constitutional law! It would never happen.

This case involves the future of religious liberty in a wide variety of cases. We live in precarious times, and this is

especially true of the content of our culture. The Judeo-Christian tradition that has served us so well badly needs to be strengthened.

CUOMO'S COVID OVERREACH IN COURT AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a court hearing affecting the Diocese of Brooklyn:

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit will hear a case today on whether New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo breached his authority in effectively shutting down some Catholic churches in the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Bishop Nicholas DiMarzio is protesting Cuomo's executive order. He maintains that the governor overreached when he used a spike in Covid-19 to cap church attendance at 10 people in some areas. In the so-called red zones, only essential businesses are allowed to remain open. For reasons which Cuomo has not detailed, religious gatherings are deemed nonessential. Such a decision was labeled as arbitrary by the bishop.

DiMarzio is not being stubborn—he is being reasonable. He has said that if he thought that Catholic churches were “superspreaders,” he would keep them closed. But there is no evidence to support this thesis.

Religious liberty occasionally collides with other rights, and it is up to the courts to weigh each issue based on the constitutionality of the opposing claims. If this First Amendment right is to take a back seat to public health

concerns, the burden is on those calling for restrictions to demonstrate the veracity of their claims. Otherwise, we have an abuse of power exercised by the chief executive of the state.

Cuomo has an obligation to tell the faithful why going to Costco is more essential than going to church. We'd love to see his reasoning. Though he may think so, he is not vested with imperial powers. It is time the courts set some boundaries for him. He certainly has no interest in doing so.