

TRUMP DIDN'T CREATE INCIVILITY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Trump's critics:

After watching President Trump for the past few years, *New York Times* columnist David Brooks recently opined that he fully expected "the country would rise up in moral revulsion" at his gruff style. He is dumbfounded at the outcome. "Trump's behavior got worse and worse...and nothing happened."

There are plenty of reasons why. The mainstreaming of incivility in our culture tops the list.

For several decades now, the public has become so inundated with crassness that it has become increasingly inured to expressions of it. That is why it smacks of naiveté to express horror when our elites adopt the cues of the dominant culture. This isn't the 1950s.

Howard Stern is more than a shock-jock: He epitomizes the coarseness of our culture, and his fans are legion. Moreover, he has inspired many others to follow suit. Kathy Griffin, Sarah Silverman, Bill Maher, Louis C.K., Samantha Bee—just to name a few—have contributed mightily to the dumbing-down of our culture. Just think how vile they are when compared to Lucille Ball, Milton Berle, Bob Hope, Jerry Lewis, Groucho Marx and Dean Martin.

It is not just the lyrics that have changed in the music world; it's the behavior exhibited on MTV and BET. The filth of the songs is routine, as are the crotch-grabbing antics. Cardi B's best-selling "WAP" is another index of our gutter culture, and it does not speak well of Joe Biden that he gave this vicious misogynist a high-profile interview during the Democratic National Convention. The success of Miley Cyrus is

another index of our moral destitution.

“South Park” and “Family Guy” are demonstrative of our nation’s moral health, as is the popularity of non-stop “genital jokes” on network sit-coms. Movies that were once given an “R” rating are now “PG-13,” if not “PG.” And it is next to impossible for responsible parents to screen all that is available online to their children.

There was a time, not long ago, when students would be suspended from school for foul language. Now they can curse out their teachers with impunity. Worse, affluent suburban parents who are notified of the offensive behavior of their children are as likely to express umbrage at the principal as they are their child.

Social media has played a big role in corrupting our culture. The idea of liberty as license is on full display, and attempts to mitigate it are resisted. It’s cool to go against what is left of our Judeo-Christian culture, and few adults in authority are willing to confront the offenders. In the workplace, surveys show that women use the F-word more than men. Such are the fruits of equality in the age of rappers.

An array of court decisions, starting in the 1960s, did much to lower the moral bar. Incivility and indecency were redefined as freedom of expression, and the results are everywhere today. The Supreme Court ruled in 1971 that women and children waiting in line in a California courthouse had no right to protest a man standing in front of them with the inscription “F*** the Draft” on the back of his jacket.

When Rep. Rashida Tlaib called President Trump a “motherf*****,” what price did she pay? None. Why the silence? Tip O’Neill would never have allowed her to escape without a sanction.

Trump’s abandonment of established presidential etiquette has gotten out of hand on many occasions. It is easy to understand

why people complain. Whether it is reason enough to negate the success of his policies, as compared to Biden's record of 47 years, is another matter altogether.

We have a right to expect our presidents to rise above the fray. But in the end, Trump is a reflection of what our cultural elites have wrought. It is a little late in the game to cry foul at this point. We reap what we sow.

VANDALS OF ST. SERRA STATUE DESERVE SANCTIONS

San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone's decision to press for sanctions against the vandals who recently toppled a statue of St. Junípero Serra is being supported by the Catholic League.

To read Bill Donohue's letter to the District Attorney of Marin County, click [here](#).

BIDEN OUT OF STEP WITH BISHOPS AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on another break between Biden and the bishops:

As we know, there is no marriage, family, or reproductive issue that Joe Biden is on the same page with the United

States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). What has gotten by most observers, however, is his support for gender theory, a fictional construct that argues if a male considers himself to be a female, he is. Pope Francis has condemned this crazed idea as “demonic.”

Thanks to CNSNews, we learned that the Biden campaign’s website is flagging their candidate’s pledge to allow boys to compete against girls in girls’ sports. To qualify, all the boys have to do is say they are a girl, and bingo—they can compete. This is considered equality, even though it puts real girls in an unequal position.

Allowing boys who self-identify as a girl to crash girls’ athletics—and to use the same locker room and shower facilities—is not a side issue for Catholic Joe. No, his website says he will act on this pledge on “his first day in office.” Too bad he never told the country what a pressing issue this is for him.

More bad luck for the Biden camp. On October 27, 2020, Bishop Michael C. Barber, S.J., of Oakland, chairman of the USCCB’s Committee on Catholic Education, and Bishop David A. Konderla of Tulsa, chairman of the Subcommittee for the Protection and Defense of Marriage, wrote a letter to members of Congress supporting the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2020.

This bill affirms the right of boys and girls to compete exclusively against those of their own sex, providing no allowance for the sexually confused. It would stop entities that receive federal funds under Title IX from “permitting male students to participate in athletic programs designated for women and girls.”

The bishops note that while transgender students should not be harassed, their condition is one of “gender identity discordance.” It must be said, they stressed, that allowing

boys to join a girls' athletic team would be "a loss for basic fairness and the spirit of Title IX."

Thus, the Biden campaign is once again out of step with the bishops.

We at the Catholic League have only one question: Why would Catholic Joe want to fight so hard for a cause the Holy Father labels "demonic"?

Contact Jen O'Malley-Dillon, Biden's campaign manager:
jod@joebiden.com

THE NEED TO CLAIM AOC CATHOLIC

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the need to claim AOC as Catholic:

There isn't much left of the Catholic Left these days. Jealous of the success that EWTN has had for decades—there is no TV station run by Catholic dissidents—and outclassed by Catholic conservative writers and speakers, there is a pressing need for them to find a public person they can anoint as one of their own. They have found such a person in Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (AOC). Or at least they think they have.

The latest attempt to rescue AOC from her inveterate secularism is the *National Catholic Reporter*. The New York congresswoman is said to credit her Catholic faith for her positions on climate change and healthcare. But is she really a Catholic?

"I consider myself Catholic," AOC said.

That is not how Catholics speak of themselves. They simply say they are Catholic. Indeed, it is not how most people articulate any of their multiple identities. Imagine someone saying, "I consider myself to be Irish," or "I consider myself to be an author." Why the need to hedge? There is nothing subjective about being Catholic, Irish, or an author. You either are or you are not.

Ironically, AOC's tentativeness is warranted. For example, she did not tell the reporter that she has been a Catholic all her life; rather, she said she "grew up in the Catholic faith" (while noting her mother is not Catholic). More important, to what extent does she take her moral cues from her Catholic background?

Over the summer, the *National Catholic Reporter* ran an article they knew was false. "AOC is the Future of the Catholic Church." Fallen away Catholics are a reality, and they may play a role in shaping the culture, but they are certainly not the future of the Catholic Church.

Indeed, the best the author of this propaganda piece could do was to say that after listening to an address AOC gave on the House floor, she was "struck by how often it referenced Catholic values." The subject of AOC's speech was the need to respect women. Fine, but there is nothing inherently Catholic about that stance; even non-believers agree. Moreover, it was not AOC who credited her Catholicism for her view—it was the author. This shows how desperate Catholic dissidents are in their search to find someone to carry their banner.

The Catholic Left wants the public to think that AOC's Catholicism is evident in her social justice positions. But how kind was AOC to the poor when she fought an attempt by Amazon to set up shop in her district? Because of her effort, an estimated 25,000 to 40,000 jobs were lost.

How kind is AOC to the poor by consigning them to failed

public schools? She is opposed to all school choice initiatives, except for those that touch her personally: She bragged about getting her Goddaughter into a charter school.

The poor are the ones most affected by crime, and they are not proponents of defunding the police. AOC is. In fact, she wants to abolish the prisons. Just whose neighborhoods does she think the felons will repair to once released?

Children are among the most vulnerable Americans. AOC says we have too many of them. That is why last year she raised the question, "Is it okay to still have children?" This sheds great light on her enthusiasm for abortion rights.

Social justice crusaders are supposed to be judicious in their approach to minorities. Yet AOC is a strong ally of Linda Sarsour, a vicious anti-Semite. More recently, just a few months ago AOC ripped Father Damien, the 19th century priest who gave his life serving lepers on the Hawaiian island of Molokai. She said this heroic priest was guilty of patriarchy and white supremacy.

If AOC is the best the Catholic Left can do in their quest to find a leader, they are in serious trouble. They may "consider" AOC to be a Catholic, but we are equally free to consider their campaign a ploy.

Contact National Catholic Reporter CEO, Tom Fox:
tfox@ncronline.org

HALLOWEEN COSTUMES EVINCE

RELIGIOUS BIAS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue discusses Halloween costumes that are generally available:

Every year we are treated to Halloween costumes that disparage priests and nuns. As usual, all other major religions are treated with humor, but not with offensive wares.

Amazon is featuring a priest outfit equipped with a pump that makes it look like he is sporting an erection. There is nothing equivalent available for rabbis, imams or ministers. Nor do the other religions have anything that resemble the "Evil Bishop" costume. The pregnant nun dress is currently unavailable.

Walmart has an "Evil Bishop" costume but there is nothing like that for those who want to dress as a rabbi, imam or minister. Party City has an "Adult Blessed Babe Nun Costume" and a few inoffensive priest outfits; there is nothing available for the Jewish, Islamic and Protestant clergy.

Halloween Costumes has by far the biggest selection. There is the priest-with-an-erection one. Those who would like to see a rabbi, imam or minister dressed this way are out of luck—none are available. They are also selling a "Sexy Priest Men's Costume," a "Pregnant Nun Costume," a "Misbeheaven Women's Nun Costume," a "Women's Dreadful Nun Plus Costume," a "Naughty Nun Costume," and a "Bad Habit Nun Costume." Those who like to dress as an "Evil Bishop" will be disappointed—it is all sold out.

We have asked these companies before why they don't treat Jews, Muslims and Protestants the way they treat Catholics. They always say the same thing: there is no demand for such outfits.

Are they telling us that there is a demand for offensive

Catholic ones, and that they are only too happy to oblige? What does that say? And would they feature some blackface costumes if there was a demand for them?

As disturbing as the obnoxious stereotypes that these companies promote is their dishonesty. We'd rather deal with honest bigots than with dishonest ones.

Contact Halloween Costumes media rep, Henni Kristiansen:
henni.kristiansen@halloweencostumes.com

MAKE CIVIL UNIONS INCLUSIVE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on civil unions for homosexuals:

When it comes to marriage and the family, heterosexuals are entitled to a privileged position in law. Only a man and a woman can reproduce, without which the population ends, making it nonsensical not to codify their special gift in law. But our legal and cultural elites have decided otherwise, pretending human nature does not exist. Hence, the reality of gay marriage.

Pope Francis opposes gay marriage. In fact, he calls it the work of the Devil. But he is open to civil unions for homosexuals. This is, of course, a moot issue in the Western world where two men can legally marry. But in other parts of the world, civil unions for homosexuals seem like an attractive alternative. However, those inclined to accept this proposal should not do so unless civil unions are open to everyone, not simply homosexuals.

San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone has released a

statement, "[The Role of Civil Unions](#)," that makes a great deal of sense. Why should access to benefits that civil unions entail, e.g., healthcare and tax breaks, be limited to homosexual couples? Cordileone, who discussed this matter with Pope Francis earlier this year, argues that this initiative is too narrowly drawn. Why, for example, cannot an unmarried brother and sister who live together not be eligible?

This inclusive approach was broached by San Francisco Archbishop William Levada back in the 1990s. The issue at that time, when gay marriage was still illegal, was whether straight or gay couples could qualify for the benefits afforded by domestic partnerships; gays were pushing this issue. In 1990, the proposal won in a referendum.

Then city authorities tried to force any institution that did business with the city to recognize domestic partnerships in their benefit plans. Levada met with Mayor Willie Brown and a compromise was reached: each employee was allowed to name a legally domiciled member of his household to be eligible for spousal equivalent benefits.

Civil unions have taken the place of domestic partnerships, but the concept is similar. What Cordileone is now proposing is similar to what Levada offered.

There are millions of Americans who live with their father or mother, or their sibling, or other relatives, providing much needed care. Why should they be shut out from a program designed to make spousal benefits more extensive? Why should we be speaking only about homosexuals?

Archbishop Cordileone knows the difference between civil unions and marriage, and will never support any measure that would dilute the latter. "Marriage is unique because it is the only institution that connects children to their mothers and fathers, and therefore is presumed to be a sexual relationship. Indeed, the sexual relationship that marriage is

presumed to involve is the only kind by which children are naturally made" (his *italic*).

Legal fictions are nothing new. Every honest person knows that a certificate of marriage granted by the state to persons of the same sex cannot change what nature and nature's God have ordained. The biological and social purpose of marriage is the family, something which two men and two women can never naturally create. Providing for inclusive civil unions do nothing to vitiate this verity.

Kudos to Archbishop Cordileone for mapping out a realistic proposal.

POPE WEIGHS IN ON CIVIL UNIONS FOR GAYS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue responds to news stories about the pope endorsing civil unions for homosexuals:

In a new documentary about Pope Francis, "Francesco," the Holy Father [comments](#) on homosexuals. "Homosexual people have the right to be in a family. They are children of God. You can't kick someone out of a family, nor make their life miserable for this. What we have to have is a civil union law; that way they are legally covered."

The Vatican website posts a [news release](#) on the movie but makes no mention of the pope's reflections on homosexuals. Is it because what he said does not change Church doctrine? Or is it because they want to avoid controversy? The former is true and the latter may also be.

Before commenting on what the pope said, it is important to recognize what he did not say. He did not endorse gay marriage. That is because he cannot: It would be against everything he has previously said, and it would conflict with official Church teachings on the subject.

In 2010, Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio, the Archbishop of Buenos Aires (and future Pope Francis), mobilized Catholics to defeat a law affirming gay marriage. Though he failed in his quest, he was quite blunt about his opposition to same-sex marriage.

[“At stake](#) is the identity and survival of the family: father, mother and children. At stake are the lives of many children who will be discriminated against in advance, and deprived of their human development given by a father and a mother and willed by God. At stake is the total rejection of God’s law engraved in our hearts.”

Who was behind the push for gay marriage? Satan.

[“Let us not be naive](#): this is not simply a political struggle, but it is an attempt to destroy God’s plan. It is not just a bill (a mere instrument) but a ‘move’ of the father of lies who seeks to confuse and deceive the children of God.” The “father of lies” whom he speaks of is the Devil.

The would-be pope tried to work out a compromise with Argentinean authorities at the time. That is why he [floated the idea](#) of recognizing civil unions. But it was clear that would not satisfy, so nothing came of it.

The pope’s statement about homosexuals having a right to be in a family, and that they cannot be kicked out, is of course true. He was referring to what sociologists call the “family of orientation,” meaning the family we were born into. He was not referring to what is called the “family of procreation,” meaning the family we make as adults.

To be exact, homosexual acts cannot result in procreation, which is why the Church teaches that homosexuality is intrinsically disordered. Indeed, homosexuals owe their very existence to opposite-sex unions. Moreover, the pope knows that “gay families” are not legitimate.

[Two years ago](#), Pope Francis said only heterosexuals can form a family. “It is painful to say this today: People speak of varied families, of various kinds of families,” but “the family [as] man and woman in the image of God is the only one.”

If the pope did not change any Church teaching on homosexuality or marriage, why did he make the remarks attributed to him in the documentary?

This appears to be one more instance where he is trying to reach out to homosexuals, letting them know that their sexual status does not disqualify them from God’s love. There is a huge difference, however, between the sexual status of an individual, and the social status of an institution, such as marriage and the family. The pope knows the difference, even if some of his gay fans do not.

It would be helpful for the Vatican to clarify what the pope meant. The content of his remarks is not problematic, but the lack of context is. The laity need clarity, not confusion.

DISSIDENT CATHOLICS HATE BARRETT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Judge Amy Coney Barrett’s nomination to the Supreme Court:

Judge Amy Coney Barrett has won over the American people and, as we shall see shortly, a majority of the senate. Women are particularly admiring of her, and Catholic women see her as a role model. About the only ones unhappy with her are left-wing atheists, and a few others. The few others includes the editorial staff of the *National Catholic Reporter*. It has come out formally against Barrett, asking the senate to reject her. Fortunately, no one on the senate knows who they are.

The *Reporter* is a pro-abortion, pro-gay marriage, pro-women's ordination newspaper that is partly responsible for the clergy sexual abuse scandal. It is mostly read by ex-Catholic faculty who condemn the Church's teachings on marriage, the family, and sexuality. Lots of ex-priests and ex-nuns like it as well. It makes them feel validated.

Why doesn't the *Reporter* like Barrett? She should "have phoned the White House and asked not to be considered for the nomination." This is the kind of comment we might expect from a child. Why should she have done what no other nominee to any federal post would ever conceive of doing? Because the senate hearings are too close to the election.

The *Reporter* needs to hire some non-sexist men and women. Either that or fold. Only sexists would express their anger at Barrett's "adoring look" at the president. Worse, they said it was feigned: they wrote that Barrett gave President Trump "the required adoring look." The sexists would never make such a remark about a male nominee to the high court.

Everyone with an IQ in double digits knows that climate change is a contentious issue. Everyone but the sages at the *Reporter*. For them, there is nothing to debate—it's a slam dunk. Indeed, no debate should be allowed. That's another reason they hate Barrett, who acknowledged it is a controversial matter. Her independence of mind is not something the dissidents can appreciate.

The *Reporter* is furious that Barrett will replace the “brilliant scholar,” Ruth Bader Ginsburg. It is not Ginsburg’s alleged brilliance that they like: it’s her pro-abortion, pro-gay marriage record they like. Ginsburg was also a pro-affirmative action judge who never hired a black person to work for her (until she was seated on the Supreme Court). She also got confirmed despite wanting to lower the age of consent for sexual crimes and advocating the legalization of prostitution.

Finally, the “Catholic” newspaper is livid over the prospect of having six Catholics on the high court (that’s if we count Catholic dissident Sonia Sotomayor). Imagine a Jewish newspaper saying there are too many Jews on the high court (we had three up until Ginsburg died)? No, only alienated Catholics would make such an argument.

Judge Barrett is a stunningly courageous and erudite woman who makes Catholics proud. And that is one more reason why the *National Catholic Reporter* does not want her on the bench. Too late for that—we’re just shy of winning.

Contact Reporter CEO, Thomas Fox: tfox@ncronline.org

TERMINATE TOOBIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Jeffrey Toobin’s fate:

CNN and the *New Yorker* need to let Jeffrey Toobin go. They should not have perverts on their payroll.

Both of these media outlets have been highly critical of sexual offenses committed by priests—this is especially true

of CNN—so they should now invoke the “zero tolerance” stance adopted by the Catholic Church. If a priest had done what Toobin has done, he would be removed. It is time CNN and the *New Yorker* were held to the same standard. Toobin should be terminated.

The initial news stories on Toobin, the long-time legal analyst for CNN and writer for the *New Yorker*, [said](#) he was caught showing his penis to participants on a Zoom call; the employees were from the magazine and WNYC. The latest news stories [report](#) that he was engaged in more than indecent exposure: the Harvard Law [graduate](#) was caught masturbating during the Zoom meeting. Toobin has not denied what happened, saying only that he thought he was off-camera and could not be seen.

Toobin is no stranger to sexual escapades.

In January 2000, he was [interviewed](#) about his new [book](#), *A Vast Conspiracy, the Real Story of the Sex Scandal that Nearly Brought Down a President*. The book was about a young White House intern, Monica Lewinsky, performing oral sex on President Bill Clinton in the White House. The man who interviewed him was Charlie Rose. He would later be [let go](#) from CBS for, among other things, exposing himself to several women.

The first words out of Toobin’s mouth now look revealing. “I’m *indecently* proud of this book” (my italic.) It takes a special kind of author to characterize his work that way.

With the benefit of hindsight, it makes perfect sense that Toobin was sympathetic to Clinton’s ordeal. According to Toobin, the politicians who weighed into this matter were “really fighting about values and different conceptions of what’s morality and what’s tolerable.” Different strokes for different folks?

Indeed, he raised questions about the propriety of the

government weighing in on what he said were “private” acts. That is why he was so impressed when Clinton said that what he did with Monica—in a hallway off the Oval office—was “no body’s business but ours.”

For Toobin, what Clinton did was no big deal. He told Rose, “a lot of middle-age men have affairs at the office. I mean, he’s not the only one.” Seeking to give the president a break, he said, “they went into this crazy hallway, which was the only place that they couldn’t be seen by others. You know, he had an affair ’cause people have affairs. I mean, I don’t really think it’s any more profound than that.”

Toobin’s moral compass [explains](#) why he impregnated the daughter of CBS News analyst Jeff Greenfield while he was married. Casey Greenfield gave birth in 2009, but Toobin refused to put his name on the infant’s birth certificate, refused a paternity test, and refused to pay child support. He ultimately [gave](#) in on all three matters; the baby is his. He was sued about balking on child support, yielding only after a Manhattan Family Court judge ordered him to do so.

When it comes to conservatives whom Toobin loathes, he has a different perspective.

For example, when unfounded accusations of sexual misconduct were made by Christine Blasey Ford against Brett Kavanaugh, Toobin was quick to [condemn](#) the Supreme Court nominee. “If you sexually assault someone in high school,” he said, “your life should be ruined.”

What about sexual offenses committed by adult men? Should their lives be ruined?

It will be interesting to see how CNN plays this issue. One of its stars, Chris Cuomo, is already on record [saying](#) it is just too bad if a young girl sees a boy exposing himself in a locker room. In 2017, he was asked about a male who thinks he is a girl using the girl’s bathroom. What if a 12-year-old

girl, a Twitter user said, “doesn’t want to see a penis in the locker room?” Tough luck for her, Cuomo said. That was her “problem.” The real issue, he said, was “her overprotective and intolerant dad.”

Lousy ratings is not CNN’s biggest problem these days. The moral character of its prime-time employees is.

Contact Executive VP of CNN-US, Ken Jautz:
ken.jautz@turner.com

MAHER SHOULD BE CAREFUL WHAT HE WISHES FOR

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Bill Maher’s show from Friday night:

On his latest HBO show, Bill Maher went on another one of his rampages against the Catholic Church. He picked on homosexuals again, calling attention to predatory priests. But his favorite target of late is Amy Coney Barrett, a woman whose intellect escapes his cognitive abilities to assess.

Maher is upset that Barrett is going to be confirmed by the Senate to the Supreme Court. He is right about that. Why is he upset? Because she is a Catholic. He says we have too many of them on the high court already. He wants a religious test, and it matters not a whit that it is unconstitutional. He wants no practicing Catholics on the Supreme Court, preferring atheists like himself.

Maher needs to be careful what he wishes for.

Atheists, he said on his show, “actually make better judges.”

Really? Consider what happened in Albania under Enver Hoxha.

In 1967, Hoxha declared Albania to be the world's first atheist state. The result? He destroyed thousands of churches and mosques. This would obviously not bother Maher. What about the forced labor camps? Again, no problem for Maher. Would he approve the mass executions? There is no getting around them—they come with the atheist territory. Just read what Hitler, Stalin, Mao and Pol Pot did.

If none of this would give Maher pause—Hoxha went after all the right people, didn't he?—perhaps he would tap the breaks when weighing what happened to people like himself.

Hoxha cracked down on those responsible for “the spread of certain vulgar, alien tastes in music and art,” as well as “degenerate” behavior. By “degenerate” he meant those who engaged in “coarse language,” as well as devotees of “screaming jungle music.” Not sure if Maher is a fan of “screaming jungle music,” but the coarseness of his language would be enough to warrant sanctions, if not a death sentence.

Maher is lucky we Catholics do not act like the atheists he admires.

Contact Angela Tarantino, Senior VP, HBO media relations:
Angela.Tarantino@hbo.com