

TIMES SQUARE BILLBOARD STARTS TODAY

[Bill Donohue](#)

Starting today, through December 24, the Catholic League will feature a digital billboard in Times Square. At the top it says, "CELEBRATE RELIGIOUS DIVERSITY," and at the bottom it says, "CELEBRATE CHRISTMAS." In between is an image of the nativity scene—Our Blessed Mother, baby Jesus and Joseph.

The billboard is on the east side of the street between 44th and 45th Street on Broadway. It will be shown 4-6 times per hour, 30 seconds each.

We are sending a message to all those who invoke "diversity" as a political tool: Real diversity acknowledges our pluralistic society *and* its Judeo-Christian heritage. In other words, diversity that is used to divide Americans should be rejected; it should have a positive meaning.

Our life-size nativity scene was erected in Central Park on December 7, on 5th Avenue between 58th and 59th Street.

Merry Christmas!

NATIVITY SCENE ERECTED IN CENTRAL PARK

[Bill Donohue](#)

Today, the Catholic League erected a life-size nativity scene in Central Park, 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.

Sitting next to our nativity scene is the world's largest menorah. We are happy that the Jewish community in New York City is not following the lead of the cowards in Williamsburg, Virginia who would not allow a menorah to be displayed this week because it might look like a celebration of Judaism during the Israel-Hamas war.

California Gov. Gavin Newsom cancelled the annual lighting of a Christmas tree in Sacramento this week, citing planned pro-Palestinian protests.

Shirley Vermillion, the founder of the Art and Music Festival in Williamsburg who denied the menorah display, and the California governor, would like to be neutral. But declarations of neutrality in the face of the evil that Hamas and its supporters represent are morally obnoxious.

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.

FBI SOURCES ON CATHOLIC CHURCH ARE FOUL

[Bill Donohue](#)

This is the last of a three-part installment on the anti-

Catholic cell group in the FBI. At issue is the FBI's reliance on sources known to have an animus against Catholicism.

In the Report issued by the Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the FBI, and its probe of traditional Catholics, it says the following about the memo that revealed the Bureau's caper: "The two FBI employees who co-authored the memorandum later told FBI internal investigators that they knew the sources cited in the memorandum had a political bias—sources including the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), *Salon*, and *The Atlantic*."

Both *The Atlantic* and *Salon* have long evinced an antipathy to Catholicism.

Two years ago, *The Atlantic* published a piece titled, "The Real Threat to American Catholicism." And who might that be? Why the bishops, of course. It was their opposition to abortion that made them a threat to Catholicism.

Last year, *Salon* ran a story on how the Catholic Church is "dictating reproductive health care—even in blue states." It was concluded that we have too many Catholic hospitals nationwide, facilities that do not permit abortion. That is the source of the alleged dictatorship.

SPLC is the real clincher. As corrupt as it is partisan, it can no longer lay claim to being a beacon of information on hate groups in the United States. Its penchant for smearing innocent individuals and institutions is legendary.

The Report said that one of the FBI analysts even acknowledged that the "SPLC was known to have a political bias." Despite this, they accepted "*with high confidence*" the information they gleaned from SPLC on the Catholic Church (their italics.)

On the SPLC website, they offer a list of "hate groups." Lumped in with real hate groups is an organization of mothers concerned about what their children are being taught in the

public schools. It has 220 entries on Moms for Liberty. Only a deranged person would consider them a hate group.

Other organizations that espouse traditional values, but are in no way hateful—yet are labeled as such by SPLC—include the Family Research Council, Liberty Counsel, Alliance Defending Freedom and the American College of Pediatricians.

In 2017, when Carol Swain was a professor at Vanderbilt University, she recommended against allowing the president of SPLC to testify before the House Homeland Security Committee. She did so for a principled reason. “Rather than monitoring hate groups,” she said, “the Southern Poverty Law Center has become one.” As a result, SPLC conducted a smear campaign against her, claiming she is “an apologist for white supremacists.” Swain is black.

Other notable Americans who are anything but hateful, but who have been branded as such by SPLC, include Somali refugee Ayaan Hirsi Ali, political scientist Guenter Lewy, and Princeton professor Robert P. George (he is a member of the Catholic League’s board of advisors).

SPLC’s smear tactics backfired when a noted evangelical organization, D. James Kennedy Ministries, sued SPLC in 2017 for defamation. It accused the far-left “hate group” specialist of making “false and misleading descriptions,” subjecting it to “disgrace, ridicule, odium, and contempt in the estimation of the public.”

In other words, SPLC is a master propagandist, branding as “hate groups” institutions that are merely advocates for traditional moral values.

One might think that Antifa, which is a real terrorist group—it is responsible for countless acts of violence against innocent persons—might be included in SPLC’s list of hate groups (if for no other reason than to give it cover as an objective source). Instead, it is one of their biggest fans.

In 2020, it posted an article entitled, “Designating Antifa as domestic terrorist organization is dangerous, threaten civil liberties.” Just substitute the Klan for Antifa to get a sense of how absurd this sounds.

SPLC agents know a thing or two about domestic terrorism. Earlier this year one of its attorneys, Thomas Webb Jurgens, was charged with domestic terrorism after engaging in violence at a future Atlanta police training facility.

Having an anti-Catholic cell group in the FBI is bad enough. It is made worse when its agents turn to anti-Catholic journalistic sources, and to anti-American outlets. Indeed, it makes us wonder why these FBI employees are still on the public payroll, funded, in part, by traditional Catholics.

REP. JORDAN ASKED TO CONTINUE TO PURSUE FBI

[Bill Donohue](#)

The anti-Catholic cell group in the FBI is the subject of a letter Bill Donohue wrote to Rep. Jim Jordan today. He is Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. To read it, click [here](#).

Contact Russell M. Dye, Communications Director and Counsel for Rep. Jordan: Russell.Dye@mail.house.gov

ANTI-CATHOLIC CELL GROUP IN THE FBI

Bill Donohue

On December 4, the House Report of the Committee on the Judiciary and Select Subcommittee on the Weaponization of the Federal Government released its findings on the FBI's probe of Catholics.

How, and why, did the nation's premier law enforcement agency become radicalized, portraying ordinary Catholics as the enemy? That is something that still needs to be answered, despite the yeoman efforts of this committee and subcommittee.

It is painfully clear that there is an anti-Catholic cell group within the FBI. Most alarming, even after the release of the evidence showing how compromised certain units in the FBI have become, the Report concludes that "the FBI still apparently desires to convey the outrageous message that some Catholic Americans with traditional beliefs pose a domestic threat to our country."

Before examining the evidence in the Report, here's a quick summation of what has happened. [*Note: More on this subject will soon be released.*]

We first learned of the anti-Catholic FBI caper in February when whistleblower Kyle Seraphin disclosed a startling memo produced by the Richmond Field Office: it revealed an investigation of traditional Catholics. In February, the House Judiciary Committee began its own investigation into this matter.

On February 9, I made public my concerns. I was not convinced that the FBI was limiting its probe to "Radical-Traditional Catholics." I raised two questions: "What's next? Will it be a war on Catholics who are orthodox?"

My hunch proved to be right. The FBI subsequently said that "mainline Catholic parishes" and "local diocesan leadership" were selected for investigation. Consequently, I wrote to FBI Director Christopher Wray asking him to release those documents that pertain to this issue. He did not reply. But we did not give up.

After Jordan subpoenaed Wray on April 10, the FBI finally turned over 248 documents, many of which were redacted. On July 12, Wray testified before Jordan's committee. He said that the entire Bureau probe of Catholics was contained to the Richmond Field Office. He agreed to send documents that were less redacted.

Not satisfied with his response, I wrote to Jordan on July 24 asking him to find out why ordinary Catholics were being investigated; the letter was emailed to his staff the same day.

On July 25, the FBI finally handed over a version of the documents with less redactions. Importantly, it was learned that its actions were not limited to "a single field office," as Wray had testified: Milwaukee, Los Angeles and Portland offices were involved.

I wrote to Jordan again on July 26, August 10 and September 21, proposing a series of questions that Wray should have to answer.

The Report notes that on October 27 the FBI released another 261 pages of documents. It also noted that "the FBI has failed to produce the names of the FBI employees who were involved in drafting, reviewing, approving, or disseminating the memorandum."

While other field offices assisted the Richmond Office, the Report found that the greatest delinquency was committed by Richmond employees. For example, though the memo was peer-reviewed by other employees at the Richmond facility, none had expressed any concerns, constitutional or otherwise.

Interestingly, they relied on the advice of an analyst "who had completed two years of Catholic seminary." While most young men in recent times who have studied for the priesthood are good men, some of those who have dropped out of the seminary have been very troubled individuals, thus calling into question their judgment on these matters. So it is not reassuring to learn that an ex-seminarian was asked for his input.

The Report criticized the process as a "rubber-stamp review," one that received the blessings of the top lawyer involved. He said the memo "look[ed] good" and that there were "no legal issues."

When the memo was leaked to the public, the FBI—on that same day—withdrew it. Not only that, "everything associated with the memorandum" was deleted and "removed from the site's recycle bin."

What was the end goal? The purpose of the memo was first to "engage" the Diocese of Richmond. Then it was poised to expand its reach nationwide. It was revealed that "the FBI had plans for an external, FBI-wide product based on the Richmond memorandum." Meaning, as the Special Agent in charge of the Richmond Field Office put it, that the memo "could be [used] to inform...other intelligence analysts across the country."

This should be the focus of new hearings—it is the most alarming finding in the Report.

This is striking on another level: after the memo was withdrawn, the FBI blamed the Richmond Field Office for everything.

It's important to realize that the FBI was never interested in investigating dissident, left-wing Catholics. No, the only ones on their radar were those who are "pro-life, pro-family, and support the biological basis for sex and gender distinction as potential domestic terrorists."

That's right. The FBI sees as potential domestic terrorists those who defend the life of the unborn, those who prize the family, and those who believe that we cannot change our nature-determined sex as male or female.

There is an anti-Catholic cell group in the FBI. It needs to be purged.

HOUSE REPORT ON FBI PROBE OF CATHOLICS IS ALARMING

Bill Donohue

There is a hate group inside the FBI that needs to be purged. It is targeting practicing Catholics and is relying on the Southern Poverty Law Center, Salon and The Atlantic to dig up dirt on them. The House Report on this issue is startling. More about this on Dec. 6th.

MAKING BOGEYMEN OF CHRISTIAN

NATIONALISM

Bill Donohue

The Left is very good at making up bogeymen, and one of their favorites is Christian nationalism. The latest iteration of this madness is an article in the *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*; a subsequent analysis of it was recently published in psypost.org. As a sociologist, I am particularly interested in this issue: sociologists are the ones most responsible for promoting the fiction that America is threatened by Christian nationalists.

The journal article, written by sociologist Fanhao Nie of the University of Massachusetts Lowell, claims that Christian nationalists are likely to have negative views of atheists. Had he inquired if atheists have negative views of Christians, in general, he would have found they do—the evidence is overwhelming. But that was not what he set out to do.

What exactly is Christian nationalism? Nie says it is “broadly defined as an ideology that calls for the integration of Christianity and American civic life.” We get the gist of it, but this is so elastic a definition that it might mean something as innocent as noting that our rights come from God. In fact, one of the sociologists cited by the author, Andrew Whitehead, has said exactly that.

When Wayne LaPierre, the head of the National Rifle Association (NRA), gave a speech on the Founding documents, Whitehead, in a piece he co-authored, saw Christian nationalism written all over it. The NRA chief said our freedoms were “granted by God to all Americans as our American birthright.”

This is not the voice of a Christian nationalist—it is the voice of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence. Our unalienable rights, he said, come not from

government but from our “Creator.” Whitehead may not like this, but what LaPierre said is historically accurate.

“The genius of those documents, the brilliance of America, of our country itself,” LaPierre also said, “is that all of our freedoms in this country are for every single citizen.”

Most Americans would see this for what it is: an accurate and sober account. Some might even say it is pedestrian. But to those whose job it is to find—or invent—instances of Christian nationalism, this was like hitting the jackpot. The fact that LaPierre did not say that our freedoms are for Christians—he said they were “for every single citizen”—should have given Whitehead pause. After all, it seriously undercuts his position.

If Christian nationalism were the threat that those who promote this nonsense say it is, most Americans would oppose it. In fact, most never heard of it. In a survey released last year, Pew Research found that 54 percent never heard or read anything about it, and an additional 16 percent said they heard of it “a little.” Of the few who had heard of it, more held an unfavorable view (24 percent) than a favorable one (5 percent).

There is a reason for this. Christian nationalism doesn’t exist, save for faculty lounges, sociological circles and left-wing activist organizations. And it is they who have influenced those who hold a negative view.

The Pew story on this survey printed some of the comments made by those who had a favorable and unfavorable view of Christian nationalism.

Here’s a sample of those who hold a favorable view:

- “People who love God and USA.”
- “A society in which patriotism and religion are inseparably entwined doing the will of God in and for

America and believing God is on America's side."

- "Values of society based on Judaic-Christian values and priorities."
- "Religious people who love their country."
- "A nation that espouses Christian principles and prioritizes the faith above secular humanistic principle that are more prevalent in the secular society of the U.S. today."

Here's a sample of those who hold an unfavorable view:

- "Attempting to use the government to impose an extreme, fringe version of Christianity on everyone in the nation, regardless of others' religious views. They are no different than al-Qaida or the Taliban."
- "Racist, misogynistic, White, older, retro group of people wanting to return the U.S. to a time when everyone 'knew their place.' Narrow-minded view that the Bible is key to life for everyone."
- "Militant Christians openly attempting to install a right-wing Christian theocracy leading to a Christian ethno-state."
- "It's code used by extremists to indicate government for White Christians by White Christians."
- "White supremacists and male superiority."

All of those who offered a favorable view were Catholic or Protestant. All of those who offered an unfavorable view said they ascribed to no religion.

Regarding the latter, notice the hysteria. And the hate.

It is not those who are proud to live in a country founded on our religious heritage who are a threat—it is those who portray them as a threat. They are the real menace. Inventing bogeymen so as to trash patriotism and Christianity is a sick preoccupation of those on the Left. It's time our side ripped the mask off these demagogues.

NYS WEIGHING EXTENSION OF VICTIMS' BILL

Bill Donohue

In 2022, New York State passed the Adult Survivors Act, allowing victims of sexual abuse who were 18 or older at the time of the alleged abuse a one-time opportunity to file a civil lawsuit against persons or institutions, even if the statute of limitations had expired. It was to last from Thanksgiving of last year to Thanksgiving of this year. Now there is talk among Albany lawmakers to extend the Act for one more year.

On principle, the Catholic League opposes exemptions from the statute of limitations. They are an important due process provision: witnesses may be deceased and memories are not likely to be as acute as they once were. But because of the way unprincipled New York State officials treated the Catholic Church with the earlier Child Victims Act, we enthusiastically support extending the statute of limitations for the Adult Survivors Act. The reasons why will be made plain.

The Adult Survivors Act has ensnarled several high profile celebrities, politicians and institutions. In the weeks before the Act expired, suits were filed against Jamie Foxx, Sean "Diddy" Combs, Cuba Gooding Jr., Bill Cosby and musicians Justin Sane and Axl Rose.

Big name Democrats were also hit with suits, including New York City Mayor Eric Adams, state Sen. Kevin Parker and former Gov. Andrew Cuomo.

Columbia University got belted with hundreds of lawsuits,

forcing the Ivy to notify some 6,500 patients of former gynecologist Robert A. Hadden; he was first arrested in 2012.

The lawsuit against Cuomo is rich. It was he who championed both the Child Victims Act and the Adult Survivors Act. Even before that he boasted how newly proposed legislation combating sexual harassment in the workplace would serve women's rights. In 2019, he said, "I am very proud that New York is the most aggressive state in the country on women's rights. Anything I can do on sexual harassment we will do."

He even bragged how easy it will be to file such lawsuits, saying that by lowering the bar it will be "easier for those who have been subjected to this disgusting behavior to bring claims forward."

Two years later, a New York Attorney General's report on Gov. Cuomo found that 11 women had been sexually harassed by him for acts that he previously characterized as "disgusting behavior." Investigators interviewed 179 witnesses and what they found was not pretty.

For example, he ran his hand down a woman's spine, kissed her and asked her why she was not wearing a dress. He did this in an elevator in front of other people. Grabbing a woman's butt, putting his hand under a woman's blouse grabbing her breasts—this is how the champion of women's rights treated women.

If Cuomo had not been such a strong proponent of the Child Victims Act, we would not recommend extending the Adult Survivors Act. But with characteristic arrogance and vindictiveness, he worked to extend the Act, knowing full well that it was intended to punish the Catholic Church, not the public schools.

Rapacious attorneys found the Catholic Church to be a much juicier target, both ideologically and financially.

Consider the data: If we compare the volume of claims that were triggered by the Child Victims Act to that of the Adult Survivors Act, it shows who the lawyers were really after: there were 314,427 lawsuits filed under the former Act and just over 1,000 filed under the latter.

The Child Victims Act was enacted in 2019 and then extended in 2020 for another year, citing Covid. That statute expired in 2021. Not to extend for one year the Adult Survivors Act would be to tolerate a dual system of justice: one for Catholics, the other for everyone else.

State Sen. Brad Hoylman-Sigal and Assemblywoman Linda Rosenthal, Manhattan Democrats, have said they will explore a permanent change to New York's statute of limitations for sexual assault. That's a bridge too far. But what needs to be done—in the name of fairness—is to extend the Adult Survivors Act for one year.

When the Child Victims Act was being considered for a one-year extension, Hoylman said if the extension is not granted, "adult survivors of child sexual abuse will be further harmed by our legal system." He says he will either seek to explore convincing colleagues of either another extension of the Adult Survivors Act or permanent window.

Let's let him know how important it is not to have disparate treatment of these two laws. We will contact all lawmakers in Albany.

Contact: hoylman@nyenate.gov