

HARVARD CELEBRATES A QUEER CHRISTMAS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Harvard University's idea of Christmas:

Last weekend Harvard University hosted "Iscairiot: The Musical." It was based on a book by Harvard student Sophie Kim; she also served as executive producer of the play. It is called a "heretical gaysian (gay, Asian) love story."

The musical "reimagines" the Christian account of Jesus and Judas, and in keeping with our nation's elite obsession with race and sex (especially homosexuality), "Iscairiot is a queer, Asian American."

Kim told the Harvard Crimson, the student newspaper, that "Jesus and Judas are high school seniors at a fancy high school in Hollywood. They are both kind of outsiders in the preppy club of the Disciples. They team up to win prom king and then shenanigans ensue. There's a betrayal. There's a crucifixion."

Maddie Sebastian, who plays Judas, told The Crimson that the play was not an exercise in Christian bashing. "The message of the show is not that religion sucks, or that God isn't real, or Jesus isn't real. We're not saying that at all." Kim agrees, saying it is "a universal story."

Now some may say that these people are lying—the entire purpose of the play is to trash Christians at Christmastime—and they should be called out for their cowardice in not defending their bigoted portrayal. There is one way to find out whether these critics are right.

Harvard needs to "reimagine" a play about Charlie Chan. The detective could be depicted as a transgender freak who uses

chop sticks to stab criminals trying to rob P.F. Chang's. It may not be "a universal story," but it'll suffice to get the message across.

We are asking both Kim and The Crimson to consider my suggestion today.

Contact Kim: copperfig@gmail.com

Contact the newspaper: president@thecrimson.com

NATIVITY SCENE ERECTED IN CENTRAL PARK

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Catholic League's nativity scene on public property:

Today, the Catholic League erected a life-size nativity scene in Central Park, on a piece of public property in front of the Plaza Hotel, between 58th and 59th Street on 5th Avenue. We received a permit from the New York City Parks Department, as we have for decades.

There are no Santa Clauses, reindeers, Jack Frosts, or any other secular symbols surrounding our religious display. We don't need to have them. Why? Because Central Park is a public forum, a place that is open to all ideas, concerts, artistic exhibitions, and the like. So the government cannot stop us from erecting our crèche.

So why do some say that religious symbols cannot be displayed on public property unless they are accompanied by secular symbols? They would not be correct if they were referring to a public forum, but they would be correct if they were referring

to a swatch of public land near a municipal building, such as city hall.

The difference there is that it could be argued that the proximity of the religious symbols near a municipal entity might be interpreted as government sanction of religion. That argument cannot reasonably be made if the land is a public forum. Practicing Christians, Jews, and others, need to understand the difference so as to avoid unnecessary problems.

We hope that New Yorkers, and those visiting New York City this Christmas season, will stop by and see the Catholic League's nativity scene in Central Park. It will be up through the New Year.

INVOKING INCLUSIVITY TO NEUTER CHRISTMAS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on attempts to weaken the significance of Christmas:

Many demographic groups have celebratory events, and some even enjoy a holiday to commemorate their special day. In the spirit of diversity, these groups should be allowed to participate in their events without others seeking to crash them in the name of inclusivity.

It's really a very simple principle. If those not associated with an event are allowed to hijack it—so as to draw attention to their own cause or group—they would effectively neuter its *raison d'être*.

Those bent on diluting the meaning of Christmas are very good

at playing this dishonest game. For example, over the past few decades there has been a push to give equal recognition to Eastern religions in the month of December. Any month could have been chosen, but they chose December for obvious reasons. This kind of contrived competition is intentionally meant to undermine the uniqueness of Christmas.

The latest attempt to subvert Christmas is coming from the LGBT crowd, clearly the most narcissistic element in society. Never satisfied with having days—even months—set aside in recognition for who they are, they have decided to invade Christmas by flashing their drag queens. Their target audience is children.

A controversy emerged last year in Taylor, Texas when drag queens jumped aboard a Pride float dancing and lip syncing to Christmas carols beneath a glittering rainbow arch. After a priest objected, making his case to the ministers who ran the Christmas parade, the Protestant clergy took his side, and changed their rules, saying all floats must “not conflict with traditional and biblical family values.”

The issue didn't go away this year, tearing the residents apart.

A spokeswoman for the city defended the inclusion of the drag queens saying, “We couldn't co-sponsor an event that wasn't open to everybody in the city.” She obviously did not think this through.

The Christmas parade organizers never said that only some people can participate. The only caveat, which is necessitated by the very meaning of the parade, is that everyone respect “traditional and biblical family values.” Gay floats with drag queens are not there to honor these values—they are there to compete with, if not eviscerate, them.

Sometimes an analogy helps to understand what's at stake.

New York City has a Salute to Israel parade each year. Would it make any sense, given the name of the parade, to allow Palestinian terrorists to march with a banner, "Death to Israel"?

Another supporter of the drag queens in the Christmas parade said she has a message for the ministers: "You don't get to decide who celebrates Christmas. You are creating an environment of hate and fear, that is what leads men to commit mass murders."

Leaving aside the deranged remark about mass murderers, the ministers do, in fact, get to decide who celebrates Christmas. It's their parade.

Who gets to decide who celebrates Gay Pride parades? Those who sponsor them? Or everyone else, including those who want to ban them?

Martin Luther King Day excludes racists. President's Day includes only presidents, past and present. St. Patrick's Day honors the patron saint of one country, namely Ireland. At a minimum, Mother's Day excludes fathers and Father's Day excludes mothers. Memorial Day excludes the living, and those who did not die for their country.

Labor Day is for workers only. Yom Kippur excludes non-Jews. Columbus Day pays tribute to Columbus. Veteran's Day excludes those who never served. Hanukkah is not for Christians. Christmas is not for non-Christians. The only two holidays that recognize everyone—without diluting their meaning—are the 4th of July and Thanksgiving (fortunately, America haters usually exclude themselves).

In other words, holidays, and other special days, acknowledge our diversity. That is why those who try to jam celebrations that are extrinsic to these events, in the name of inclusion, need to be defeated. Their intolerance should not be tolerated.

SEATTLE AREA FASCISTS CENSOR CHRISTMAS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest attempts to censor Christmas:

What do banning Christmas, mass killings, attacks on churches, support for the radical LGBT agenda, and promoting riots have in common? Moral anarchy. Welcome to [King County, Washington](#), which includes Seattle.

It is not unconstitutional for public employees to wear religious apparel, but in King County they will punish you if you do. In the name of equity, the fascists who work in Human Resources (HR) have decided that all Christmas and Hanukkah decorations are banned. But it is okay to celebrate LGBT Pride and Black Lives Matter.

The justification for the censorship is that "Some employees may not share your religion, practice any religion, or share your enthusiasm for holiday decorations." This is true. It is also true that some employees may not be enthusiastic about celebrating sodomy or racism, yet those who do so are applauded for their behavior.

Employees are being warned not to have religious decorations in the workplace "including your virtual workplace." So now they are policing your home!

"Religious symbols are not appropriate in these [common] areas, because it may cause disruption to co-workers or members of the public that do not share that particular religion," the HR memo says. In other words, because religious bigots may be offended by a nativity scene, Christians lose

their rights.

This is what Harry Kalven once called the “heckler’s veto,” meaning the right of hecklers to deny the free speech of those with whom they disagree. If this were to be allowed, only sterile debate would be permitted. By the way, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled this tactic unconstitutional in 1949 (see *Terminiello v. City of Chicago*).

In 2020, while innocent people were shot and raped, the mayor of Seattle called it the “Summer of Love.” Nothing much has changed since. Crime is out of control, with a record number of homicides, rapes, robberies, aggravated assault—to say nothing of police officers being shot. Bad as this is, the anarchists didn’t have to vandalize churches, or bask in sexually degrading behaviors, but they did.

It all makes good sociological sense. The common thread uniting violence, moral destitution and attacks on churches is a deep-seated hatred for God. We’ve seen this before in history—the French Revolution, for example. The results are always ugly.

It would be so refreshing if those who work in King County were to practice civil disobedience and decorate their work area with religious symbols, letting the courts decide who is right. It is one thing for the government to formally endorse a religion; it is quite another for government bureaucrats to dictate what employees can celebrate.

It’s time for a “Winter of Resistance” in Seattle.

Contact Gloria Ngezaho, Workforce Equity Manager:
GNgezaho@kingcounty.gov

CATHOLIC LEAGUE BRIEF IN SCOTUS CASE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the league's amicus brief before the U.S. Supreme Court:

The Catholic League has filed an amicus brief in support of the First Amendment rights of web designer Lorie Smith; we will be anxious to see how the Supreme Court Justices react to oral arguments on this case today.

At issue is the judicial merits of the Colorado Anti-Discrimination Act. It would compel Smith to design a website that celebrates same-sex marriage. Smith has never refused to service anyone on the basis of sexual orientation, or any other demographic factor. But she draws the line at forcing her to express a message that runs counter to her Christian beliefs.

Smith is pointed in her position. "As a Christian who believes that God gave me the creative gifts that are expressed through this business, I have always strived to honor him in how I operate. Because of my faith, however, I am selective about the messages that I create or promote."

The Catholic League amicus brief, prepared by Kathleen A. Gallagher and Russell D. Giancola of Gallagher Giancola LLC, a Pittsburgh-based law firm, argues that "it is clear that the First Amendment provides dual protections for religious expression (or non-expression) in its guarantees of free speech and free religious exercise. This reality compels the conclusion that religious speech enjoys the highest constitutional protection."

Critics of Lorie Smith maintain that the real issue is not the First Amendment. One of the most prominent persons to take this position is Father James Martin.

“Let’s call it what it is: homophobia,” Martin says. Now if this were true, Smith would have a record of refusing to serve homosexuals, but this is manifestly not the case.

Would Martin also call the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops “homophobes”? The USCCB filed an amicus brief in support of Smith. It would be great to hear from him about this issue.

“In the guise of ‘religious liberty,’ Catholic business owners could deny services to Protestants and, more broadly, Christians could deny services to Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists, atheists, agnostics, and so on,” says Martin.

Father Martin is wrong. Indeed, he misses the point completely.

There is a profound difference between refusing to serve someone because of his demographic characteristics, and refusing to affirm a message that runs counter to one’s sincerely held religious beliefs.

For example, if a Jewish artist refuses to draw a swastika on a picture of a synagogue, is he exercising his First Amendment right to freedom of speech, or does he harbor a phobia about Nazis and should be forced to accede to the request? Again, it would be instructive to hear from Father Martin about this.

Those who put religious liberty in quotes are signaling their contempt for it, as if to say so-called religious liberty. Indeed, they may even have a phobia about it.

THE POLITICS OF THE WORLD CUP

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the shenanigans of the World Cup:

Sports was one of the last bastions of political neutrality, which explains its longstanding appeal, if not charm. People of every political persuasion would put their politics aside and join hands in communion, rooting for the home team. No more. Division and polarization rule.

The World Cup is the latest example of how far removed we are from a time of political tranquility. Played in Qatar, the ruling class in the West has shown just how ideologically and ethically corrupt it is.

The entire Western world is caught in the grip of a homosexual whirlwind that is unparalleled. The soccer players from England, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland and Wales intentionally planned to violate the strictures of FIFA, the game's governing body, by wearing "OneLove" armbands during the game. Threatened with sanctions, they backed down.

The players from England took a knee on the field before squaring off against the United States. They were making the case for "inclusivity," a term so overused it carries no substantive weight anymore. It's a cliché, a cheap slogan designed to make its users feel morally superior.

None of these players has ever been known to take a knee in protest of abortion. Might that have something to do with serving their own interests? Single men, after all, have long been the biggest champions of abortion. Small wonder why.

The elites who represent the United States showed their contempt for diversity when they disrespected the Iranian flag: on social media, the American team showed the flag with

green, white, and red stripes, leaving out the Islamic Republic religious emblem. The players, however, had nothing to do with this stunt.

Gregg Berhalter is the USA head coach, and he made plain his politics when he showed up at the first game wearing a shirt that did not feature the American colors of red, white and blue. Nor did his shirt say "United States." Instead, he wore a black-and-white Nike shirt that simply said, "STATES." It's not as though he chose to be discrete. Two years ago he was proudly wearing, and loudly praising, a Marxist-led violent group that is under investigation for tax fraud, and for enriching themselves at the expense of their donors. It's called Black Lives Matter.

The captain of the U.S. team is Tyler Adams, a black athlete. When asked about defending his home country, given its racist problems, he said progress has been made, but not before he opined, "There's discrimination wherever you go..." Someone should have asked him to provide some personal examples. The 23-year-old is already worth \$4 million and he just signed a deal worth \$24 million.

FIFA president Gianni Infantino is another self-proclaimed victim, notwithstanding his privileged status. After he fell under pressure to condemn Qatar's human rights record, he decided to lash out at his fellow left-wing Europeans for making him look bad. "I think what we Europeans have been doing the last 3,000 years we should be apologising for next 3,000 years before starting to give moral lessons to people."

Any man who walks around with that much guilt is to be pitied.

A super-rich lawyer who speaks seven languages, Infantino has also been accused, on several occasions, of ripping off FIFA for personal expenses, even to the tune of charging mattresses at his home to the governing soccer body. A staunch environmentalist, he likes to travel by personal jet so he can

“persuade” officials to offer the World Cup to Qatar. Oh yes, he owns homes in Switzerland and Qatar.

How exactly did Qatar, a little desert nation, wind up with the World Cup? It beat out the U.S., South Korea, Japan and Australia.

In 2020, after years of investigation and indictments, the U.S. Department of Justice said that representatives working for Qatar had bribed FIFA officials to secure the right to host the 2022 World Cup (it made the same claim against Russia for its hosting of the 2018 World Cup.). Three South American officials were indicted for receiving payments to vote for Qatar.

This raises the question: What are all of these self-righteous, guilt-ridden, officials, coaches and players doing in Qatar? Why didn't they boycott the games? Is it because they don't want to jeopardize their lucrative contracts? If so, what would that make them?

Nike is one of the world's greatest exploiters of human beings in the world. Its slavemaster status in China is well known, yet all of these soccer officials, coaches and players prominently wear Nike apparel.

One year ago, Nike signed a 10-year deal with U.S. Soccer, making it the largest and longest commercial partnership in the American governing body's history.

In short, Nike, FIFA, and many of the coaches and players, like to showcase their commitment to human rights while enriching themselves off the backs of the oppressed. There are plenty of American gangsters who have a more honorable record than these people.

TREVOR NOAH'S BIGOTED LEGACY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Trevor Noah:

December 8 is Trevor Noah's last episode of "The Daily Show." The general consensus seems to be that he did a pretty good job during his years on the Comedy Central show. That is of little interest to the Catholic League. What matters to us is the way entertainers treat Catholicism, and on this count, Noah will go down as one of the most vulgar and bigoted comedians in television history.

The following are quotes from the "Daily Show with Trevor Noah" that provide evidence of my assessment of him.

September 28, 2015—While commenting on the pope's visit to America, Noah stated that the pope's car was small and that "somebody's compensating. I'm saying the pope has a huge c**k."

June 27, 2016—After Noah made some humorous and inoffensive jokes about the pope's quips aboard the papal plane, he referred to the pontiff as that "mother*****."

January 5, 2017—While commenting on a McDonald's opening near the Vatican, Noah stated that "it makes a lot of sense when you think about it—both the Catholic Church and McDonald's have served billions, they both make people feel guilty about themselves, *and both are historically bad for children*, so it makes sense (emphasis added)."

March 23, 2017—While commenting on a three-year-old removing the pope's hat, Noah stated that "I can see why this made the news—a child undressing a priest for a change."

September 5, 2018—While commenting on two Catholic priests performing lewd acts on each other, Noah stated, “that sounds like a good news story to me. Two adults having consensual sex, hallelujah! That’s pretty dope.” The comic went on to suggest that the pope was “pretty stoked” about the story and introduced a dubbed-over clip of the Holy Father saying, “You want to talk about a miracle? They are both over 18. Two adults, just a midday quickie in a PT cruiser. Thank you, Lord Jesus!”

March 26, 2019—While commenting on the pope not wanting people to kiss his ring, Noah stated that “it’s a nice change of pace to see a priest not want to touch people.”

April 22, 2019—While discussing the fire that seriously damaged Notre-Dame, Noah asked, “Why doesn’t France ask for the Catholic Church to pay for the repairs? A billion dollars is nothing to them. It’s like three child abuse settlements.”

May 29, 2019—While discussing an alleged Catholic group selling video games, Noah provided a platform to “Daily Show” correspondent Ronny Chieng to say that “I don’t think an institution known for luring children should put out a game to lure more children. Where do you catch the final Pokémon Jesus—Father Garrity’s tickle room?”

June 11, 2019—While commenting on the Vatican’s teachings on gender ideology, Noah stated that “the Catholic Church thinks that if you’re a girl, you’re a girl forever, and if you’re a boy, they are going to f*** you.” He then made several jokes about “pedophile priests.”

October 9, 2019—Noah questioned “why is the communion wafer so bland? Jesus was from the Middle East. How about a bowl of hummus to go with it? Body of Christ, tasty.”

January 16, 2020—While commenting on the pope’s remarks on the issue of celibacy for priests, Noah mocked Pope Emeritus Benedict for publishing a book on celibacy stating that “the

old pope wants the rules to stay the same. And I get that. I mean if I had been forced to be a virgin for 92 years, I would also be out there like, 'guys come on! Those are the rules! We agreed!'"

March 9, 2020—While commenting on Covid-19 restrictions, Noah stated that “it’s going to be hard to take Communion seriously when the priest has to throw wafers into people’s open mouths from across the room, the Body of Christ—from downtown!”

April 13, 2020—While commenting on Covid-19 restrictions, Noah stated that Easter Sunday would be hard for many church-goers, “but for the Catholic Church, this is a good thing—keeping priests separate from the congregation might not be the worst idea.”

May 18, 2020—While commenting on Covid-19 restrictions, Noah stated that a Detroit priest using a water gun to bless parishioners with holy water from a distance was “a great way for other Catholic priests to explain why they have a bunch of kid’s toys in their basements.”

March 16, 2021—While commenting on the Jesuits providing reparations to African-Americans, Noah mocked the Sacrament of Baptism by calling it “waterboarding babies.” The comic went on to do a skit where he impersonates a priest offering money to a black man “for owning [his] great-grandfather.” Noah then takes on the role of the black man and replies that “I thought this was for you guys touching us when we were kids.”

Some say Noah is a nice person. The same was said about his predecessor, Jon Stewart. But like Stewart, who was another anti-Catholic bigot, his unrelenting assaults on Catholics and the Catholic Church sufficiently detract from whatever good qualities he may possess. Noah’s bigoted legacy is secure.

Contact Noah’s agent, Rachel Rusch: rrusch@caa.com