

DISSIDENT CATHOLICS HATE BARRETT

Judge Amy Coney Barrett has won over the American people and, as we recently saw, 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 came 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 were 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.

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 won.

HIGH COURT HEARS KEY RELIGIOUS LIBERTY CASE

On November 4, the United States Supreme Court heard oral arguments in one of the most important religious liberty cases in recent years. At stake is the right of religious social service agencies to follow their own religious prerogatives, rather than yield to the secular values of the state. Catholic foster care programs seek to place children in Catholic homes where there is a mother and a father. This was regarded as wholly unexceptional, up until recently. But in the age of an aggressive gay rights lobby, this time-honored tradition is now before the Supreme Court. It will issue its ruling next spring.

The case before the high court, *Fulton v. City of*

Philadelphia, involves the City of Philadelphia's decision to stop referring children in need of foster care to Catholic Social Services (CSS). Miami Archbishop Thomas Wenski, who is also the chairman of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' Committee for Religious Liberty, noted on November 2 that "The Church pioneered foster care in Philadelphia 150 years before the government got involved." But because CSS, following Church teachings, will not place children with homosexual couples, the government is seeking to force it to get into line with its amoral values.

It is important to recognize that no one has ever charged that CSS discriminates against anyone. No homosexual couple has ever sought to secure foster children from CSS. This is an entirely contrived case, designed to strip CSS of its religious rights. Before assessing the merits of the Catholic Church's foster care programs, consider how this case began.

On March 9, 2018, a reporter from the *Philadelphia Inquirer* called the Philadelphia Human Services department complaining that CSS, and a Protestant-run child care agency, would not work with homosexual couples as foster parents. Four days later the newspaper ran a piece on this story. Cynthia Figueroa, the Commissioner of Human Services, called officials at the Catholic and Christian agencies seeking to verify the paper's claims. James Amato, Secretary of CSS, confirmed the veracity of the story.

Figueroa and Amato met to discuss this issue. Amato explained that he was only following the teachings of the Catholic Church, and that CSS had been doing this for over 100 years. Figueroa then showed her true colors, which, despite her Jesuit education (some might say because of it) allowed her to argue that the Church had better get with the times. That is where she crossed the line.

Figueroa went further than that. She told Amato that "it would be great if we could follow the teachings of Pope Francis."

According to Amato, she chided him for following the lead of Archbishop Charles Chaput (who recently retired): he defended the CSS policy as sound Catholic thinking.

This alone should sunder the case made by the City of Philadelphia. Here we have an agent of the state telling a Catholic social service agency that it is not being faithful to the Church's teachings! And because of that, it must be punished by the state.

First of all, nothing that Pope Francis has ever said about homosexuals wanting to adopt children should ever be construed as affirming their desire to do so.

Secondly, what right does a municipal employee have in lecturing a religious institution about its doctrines, telling them that they are wrong in their interpretation of them? Imagine a bishop lecturing a government official on his need to get up to speed with the latest interpretations of constitutional law! It would never happen.

This case involves the future of religious liberty in a wide variety of cases. We live in precarious times, and this is especially true of the content of our culture. The Judeo-Christian tradition that has served us so well badly needs to be strengthened.

“FAMILY GUY” ASSAULTS CATHOLICS AND JEWS

Bill Donohue wrote to the Walt Disney Company Board of Directors about the November 8 episode of the Fox TV show, “Family Guy” (Fox entertainment is owned by Disney). This

episode featured a scene where two Catholic sacraments, Baptism and Holy Communion, were mocked. It also maligned priests and disparaged rabbis. The offensive scene involved a Christening.

Meg (The Daughter): "Where's the priest?"

Lois (The Mother): "Oh, the Church ran out of priests months ago because of all the diddling. Now they just have a rabbi fill in."

The scene then cuts to a rabbi at a baptismal font where he makes this comment while doing the baptism.

Rabbi: "Welcome to the Christening. Now, before the child goes in the water, has it been at least 20 minutes since she ate?"

Joe (Father of Girl being baptized): "Yes, rabbi."

Rabbi: "Let's dunk this kid like a doughnut. I hereby Christen this child in the name of Jesus Christ, who was killed by we-don't-know-who, it's not important. The last thing we want to do is point fingers."

After the Baptism, the rabbi makes a joke about the Eucharist.

Rabbi: "Congratulations, sweetie, you're a Christian. From now on, every Sunday you get to eat a hard cookie and pretend it's a guy."

Donohue asked Mr. Robert Iger, the Executive Chairman of the Walt Disney Company, and the other members of its board of directors, to answer several questions.

Donohue asked him to "call off the dogs," pledging that "If I have to write again, the content of my communication will be strikingly dissimilar."