

# REPLY TO BIGOT

*The Catholic League was asked by the Supreme Court of Wisconsin if we wanted to comment on a reply to our grievance against attorney Rebekah M. Nett. We are seeking to get her, and her attorney client, Naomi Isaccson, disbarred for making incredibly anti-Catholic remarks in the courtroom. Here is an excerpt from our response:*

Ms. Nett maintains that “All references made throughout the document to ‘Catholic’ something or another do not necessarily refer to the Catholic religion per se or to being a person who considers him or herself to be of the Catholic religious faith.”

This is a classic example of intellectual dishonesty: there is no other way to interpret Nett’s vicious comments on Catholicism than to see them for what they manifestly are—bigoted assaults on the Roman Catholic religion. Quite frankly, no amount of spin can rescue her at this point. And it hardly helps her cause to rebrand Catholicism a “type of political movement.”

Finally, it is so nice to know that Ms. Nett has Catholic friends. No doubt the Imperial Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan has been known to consort with his black buddies.

Our initial grievance stands without emendation. Ms. Nett’s plain words are positive proof of her anti-Catholic bigotry and unsuitability to function as an attorney.

---

# MAUREEN DOWD IS IRRESISTIBLE

Recently, *New York Times* columnist Maureen Dowd began her column by saying, "As though Bill Donohue didn't have enough to be cranky about." In good fun, she ripped into Donohue's criticism of Nicki Minaj's obscene and bigoted skit at the Grammys.

Maureen wasn't offended. Liberal Catholics never are. Yes, they can get mighty angry when someone says Catholics can't think for themselves. That kind of anti-Catholic bigotry bothers them immensely. But when their religion is trashed by celebrities, they reflexively take the opportunity to show how open-minded they are. Indeed, their tolerance for intolerance is infinite, provided that the object of intolerance is Catholicism.

Trying to get inside the head of a liberal Catholic is not easy, but it sure is fun.

---

# BISHOPS SHOULD ONLY HIRE TOUGH LAWYERS

A recent editorial in the *New York Times* slammed the Catholic Church for playing hardball in regards to the David Clohessy deposition. We know from the deposition that Clohessy has been (a) lying to the media about his work (b) falsely advertising his group as a rape crisis center (c) working with unseemly lawyers (d) exploiting his clients by providing unauthorized "counseling" services (e) ripping off those who are truly in need of help by failing to contribute even a dime for licensed counselors, and (f) pursuing priests on the basis of legal

criteria he admits he cannot explain.

Furthermore, we know from two people who went undercover last summer to a SNAP conference in the D.C. area that the Catholic Church is regarded by these activists as “the evil institution.”

When the *Times* is sued, does it hire wimpy lawyers? Does it allow itself to be a punching bag? Not on your life: they hire the most aggressive attorneys they can buy. But when the bishops follow suit, they’re accused of not showing “reconciliation” for the victims.

The *New York Times* needs to get it straight: when rapacious activists and lawyers, motivated by revenge—not justice—seek to bleed the Catholic Church by using methods that are unethical at best, and illegal at worst, then it is only fair that the bishops take a page out of the *New York Times* playbook and defend themselves. With vigor.