

“ANGELS & DEMONS”: MYTHS, LIES AND SMEARS

The Catholic League has launched a major attack on the upcoming film, “Angels & Demons.” It is based on the book by that name by Dan Brown, the author who penned *The Da Vinci Code*. The movie opens May 15.

Joining Brown in his latest anti-Catholic assault is director Ron Howard. Both producers are back, as well: John Calley, who admitted that “The Da Vinci Code” was anti-Catholic, and Brian Grazer, who has said that he hopes “Angels & Demons” is less reverential than their previous venture.

“Angels & Demons,” like “The Da Vinci Code,” is strewn with myths, lies and smears about the Catholic Church. Both are a curious blend of fact and fiction, and in both instances the tag team of Brown-Howard paints the Catholic Church in the worst possible light. To combat the movie, Bill Donohue has written a booklet, “Angels & Demons: *More Demonic Than Angelic*.”

“Angels & Demons” alleges there is a secret society, the Illuminati, which is angry at the Catholic Church because of its purportedly anti-science bent. Originally claiming Galileo as one of its members, the group seeks to blow up the Vatican. The protagonist, Harvard professor Robert Langdon, is out to get them before the time bomb explodes.

The book, and perhaps the movie, is entertaining. But it is also malicious. To intentionally distort the historical record as a means to discredit Catholicism is morally indefensible. For example, Galileo died almost 150 years before the Illuminati were founded in 1776. Yet Brown and Howard say “it is a historical fact” that the Illuminati were formed in the 1600s. They say this because they need to justify trotting out

their favorite martyr, Galileo, to beat up on the Catholic Church.

The portrayal of Catholicism as anti-science is bunk. Had it not been for the Catholic Church, the universities would have died during the Middle Ages. Had it not been for the Catholic Church, the Scientific Revolution would never have happened. After all, science did not take root in South America, Africa, the Middle East or Asia. It took place in Christian Europe.

Brown-Howard, as well as others associated with the film, can say all they want that they are not anti-Catholic. The booklet has devastating evidence to the contrary.

Our goal is not to call for a boycott of the movie, but to educate the public about the Brown-Howard agenda. That's why we unloaded so early—to alert the public to the game they're playing.

POPE REBUKES PELOSI

When House Speaker Nancy Pelosi traveled to Rome in February, all Catholic eyes were on her meeting with the Holy Father. Practicing Catholics were not disappointed with the outcome.

At their meeting, Pope Benedict XVI took the occasion “to speak of the requirements of the natural moral law and the Church’s consistent teaching on the dignity of human life from conception to natural death which enjoin all Catholics, especially legislators, jurists and those responsible for the common good of society, to work in cooperation with all men and women of good will in creating a just system of laws capable of protecting human life at all stages of development.”

What occasioned such a rebuke was not only Pelosi's total support of abortion rights, including the now outlawed practice of partial-birth abortion, but her incredible statement last fall on "Meet the Press." She said that the Catholic Church had not consistently opposed abortion over time. Hence, the pointed response by the pope.

What was perhaps even more significant, was the fact that Pelosi was denied her big prize: she desperately wanted a picture of her and the pope smiling together. But there was no photo-op—the Vatican, uncharacteristically, had no photographer present. Thus, there was no way for Pelosi to exploit her meeting.

Now if only Pelosi would pivot and accept the Catholic Church's teachings on abortion. Then perhaps she could work on Joe Biden.

BUSY ON ALL FRONTS

William A. Donohue

Last December I wrote a president's desk piece titled, "Culture War Ready to Explode." I predicted that the election of Barack Obama would occasion a fierce battle between traditionalists and modernists, and that was because many of those in the latter category will "see in his victory a golden opportunity to wage war on traditionalists." That is exactly what has happened.

We have been so busy at the Catholic League, and on so many fronts, that we could fill this issue of *Catalyst* many times over. We could also fill the entire issue with all the media hits we've had. So the bad news is the bigots are on the

march; the good news is we're taking them on, chalking up some big victories along the way.

The culture war has indeed exploded. I am of the 60s generation, the generation that witnessed a radical turn in our culture. Some good things happened in the 60s—such as the civil rights movement, giving black Americans rights long denied them. But overall, the 60s saw a coarsening of our culture. Radical individualism triumphed, something which by now is deeply ingrained in our society.

I was in the U.S. Air Force in the late 60s, stationed at Beale Air Force Base in northern California, not far from Marysville and Yuba City. On weekends, I would travel with friends to San Francisco. The Haight-Ashbury section was the epicenter of hippie America, a drug infested hell hole where anti-Americanism flourished. Many of those radicals wound up dead. Others turned the corner. Still others joined the establishment, but never really changed their thinking. It is this group that is now igniting the culture war.

The radicals who are fomenting the culture war see in Obama a chance to relive the 60s. As I said in December, "I am not blaming Barack Obama for all of what is about to happen." But he is the catalyst, however personally uninvolved he may be. The fact is that many see in him a chance to finish what they started in their youth. And a big part of it is driven by anti-Catholicism. Consider the following.

In Maryland and New York, as this issue shows, bills have been introduced that take direct aim at the Catholic Church. The proponents say they are interested in protecting children, and that is why they want to suspend the statute of limitations allowing for those abused many years ago to get their day in court. But this is a ruse. They are not interested in protecting kids—they are interested in sticking it to the Catholic Church.

How do I know this? Because if they were truly interested in protecting kids and securing justice for those who have been molested, they would start where the action is, and that would be in the public schools. But, in fact, in every state where these bills have been introduced, the public schools have been shielded by special laws tailored to insulate them from the same kinds of penalties afforded private institutions. It is outrageous, duplicitous and bigoted.

Look at what happened in Connecticut. Two gay Democrats tried to engineer a takeover of the Catholic Church by the Connecticut legislature. They lost, but the fact that they even tried is incredible. To single out the Roman Catholic Church in an unprecedented power grab shows beyond any doubt that anti-Catholicism is alive and well in the United States. No other religion is ever targeted the way Catholicism is.

As I said on "Glenn Beck," could anyone imagine what would have happened had Catholic bishops in Connecticut decided to lobby for a bill granting them the authority to run the administrative and fiscal affairs of the state legislature? The charge would be fascism. So why, aside from the Catholic League, didn't others use this term to describe what happened?

And where was the ACLU, that great protector of separation of church and state? Americans United for Separation of Church and State was even worse: it took the occasion to lecture the Catholic Church on the meaning of separation of church and state! The best it could do was to say that the lawmakers who tried to stage this coup were "misguided." It proves, once and for all, that Americans United is an organization that exploits the First Amendment for political reasons, not principled ones.

Not only is Catholicism singled out, when our side strikes back, we are bashed beyond belief. Our victory in Georgia, as this issue shows (and we could fill many pages with the hate mail we received), triggered a hate-filled stream of bigoted

comments. Not to worry—we are thick-skinned at the Catholic League.

Radical secularists, many of them from the 60s generation, believe this is their last shot. That's why they are in high gear. They can create so much damage because of where they are situated: They dominate higher education, the arts, the media, Hollywood, the publishing industry, the foundations and the non-profit advocacy organizations. And their lust for power is insatiable.

As I said in December, "So buckle your seat belts." Just reading this issue of *Catalyst* shows why.

SEBELIUS FOR HHS IGNITES PROTEST

When Kansas Governor Kathleen Sebelius was chosen by the president as his top choice as secretary of health and human services (HHS), it ignited a protest that included her bishop, Joseph Naumann, Archbishop of Kansas City in Kansas, the Catholic League and many pro-life groups, not all of whom were Catholic.

As we pointed out to the media, Sebelius' support for abortion is so far off-the-charts that she has been publicly criticized by the last three archbishops of Kansas City.

In 1992, when Sebelius was a state legislator, Archbishop Ignatius Strecker rebuked her for leading what he dubbed a "death-march of the unborn." When Sebelius became governor in 2003, Archbishop James Keleher, citing her abortion record, asked her to move her inauguration interfaith service from

Topeka's Assumption Catholic Church. She refused. And her current archbishop, Joseph Naumann, called her out on the issue: he challenged her to name *one* instance in her long legislative career where she supported limiting abortion rights. She could not. He subsequently asked her not to go to Communion.

Our response was as follows: "None of these archbishops overreacted. Not only does Sebelius support the now outlawed practice of killing babies who are 80 percent born, so-called partial-birth abortion, she has accepted donations from one of the most notorious practitioners of this Nazi-style act—Dr. George Tiller. Moreover, she even hosted a dinner for him in the Governor's Mansion."

Tiller, by the way, boasts of performing over 60,000 abortions—he claims to do 100 a week. His specialty is killing kids in the second and third trimester. Tiller knows exactly what he is doing. On his website, he cites that one of the "Three Rules of the Practice" of late-term abortion care is "*Time, patience, and the baby will come.*" (His italics.) The baby will come?

Tiller's Women's Health Care Services advertises a chaplaincy program that provides "sacraments such as baptism of the still born [*sic*] fetus and blessings for the aborted fetus." Yet no one—including Tiller—offers baptism or blessings for shoes or salamanders. Just kids. We called and asked why the distinction between the baptism for the stillborn and blessings for the aborted baby. Chaplain Diane Warren just laughed and said they would do whatever was requested. But of course—it's all about choice! The kind of choice that Sebelius loves.

In 2002, Sebelius described herself as "a practicing Catholic." But not always. For example, she opposes capital punishment and animal abuse, but supports abortion. Evidently, being a "practicing Catholic" allows her to protect

serial murderers, cats and dogs, but not innocent unborn children. But she does not claim ignorance. In 2006, she said, "My Catholic faith teaches me that life is sacred. Personally, I believe abortion is wrong." She said this immediately after she vetoed a bill which would have strengthened her state's ban on late-term abortions.

It is for reasons like these that Archbishop Naumann has been so public in his criticisms of Sebelius. In doing so, he put left-wing Catholics in a jam: their support for Sebelius pitted them against her Ordinary.

Kathleen Sebelius as secretary for HHS will face a real dilemma: She may be called upon to enforce regulations that strip Catholic health-care workers of their right not to perform, or assist in performing, an abortion. She would then effectively create a dilemma for those doctors and nurses—they would either do what they are ordered to do and risk excommunication, or suffer the consequences. And given that there are more than 2,000 members of the American Association of Pro-Life OB-GYNs alone, it is safe to say that the impending problem could explode.

The Catholic Catechism is not ambiguous: "Formal cooperation in an abortion constitutes a grave offense. The Church attaches the canonical penalty of excommunication to this crime against human life." In other words, if Sebelius enforces regulations which deny conscience rights, she will ineluctably put herself on a collision course with the Catholic Church. Archbishop Naumann said it best when he opined that she "will have to make many decisions that will in all probability continue her personal involvement in promoting legalized abortion and *her cooperation in this intrinsic evil.*" (Our italics.)

In 2003, Gov. Sebelius vetoed a law mandating health standards for abortion clinics in Kansas. Her reasoning? The problem with the bill, she said, was that it allowed "the legislature,

instead of physicians and medical personnel, [to] regulate health care procedures.” But if her interest in protecting the autonomy rights of health care workers vis-à-vis the state was genuine in that instance, then surely she could invoke the same principle again and insist on conscience rights. We won’t hold our breath.

CBS Evening News interviewed Bill Donohue about the Sebelius nomination. He said, “She is the champion of abortion rights right through term, and for Obama to choose somebody who sews such division within the Catholic community to head HHS really is an insult to Catholics.”

Finally, it is worth noting that Sebelius once signed a law that calls for the killer of a pregnant woman to be charged with two murders. Someone should ask her who the other person is.

VICTORY IN CONNECTICUT

In March, two Connecticut lawmakers sought to effectively take control of the Catholic Church in their state. Because Bridgeport Bishop William Lori, Hartford Archbishop Henry Mansell, the Connecticut Catholic Conference, the Catholic League, and thousands of Catholics all over the state fought back, the bill was quickly pulled. It proved to be a giant victory for Catholics loyal to the Magisterium and to the First Amendment provisions on religious liberty.

The big losers were dissident Catholics. Tom Gallagher, the person who proposed the takeover, is a contributor to the *National Catholic Reporter*, a left-wing newspaper unhappy with the Catholic Church as it exists. The driving force behind the takeover was Voice of the Faithful, a dissident

group comprised mostly of senior citizens out to remake the Catholic Church.

Bill #1098 was introduced in the Connecticut legislature by Rep. Michael Lawlor and Sen. Andrew McDonald, both Democrats. Its express purpose is "To revise the corporate governance provisions applicable to the Roman Catholic Church and provide for the investigation of the misappropriation of funds by religious corporations."

The bill specifies that each parish is to elect a board of directors to run all parish functions, thus stripping the Pastor of his authority. As the *Hartford Courant* said, the bill "would take administrative and fiscal power away from priests and bishops and give it to parishioners." Moreover, it would only apply to the Catholic Church—all other religions would be totally unaffected by this power grab.

Not only was the bill clearly unconstitutional, the way it was handled made it even more odious. It was introduced on Thursday, March 5; the public did not know about it until the following day. Hearings were scheduled for Wednesday, March 11. In other words, stealth-like tactics were used to slip the bill in with minimum input from Catholics.

The weekend after the bill was introduced, it led to a firestorm of protest. The Catholic League was contacted by members from all over the state. By the time the staff arrived at work on Monday, March 9, it was deluged with phone calls, e-mails and faxes from Catholics, as well as non-Catholics, from every part of Connecticut.

Bishop Lori and Archbishop Mansell implored Catholics to attend the public hearing. They announced that there would be buses galore to take Catholic students, teachers, parents, priests, nuns—anyone who wanted to go—to the event.

On March 9, Bill Donohue released a statement to the media saying, "More than that needs to be done." He said, "Bishop

Lori is correct to say that the bill 'is a thinly-veiled attempt to silence the Catholic Church on the important issues of the day, such as same-sex marriage.' Indeed, it is payback: this brutal act of revenge by Lawlor and McDonald, two champions of gay marriage, is designed to muzzle the voice of the Catholic Church."

Because the Catholic Church was singled out, Donohue charged, "Lawlor and McDonald have demonstrated that they are ethically unfit to continue as lawmakers. They have evinced a bias so strong, and so malicious, that it compromises their ability to serve the public good."

Donohue then called for their expulsion from the state legislature. "They should therefore be expelled by their colleagues. Reprimand and censure suggest that the offender can be rehabilitated. It is painfully obvious in this instance that neither lawmaker is prepared to accept such a sanction. Expulsion is the only rational response. We are contacting House leader Christopher Donovan and Senate leader Martin Looney to explore this action."

We also blanketed the media with our news release, getting more hits than usual. Very quickly, we heard from lawmakers on our side. A unanimous vote against the bill was delivered by Republican legislators. It was evident that our side had struck back so hard that the two Democratic lawmakers, and their supporters, were taken aback.

On Tuesday, March 10, the day before the scheduled hearing, McDonald and Lawlor pulled their bill. They said they did so at the behest of Gallagher, the person who initially proposed it.

When the bill was withdrawn, Donohue released another statement: "Every pre-law undergraduate knows what Lawlor and McDonald tried to pull off—in stealth fashion—was flagrantly unconstitutional. For their fascist stunt, they should at

least be censured by their colleagues. Ideally, they should resign or be forced out of office.”

After information was revealed about the bill being pulled, those who sought a state takeover refused to apologize. In fact, Paul Lakeland, who is chairman of the Catholic Studies Department at Fairfield University, a Jesuit institution, said the bill did not violate the First Amendment because the bishops still had control over doctrinal matters. Then the *Hartford Courant* chimed in saying in an editorial that McDonald and Lawlor “were trying to help rank-and-file Catholics.”

But few Catholics, or non-Catholics for that matter, were fooled by Lakeland and the *Hartford Courant*. What the lawmakers sought to do was to implement the goals of left-wing Catholics who have long had one foot out the door. This time they ran into a brick wall.

It was very encouraging to see the way Connecticut Catholics rallied to support their bishops, and their religion.

OBAMA SIGNS STEM CELL BILL

On March 9, President Obama signed an executive order on stem cell research.

Bill Donohue discussed this matter on radio and television. Here is part of what he told the media:

“President Obama acknowledged that he supports ‘groundbreaking work to convert ordinary human cells into ones that resemble embryonic stem cells.’ So do we. What he doesn’t seem to realize is that the enormous progress that has already been

made in this area largely undercuts his decision to fund embryonic stem cell research. After all, if the same, or similar, results can be obtained without endangering embryos, on what basis can their destruction be warranted?

“Obama seems to know that he is in dangerous territory, but fails to say why. For example, he insists that embryonic stem cell research demands ‘proper guidelines and strict oversight’ so that ‘the perils can be avoided.’ What perils is he talking about? If the killing of nascent human life isn’t an issue—which he apparently thinks it isn’t—then what are the perils associated with this research? It is starkly remindful of the position of pro-abortion advocates: they always say we should have fewer abortions, but never say why.”

SLOPPY JOURNALISM—FODDER FOR BIGOTS

A sordid combination of sloppy journalism, which started in London and made its way to New York, wound up providing fodder for the bigots on the ABC-TV show, “The View.” After the panelists on the TV show were roundly criticized by Catholic League members, they went on the defensive the next day, and took a shot at Bill Donohue. Here’s what happened.

On February 18, there was a news story in *The Times* (of London) about “a study approved by the Vatican” showing that men are more given to lust; women to pride. This story was reprinted in the *New York Post* on the same day. Both newspapers identified Wojciech Giertych as “the personal theologian” to the pope. The next day, ABC News referred to the work as a “survey.”

On the same day, panelists on the ABC show, "The View," discussed these news reports and took the occasion to slam Catholicism. Though the story was flawed, it didn't stop the panelists. Here is an excerpt:

Whoopi Goldberg: *Realize the Vatican is the last word in all things that are god. For some folks. But explain how you suddenly can write new sins. You can't do that.*

Joy Behar: *The pope is supposed to be infallible. He can say whatever he wants and people believe it. That's how it goes.*

Goldberg: *But that doesn't make any sense.*

Barbara Walters: *What do you think is the biggest sin?*

Behar: *Lust amongst priests.*

Elizabeth Hasselbeck: *Pedophilia. They put that in the year after.*

Goldberg: *The biggest sin? ...Intolerance.*

Donohue immediately responded as follows:

"After we blasted Barbara Walters in an op-ed page ad in the *New York Times* in June 2007 for sanctioning anti-Catholic bigotry on 15 occasions over the previous year, she got the message and quieted her panelists. But now they're back, expressing their ignorance as well as their hostility.

"Goldberg is wrong to say that the Vatican is writing new sins: The report quotes one monsignor about a study whose author remains curiously undisclosed. Behar, another ex-Catholic, is wrong to speak so sweepingly about the pope's infallibility: almost everything he says is of a fallible nature, and he has said absolutely nothing about this issue. And Hasselbeck, yet another ex-Catholic, was anxious to show that she also hates Catholics (she succeeded), paints priests as child molesters. How ironic it is to hear them say it is

the Church that is intolerant. If only they could hear themselves speak.”

The next day on the show, Joy Behar said that Donohue “says in a letter that we read that Barbara [Walters] should be squelching us from this type of thing.”

Donohue got the last word:

“What a bunch of incompetents. First of all, there is no study that was approved by the Vatican on the subject. There is a book by Dominican Father Giertych, and it was not ‘approved’ by the Vatican: his comments appeared in a Vatican newspaper, *L’Osservatore Romano*. He is not ‘the personal theologian’ to the pope; rather, he is theologian of the papal household. Moreover, he did not conduct a survey—he wrote a book. Both the terms ‘study’ and ‘survey’ suggest something scientific, and therefore distort the priest’s work.

“What Behar calls a ‘letter’ was actually a news release. More important, I never said Walters should be squelching them. What I said was that after we hit her with a *New York Times* ad in 2007 for tolerating anti-Catholicism, ‘she got the message and quieted her panelists.’

“What a media circus: inept journalists feeding anti-Catholic bigots. We contacted one of the two Brit reporters, Jack Malvern, about his story but he failed to reply. It’s time he heard from our side. Let ‘View’ co-producer Bill Geddie hear from you again.”

So there you have it. Lousy journalism, combined with a predisposition to believe the worst about the Catholic Church, resulted in one more needless attack.

CHILD RAPE IN NEW YORK STATE: LOCATION MATTERS

Recently a bill was introduced in the New York State Assembly, by Assemblywoman Margaret Markey, which will have grave implications if passed.

According to the bill, an 18-year-old who was allegedly raped by a public school teacher has a 90-day period to file a claim for an offense that happened in a public institution. But a student who was allegedly raped in a Catholic or Jewish school during the JFK presidency could bring suit (for one year, there is no time limit on claims affecting private institutions). After a year, a student from a Catholic or Jewish school would still have 3,650 more days to file a claim than a victim from the public schools (the current five year period to file a claim would be expanded to ten years).

There is another bill in the Assembly, by Assemblyman Vito Lopez, that would not discriminate on the basis of location. Eric Schneiderman, chairman of the Senate Codes Committee, said that the glaring disparity might be addressed in future legislation. Schneiderman said, "Just because it [the Markey bill] does not broaden the rights of victims 100 percent does not mean we should not try to broaden their rights somewhat." His argument collapses, of course, when considering the Lopez bill: it would cover 100 percent of the victims.

In response to the disparity in the Markey bill, Bill Donohue wrote an open letter to New York State lawmakers. The following is the text of his letter:

"Complaints have reached my office about some New York State lawmakers who are considering a bill, sponsored by Assemblywoman Margaret Markey, that would discriminate against the Catholic Church by selectively targeting private

institutions in legislation aimed at prosecuting the sexual abuse of minors. There is another bill on the same issue, sponsored by Assemblyman Vito Lopez, which does not discriminate: it treats private and public institutions the same way. While there are some differences between the two bills, the central difference is in their application.

“Please understand that I am not accusing anyone who supports the Markey bill of anti-Catholicism. But I hasten to add that those who do so are certainly giving the appearance of sponsoring bigotry. Perception, it is often said, is reality.

“Alabama Governor George Wallace was known for promoting a dual system of justice—one for whites and one for blacks. It is no less invidious to promote a dual system of justice based on other grounds. If a child has been violated, what matters is the crime, not the location.

“Anyone who is really serious about prosecuting the sexual abuse of minors wants all victimizers to be treated equally. I hope you agree.”

As of March 18, the Markey bill was passed in an Assembly committee by a thin margin. The outcome of the bill is still to be determined.

DUPLICITY MARKS MARYLAND SEX ABUSE BILL

Bills were recently introduced in both houses of the Maryland legislature—sponsored by Delores Goodwin Kelley in the Senate and C. Sue Hecht in the House—that would have continued the duplicitous way private and public institutions are treated.

We addressed this issue and within a day of our news release, we found out that the bill did not make it out of committee.

Obviously, the Maryland lawmakers that sponsored these bills were not serious about combating child sexual abuse; if they were they would have required the same law be applied to every institution equally, private or public. To be specific, these bills continued the outrageous insulation afforded public schools: under the law, claims are limited to \$100,000 in damages and alleged victims must give notice of a suit within six months. No such cap is awarded to private institutions. In other words, both of these bills would have ratified a dual system of justice.

Sen. Kelley denied that her bill targeted the Catholic Church, and conceded that priests account for "less than two percent of the perpetrators." Likewise, Delegate Hecht admitted that priests account for "a miniscule number" of offenses. That being the case, it suggests that the real damage is being done elsewhere. And since we know that the sexual abuse of minors is 100 times greater in the public schools than in the Catholic Church, justice demands that the law include public schools as well.

We issued a news release calling out Kelley and Hecht for their duplicity and asked our members to contact Sen. Kelley. In our release we said: "Imagine, for just one moment, what the reaction would be if a law were proposed that would severely penalize public school teachers for sexual abuse but would give a slap on the wrist to Catholic teachers for the same offense. And imagine what would happen if there were a cap on the amount of damages a victim could extract from Catholic schools, but the public schools could be squeezed for millions."

Within 24 hours of our news release, we received the news that Kelley's bill did not make it out of committee, thus rendering it dead. While this is a good sign, there is still the

possibility that this bill could rise again. But rest assured, if there is still life in this bill, the Catholic League will be waiting.

VICTORY IN GEORGIA

Recently the Catholic League won a major victory against the University of Georgia. As part of its Sexual Responsibility program, the university placed a poster in the dormitories that misappropriated Christian iconography to promote condom distribution. Within hours of our press release addressing this situation, we received an apology from a university administrator.

The controversy revolved around a poster of the famous Michelangelo painting on the Sistine Chapel ceiling that features the hand of God giving life to Adam; the university's poster hijacked this treasured piece of art to show God handing Adam a condom. The poster was used as part of the University of Georgia's Sexual Responsibility Week, but surely if condom distribution was to be part of that program, it could have been done without needlessly offending the religious sensibilities of Catholics and Protestants alike.

In his letter to Dr. Rodney D. Bennett, Vice President for Student Affairs, Bill Donohue said, "I hasten to add that the University of Georgia would never choose a depiction of Muhammed to hawk condoms. Indeed, only a few years ago an inoffensive depiction of this Islamic figure in a Danish cartoon led to murder and churches being burned to the ground. One can only imagine what would have happened had he been portrayed pushing condoms to youth."

A few hours later, after receiving a copy of Donohue's letter

via e-mail, Bennett called Donohue to apologize for the offensive poster. During the course of their conversation, Bennett told Donohue that he had received numerous e-mails from Catholic League members addressing their outrage over the poster. Dr. Bennett told Donohue that he was not aware of the poster until we contacted him, but when he saw it, he acted swiftly and responsibly: his apology was as sincere as it was thorough. He pledged to take "corrective action," doing what he can to make sure that something like this does not happen again on the University of Georgia campus. Not only did he convey his "deepest apology" over the phone, he also put it in writing.

Donohue also wrote a letter to the president of the University of Georgia, Dr. Michael F. Adams, commending him for choosing Dr. Bennett as his Vice President for Student Affairs. In our press release ending our dispute with the university, we said that it is "too bad other officials, in and out of education, aren't as honest and diligent as Dr. Bennett."

But it didn't take long for the enemies of Catholicism to show their heads. The *Atlanta Journal-Constitution* ran a piece on its website on our victory, and in the comments following the article there were numerous posts of anti-Catholicism (click [here](#) for a sample).

Regardless of the ignorant commentary following the *Journal-Constitution* piece, this was a major victory for the Catholic League.