

COMPUSERVE PULLS DISPUTED FORUM FROM WEBSITE

CompuServe, one of the nation's leading computer companies, withdrew a disputed forum from its website after a protest by the Catholic League.

Thanks to league member Lisa Bastian of Cincinnati, Ohio, we got a tip that the CompuServe website featured a "Transgender Forum" that was laced with anti-Catholic commentary. All it took to find these remarks was to tap into the "What's New" section: up popped a quip about how the Vatican was "built on the site of the temple of a sect of transgendered priests."

The disputed section targeted the pope. He was cited as "acknowledging" this "historical fact," and was said to have apologized for Christian intolerance of transgendered people. Moreover, the statement said that "His Holiness confirms that henceforth only post-operative trans men would be allowed to become Cardinals."

Upon learning of this, William Donohue called Ann Bentley, the director of communications for CompuServe (the company is owned by American Online). She said that this was a "programming error," apologized for the mistake and said that the objectionable site had been taken down. But she also remarked how this was posted by one of their business partners and was meant to be "satirical." Donohue made the point that she wouldn't treat this as satire if some other group had been lambasted. She didn't dispute this. In any event, it appeared that the league's demands were satisfied.

Unfortunately, another phone call by Bastian to Donohue—alerting him that the statements had not been taken down—led to Donohue contacting Bentley again. He was told that the objectionable remarks were removed from the "What's New"

section, but that they would remain part of the “Transgender Forum” section. Bentley said she had no control over what people put on this forum.

Donohue pressed her by arguing that he wanted to put up a Klan Forum on her website, one that would target blacks and Jews. She balked, got his point and moved quickly to eliminate the “Transgender Forum” altogether.

This victory demonstrates what can happen when league members work in tandem with our office. It also shows the limits of what dialogue can accomplish and how successful old-fashioned pressure politics can be. Needless to say, it also points out the nonchalant attitude that many have toward anti-Catholicism, and the need for the Catholic League.

“THE SIMPSONS” OFFENDS AGAIN

In the last edition of *Catalyst*, we ran a story on an episode of the Fox animated TV show, “The Simpsons,” that raised our eyebrows. Our objection centered on an exchange between the character, Bart, and his mom.

On the November 22 show, Bart said to his mother, “I’m starving. Mom, can we go Catholic so we can get Communion wafers and booze?” She replied, “No, no one is going Catholic. Three children is enough, thank you.” What we received from Thomas Chavez, Manager for Broadcast Standards and Practices, was double-talk. Now “The Simpsons” has struck again, big time.

On January 31, in an episode that ran shortly after the Super Bowl (Fox aired the game and must have known that they’d draw a big audience), there was a segment in which a nerdy-looking man drives up to a gas station and is greeted by three buxom,

scantily-clad women. One of them is wearing black and she is the most scantily-clad of all. She's also shaking her body more than the others to the rock music which is playing in the background. As she bends forward, the camera zooms in on her to reveal a large cross, and then says, "The Catholic Church, we've made a few changes."

We wrote to Mr. Chavez again, but we also told him that he'd be hearing from you, too. So don't disappoint us. Write to him at Fox Broadcasting Company, P.O. Box 900, Beverly Hills, California 90213-0900.

SOME (LIFE ISSUES) ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

William A. Donohue

A Catholic priest speaks against abortion from the pulpit. At a neighboring church, a Catholic priest speaks against capital punishment. Both priests address the subject of life and death, and both issues involve public policy concerns, yet only one priest will be criticized for violating the wall of separation between church and state. Moreover, the other priest will be heralded—by the very same people—as a dutiful moral leader. We all know which priest is “guilty” and which is “innocent,” but do we know why?

To be sure, we all have our blind spots. But this goes beyond what can be understood as simply another expression of self-interest. This is high inconsistency, the kind of rank hypocrisy that should never be tolerated. Unfortunately, in an

age when politics trumps principle, it is not surprising that we have become accustomed to tolerating the intolerable.

When the pope recently visited St. Louis, he spoke about many life issues. "As believers," he told the crowd at Trans World Dome, "how can we fail to see that abortion, euthanasia and assisted suicide are a terrible rejection of Gods gift of life and love?" He also spoke against capital punishment, imploring America to "end the death penalty," a punishment he branded "cruel and unnecessary."

That night on the evening news, and the next day in the newspapers, the media were all a buzz about the pope's condemnation of capital punishment. Indeed, in some reports, the public was led to believe that the pope spoke extensively, and perhaps exclusively, about the death penalty. This, of course, was false. The enthusiasm with which this "news" was greeted underscored the media's desire to hype the pope's anti-capital punishment message while diluting his admonitions regarding abortion.

Orwell's quip that "some are more equal than others," has application here: for many in the media, capital punishment is a life issue worthy of much more attention than abortion, hence the interest shown when the pope speaks against it. Then, when the pope successfully intervened to stop the execution of a three-time murderer, the media really began to hyperventilate.

On January 27, Pope John Paul II personally asked Missouri governor Mel Carnahan to commute the death sentence for Darrell Mease. The next day, Carnahan, a Southern Baptist who had previously approved 26 executions, granted the pope his wish. He was immediately hailed as a hero, even by those not inclined to agree with the Church on just about anything.

But why wasn't this plea for mercy labeled a flagrant violation of the principle of separation of church and state?

Why wasn't the ACLU up in arms? Why didn't the *New York Times* issue a dire warning about the fragility of the First Amendment? Why didn't Americans United for Separation of Church and State ask the IRS to rescind the Church's tax-exempt status? Why was the pope not slammed by NPR for sticking his Vatican nose into the public affairs of Americans? Because none of this has anything to do with principle, that's why—it's all about politics, pure and simple.

Want proof? Just ask yourself what would have happened if the pope had intervened to stop an abortion, instead of an execution? Imagine the reaction to a news story that the pope had successfully persuaded an abortion clinic operator in St. Louis to shut his doors, even if only for a day? The hue and cry over violating church and state would begin with the weeping and gnashing of teeth and end with a lawsuit against the Vatican. Catholics for a Free Choice would be going ballistic and clarion calls would be issued from every population control freak in the country demanding that the Holy See be kicked out of the U.N.

The hypocrites are in our own ranks as well. For example, we hear endlessly about the need for dialogue on the issue of abortion, but never do we hear about the need for dialogue regarding capital punishment. There's a reason for this: those Catholics who are anti-capital punishment believe that they've won that battle and thus have no interest in instigating a dialogue on the death penalty. But their skittishness on abortion makes them crave for dialogue. Yet the polls show that 67 percent of Catholics support the death penalty—a far higher figure than support abortion—making it rather odd that it is abortion, and not capital punishment, that the Vatican is pressed to reconsider.

Those Catholics who are anti-abortion and pro-capital punishment have their own inconsistencies to work out. If it is wrong for pro-abortion and anti-capital punishment

Catholics to selectively follow the magisterium, why is okay for anti-abortion and pro-death penalty Catholics?

No one ever said that being a good Catholic was easy. And that is how it should be: the path to salvation is a bogus one if it is not graced with occasional torment.

CATHOLICISM AND “THE GREATEST GENERATION”

William A. Donohue

In a new book, NBC anchorman Tom Brokaw argues that those Americans who came of age during the Depression and the Second World War constitute our “greatest generation.” Though I was not of that generation (I am one of those “baby boomers”), I would agree: there was something very special about that generation, and it is one that should make all Americans proud.

Brokaw is right to say that “This generation was united not only by common purpose, but also by common values—duty, honor, economy, courage, service, love of family and country, and above all, responsibility for oneself.” Sounds remarkably like my Uncle Johnny, the Fordham graduate who fought in World War II. Happily, he still epitomizes the virtues Brokaw cited.

Brokaw’s book is a snapshot look at a cross-section of the lives of ordinary Americans who made it the “greatest generation.” The question remains, however, “What made these men and women so great?” What precisely was it that allowed

them to embody such noble values? Clearly there were many contributing factors, but surely among them was the role that Catholicism played in the lives of non-Catholics, as well as Catholics.

The values that Brokaw discusses bear a striking resemblance to what are at root Catholic properties. Communitarian in nature, they are values that place the individual in a subordinate position to such greater social interests as family, community and nation. The communitarian element in Catholic social teaching is plain to see and is given premium status in its emphasis on self-denial: it is from this basis that duty, responsibility and service spring.

While Catholicism was not alone in fostering common values in the 1930s and 1940s, it certainly played a significant role in affecting the cultural landscape. Even those who weren't Catholic experienced the effect of Catholic moral teaching, and this was especially true of those in the world of publishing, film, broadcasting, education and health. And because these are realms of society that provide no escape, the Catholic impact on the culture was palpable.

If it is true that the cultural ascendancy of Catholicism allowed for considerable social solidarity, it is also true that social cohesion was abetted by both the Depression and the Second World War: the war helped unite the country in a way we haven't witnessed since, and it came on the heels of the Depression, which, despite its heartache, also provided for a communitarian spirit. These were tough times, but they were also times of social bonding.

This was a period in American history when Catholicism "went public." Epitomized by "public Catholics" like Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, the Archbishop of Philadelphia, the Catholic Church in America had finally hit stride. Those who weren't Catholic also got a chance to be introduced to the Church via Hollywood. In 1938, Americans met Father Flanagan (courtesy of

Spencer Tracy) in the movie, "Boys Town." Pat O'Brien, Karl Malden, Gregory Peck, Barry Fitzgerald and Bing Crosby tutored the public about the lives of other priests as well, projecting the very values that so impress Brokaw.

"Greatest generation" Catholics took their religion seriously. According to Charles Morris, the Philadelphia of the 1930s and 1940s posted a compliance rate with the Easter duty of approximately 99 percent. "Almost all Catholic children went to parochial elementary schools, and almost two-thirds went to Catholic high schools," says Morris. In addition, "It was not uncommon for the majority of adults to belong to parish organizations like the Sodality and Holy Name Society." This chapter of our history, when the Forty Hours' vigil for the Blessed Sacrament was common, and Monday-night novenas were attended by ten thousand people in one parish, is labeled by Morris as "Triumphal-era" Catholicism.

The values that were dominant in the culture, such as those cited by Brokaw, were given public expression by this newly-charged Catholicism. After all, it was the values of duty, honor, service, love of family and country that were taught in the schools, values that found reinforcement in the Baltimore Catechism. And Brokaw's most celebrated value—responsibility for oneself—was given cultural support through the Confessional.

Modesty was a cultural staple back then, and it was another value that the Church delivered to the public. Listen to the answer that was given to the following question in 1939, "Do you think it is indecent for women to wear shorts for street wear?" Sixty-three percent said yes, 37 percent no. Women were harder than men on this question: 70 percent answered yes and 30 percent said no; among men the breakdown was 57-43. Even as late as 1948, the majority of Americans were opposed to women wearing slacks. And while it sounds odd to us now, in 1937 66 percent of the public said no to the question, "Would you vote for a woman for President, if she qualified in every other

respect?"

Life and death issues also saw the impact of Catholic values on the culture. Consider the following question, asked by Gallup in 1938: "In Chicago recently a family had to decide between letting its newborn baby die and letting it have an operation that would leave the baby blind for life. Which course would you have chosen?" The overall tally was 63 percent in favor of the operation, and 37 percent in favor of letting the baby die. Those were exactly the figures that Protestants posted, but among Catholics the breakdown was 73 to 27; not so curiously, non-church members came in at 58-42.

There was growing sentiment in favor of the distribution of birth control but there was no soft middle ground when it came to divorce. Fully 77 percent said that divorces *should not* be easier to obtain, thus giving public life to Catholic teaching on the subject. It took the feminist movement of the 1960s to upend this position, as cries of injustice were voiced demanding no-fault divorce. Now only ideologues believe that no-fault divorce has helped women.

In 1938, radio owners were asked if they had heard any vulgar broadcast that offended them in the last year. Remarkably, 85 percent said no. This is even more incredible when one thinks what passed for vulgarity back then. Today, it is virtually impossible not to have one's sensibilities assaulted while simply driving to work: if it's not the commentary of radio talk-show hosts that offends, or the lyrics of pop music, it's a highway billboard or the bumper sticker in front of you that comes on like gang-busters.

It was in the 1950s that the "greatest generation" presided over families. This was a time when it seemed as though Catholicism had captured the culture. "The Catholic impulse," writes Morris, "was perfectly in accord with powerful forces that were transforming American society and culture in the 1940s and 1950s," so much so that Morris dubs this period, "A

Catholicizing America.” With Bishop Fulton J. Sheen dominating prime-time TV, it is with good reason that Protestants—who outnumbered Catholics 2 to 1—told sociologist Will Herberg that they felt “threatened” with Catholic domination.

The “greatest generation” had so much to teach, and it is not their failure that much of what they bequeathed has been lost. One does not have to be a romantic or a nostalgia-ridden neurotic to appreciate the degree of civility and community that existed not too long ago. Elementary etiquette, manners and deference to superiors were taken for granted. Manliness, and femininity, were also natural by-products. Yes, there was racism, sexism—injustice of all kinds—but at least within each circle of race, ethnicity, community and family, there was a sense of cohesion. Now selfishness has become the characteristic cultural statement of our day, a trait that is as celebrated by our elites as it is exercised by the public.

The coarseness of our contemporary culture is due, in part, to the extent that Catholicism has receded in its influence. It has receded for two reasons: a) we have lost the will to engage the culture with the kind of passion we once did and b) the dominant culture, as formed by our elites, is increasingly unreceptive to Catholicism.

To recapture the culture, Catholicism will have to first awaken from its defensive posture. Internal divisions, scandal in the priesthood and financial woes have chastened the leadership, giving way to a mentality that plays not to lose, instead of playing to win. This will have to change, not only for the betterment of the Church, but for the betterment of society.

Regarding the dominant culture, it is the job of the Catholic League to fend off onslaughts against the Church. A hostile dominant culture surrounds us and it will not retreat without a battle. Unfortunately, too many Catholics still believe that the Catholic way is to make peace with the culture, and that

is why they resist the work of the Catholic League. The league is forward-looking and will not succumb to the politics of accommodation. It is one thing to be prudential (a plus), quite another to be without principle.

The “greatest generation” paid its dues and it passed the baton to the rest of us. That baton was dropped by my generation and must now be fielded once again. What’s at stake is more than pride—the culture itself is on the line. Catholicism can play a role, a very big role, in regenerating the culture. Whether it seeks to grab the baton is uncertain, but one thing is for sure: the Catholic League will do all it can to see to it that it does.

WILLIAM BENTLEY BALL, R.I.P

On January 10, the world lost one of the most courageous and brilliant Catholic civil rights champions of the 20th century, William Bentley Ball. Bill died at the age of 82 at Lee Memorial Hospital in Fort Myers, Florida. He was a member of the Catholic League’s board of advisors and was chairman of the league’s legal advisory board.

Bill Ball argued nine civil rights cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and assisted in 25 other cases. He was known for his brilliant arguments before the bench, his commanding knowledge of constitutional law and his tenacious commitment to principle.

In 1971, Bill was on the losing side of a very controversial U.S. Supreme Court decision, *Lemon v. Kurtzman*; it was that ruling that created a three-prong test—one that set the bar

awfully high—to judge the constitutionality of statutes touching religion. Given the many problems with that decision, it is entirely possible that the high court may overturn, or at least pare back, its ruling in *Lemon*. If so, it would vindicate Bill's work.

The following year, Bill proved to be victorious in the Supreme Court, this time in defense of the Amish: in 1972, in *Wisconsin v. Yoder*, the high court agreed with Ball that to demand that the Amish send their children to public schools was a violation of their religious rights under the First Amendment.

This was not just a victory for the Amish, it was a victory for all those who know the importance of keeping government at bay when it comes to the free exercise of religion.

In 1993, Bill won again in the Supreme Court: in *Zobrest v. Catalina Foothills School District*, Ball successfully argued that the First Amendment's establishment clause does not bar a school district from providing a sign language interpreter to a deaf student who attends a Catholic school.

More recently, Bill filed an amicus brief on behalf of the Catholic League defending the religious rights of Orthodox Jews in a case against Yale University. Bill maintained that Orthodox Jewish students who are forced to live in campus residences that are sex-integrated (including the bathrooms) violates their freedom of association and religious liberty.

On a more personal level, Bill Ball was a genuinely lovable person, someone whose generosity was unparalleled. He not only did much of his work *pro bono* (including his work in *Zobrest* and the Yale case), he never tired in his commitment. For example, a few years ago I asked Bill to chair a legal advisory board for the Catholic League, and requested that he recommend some attorneys whom I would invite to join with him. When I told him that all of them were simply too

busy to take on more work, he said, "Fine, I'll do it myself." And he did—he was a one man committee.

Bill was also a scholar. For those who want to get to know his work better, I would like to recommend his volume, *Mere Creatures of the State* (check the back of *Catalyst* for ordering it). Among other things, Bill discusses how anti-Catholicism has affected legislative and judicial rulings in American history. His book is a passionate defense of religious freedom, as understood by the framers and distorted by more recent judicial rulings.

Bill was small in posture, but he was a giant among men. His contribution to religious liberty is secure and will be drawn upon for generations to come. Just as important, his legacy as a Catholic gentleman will endure as a model for all of us.

William A. Donohue

PAPAL VISIT: WINNERS—MEDIA; LOSERS—DISSENTERS

Media treatment of the pope's visit to St. Louis was overwhelmingly fair. Indeed, so few problems were spotted by the Catholic League, or brought to our attention, that it can safely be said that never before has Pope John Paul II been treated so fairly by journalists and broadcasters alike. There were, however, some interesting things that happened while the pope was in the U.S.

There was a website on the internet, www.papalvisit1999.com, that fraudulently misrepresented the visit. When tapped into, the section titled "Unholy Sex" featured pornography. The

site, operated by the Seattle-based Internet Entertainment Group (IEG), triggered a lawsuit by the Archdiocese of St. Louis.

When the Catholic League learned of this, it immediately pledged its support to the archdiocese. As it turned out, it was not needed: Judge Stephen Limbaugh issued a preliminary injunction requiring IEG to remove the sexually-explicit material. He recognized that the site infringed on the trademark of the Archdiocese of St. Louis and had thus nothing to do with free speech.

As with any papal visit, the predictable band of anti-Catholic extremist groups showed up to protest. Among them were American Atheists and Modern Manna Ministries; Catholics for a Free Choice chimed in from afar.

American Atheists charged that the pope was a "very real threat" to separation between church and state. "They [Catholics]," said the press release, "want non-adherents to support their schools, they advocate and promote prejudice and bigotry toward Atheists, gays, and other minorities, and they are buying up American hospitals in order to limit or eradicate women's health services."

Though American Atheists generated virtually no news coverage, the Catholic League responded with its own statement to the media. "Having been fleeced of \$629,500 by their founder and former hero, Madalyn Murray O'Hair, the struggling American Atheists are now lecturing Catholics once again," we said. We admitted that "Catholic hospitals *are* buying up community hospitals," maintaining that "this is something that all champions of human rights should applaud, if not fund." As for the crack about Catholics being bigoted against atheists, we said that "Catholics don't hate atheists, they just ignore them. Would that atheists do likewise, but, of course, they can't: to ignore Catholics would gut their identity, an identity that was forged by their Commander-in-Thief, Madalyn

Murray O'Hair."

Modern Manna Ministries showed up with 40 volunteers and 100,000 copies of an anti-Catholic booklet published by its founder, Danny Vierra. Vierra, an ex-Catholic, was disappointed that Catholics refused to accept his tracts, stating that he had a "mandate from God" to warn Catholics about their fate. No one paid any attention.

Francis Kissling of Catholics for a Free Choice made the usual remarks about the Church's repressive policies on women and abortion rights. The good news is that she received less publicity this time than she was able to garner during any previous papal visit, signaling that the media may finally have caught on to her game.

Unhappy Catholics got some media coverage, but very little. A small group of dissenters held a vigil outside the Cathedral Basilica where the pope appeared, but it did not make the evening news on any of the networks.

John Allen of the *National Catholic Reporter* criticized the pope for not continuing "the conversation" on women priests; Father Charles Curran, who teaches at a Methodist school, opined on the need for more dialogue; Robert Schutzius of the Association for the Rights of Catholics in the Church complained about the lack of Catholic unions in schools and hospitals; Robert Blattner voiced the concerns of his group, the National Association for a Married Priesthood (Bob, a former priest, is member of this outfit, which is also known as Corpus); Catholic Women for Justice demanded more females in leadership positions in the Church; and Mary Ryan, who advertised herself as someone who doesn't go to Mass, but is nonetheless a member in good standing in Call to Action, waxed inelegant on the need for women priests.

But not all dissenters felt the need to protest. Rosemary Radford Reuther, a feminist theologian, spoke for many

malcontents when she said of the pope, “He’s on his last legs.”

Despite these pockets of protest, which mostly went unnoticed, the crowds that turned out for the pope were large and enthusiastic. It was the masses who love Pope John Paul II that the media rightfully focused on, giving due tribute to his pontificate. What they captured was a pope whose commitment to truth, liberty and justice never wavers. And it is on those legs that his legacy stands, for now and forever.

CHEAP SHOTS

We don’t complain about criticism of the Catholic Church, but we do complain about cheap shots. Here are a few recent examples.

Newsday columnist Cheryl McCarthy doesn’t like the way Republicans have conducted the impeachment proceedings against the president. Fine. But why was it necessary for her to repeat what her friend told her about this? “It made my blood run cold. It was frightening. Here you had Henry Hyde [note: Hyde is Catholic] leading what looked like the march of the cardinals and bishops, and you had this 96-year-old man [Strom Thurmond] who couldn’t get a job anywhere else playing the role of grand inquisitor. The only thing missing were the red cardinal hats and the Pope’s hat.” That’s how the article began, yet nowhere in the rest of the piece was there any mention of anything Catholic about the issue she wrote about.

The process of canonization in the Catholic Church is a complicated one. But not for *U.S. News and World Report*. The subhead of an article on the subject by Brendan I. Koerner read, “All they need are two miracles, connections in Rome—and

plenty of cash.” And this is all Koerner needs to show his bias.

Back in May of last year, we ran what we thought was a cute, though pedestrian, short story on how some in Puerto Rico think that the reason why there are so many dogs on the island is because there are so many Catholics who live there. The connecting link, we are told, is the Catholic prohibition against contraception; this explains why not enough dogs are neutered.

We’ll, we thought that the comments of Teresa Warrick of the Greenhill Humane Society were off the wall, but we also thought that we’d share them with you. We now have something else to share: the same lunacy was recently voiced on an edition of Fox Pet News. On January 2, it was reported that not all of the “homeless dogs” in Puerto Rico could be attributed to Hurricane Mitch. No, Catholic opposition to birth control had to be factored in, viewers were told.

When we commented on this madness last May, we opined that “We think that the real reason why there are so many dogs in Puerto Rico is because their diet allows them to live longer: they don’t eat meat on Friday.” But now we’re more perplexed than ever before. Our latest theory is that those who report on such matters are eating meat found in cans; they are also known to covet fire hydrants.

By the way, we answered all these cheap shots with a letter to the appropriate party. While we may not change their minds, we have an obligation to try.

FED-UP WITH TV GARBAGE?

More than anyone else these days, Steve Allen is leading the fight to clean up TV. Allen, the famous comedian and accomplished jazz piano player, has had it with the whole entertainment industry, and he is doing something about it. He's become the spokesman for the Parents Television Council, a group that is seeking to nudge Hollywood the right way.

If you're fed-up with the vulgarity and coarseness of today's TV fare, and want to do something about it, write to Steve Allen, care of Janice Silver, Meadowlane Enterprises, Inc., 15201 Burbank Blvd., Suite B, Van Nuys, CA 91411. Their phone number is (818) 988-3930; fax is (818) 988-0276. Ask them how you can help and tell them that you belong to the Catholic League.

DIARY OF AN ATHEIST

Madalyn Murray O'Hair, who succeeded in censoring prayer in the schools, but who failed in her attempt to get "In God We Trust" removed from coins, may be dead or alive—no one seems to know. But if she's alive, she probably is wearing that mink coat she always wanted, and is no doubt driving that Cadillac she always longed for: her diaries tell us that these material possessions were the dream of her life, and given the way she looted American Atheists—robbing them of over a half-million dollars—she could well afford them.

O'Hair disappeared with the loot in 1995, along with her son and granddaughter. The diary that she left, though not complete, provides a birds-eye view of what was rumbling through her mind. Often seriously depressed, O'Hair ripped off

the taxpayers by failing to pay a quarter- million dollars in back taxes. Uncle Sam's solution was to confiscate the contents of her home and auction her wares; included in this package were her diaries.

What interests the Catholic League most about her diaries was the finding that she was a relentless bigot. News reports show that she "harshly judged almost everyone around her, often singling out Jews, blacks, gay men and lesbians." What she had to say about Catholics was not reported, but if she had no use for gays, blacks and Jews, it would be mind-boggling to learn that she didn't detest Catholics with a passion.

Margaret Sanger started Planned Parenthood and hated blacks. O'Hair started American Atheists and hated blacks (and others). Moreover, both organizations have been at war with Catholicism from the get-go. Makes us wonder how anyone who really believes in tolerance could ever support either group.

MORE "RED FLAGS"

Catholic League members know that one of our pet-peeves is the selective identification of Catholic miscreants in the press. Here are some more gratuitous comments, all designed to wave red flags at readers.

Four Northwestern football players are implicated in a point-shaving scandal. An article about this appears in the *Chicago Sun-Times*; it is noted that one of the players is a "graduate of a Catholic high school." Now how about that?

We wrote to the editor-in-chief, Nigel Wade, wondering why we

learned nothing of the religious affiliation of the other players. We also wondered why this identification was worth noting in the first place. We're glad to report that Wade said "the identification of a Catholic high school was random and should, I agree, have been removed in the editing process." Many thanks to Martin Geraghty of Evanston, Illinois for the heads-up on this one.

Another red flag incident we noted occurred in an article called, "Gospel truth: Bible Week little noticed in Seattle," printed in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. In her article on this subject, columnist Susan Paynter mentioned the various positions of the mayor (he issued the Bible Week proclamation), his press secretary, assistant press secretary, some city council members, the spokesman for the ACLU and, curiously, a sex advice writer. Even more bizarre, we learn that the sexpert is a Catholic; no one else's religion was identified. We are awaiting a response.

But to show how our members can reverse the tables, we bring to your attention Lorraine Russo of Tappan, New York. In January, Lorraine read a story in the New York *Daily News* about three firemen who tragically lost their lives. She noted that "not one single New York City paper mentioned that one of the firefighters was a former altar boy." She asked "How come?" and provided a response: "They're always so quick to report that little fact when it's a thief or murderer." Lorraine's letter was printed in the *Daily News*.

We encourage all members to follow Lorraine's lead.