

MOTHER TERESA STAMP OKAYED; ATHEISTS LAUNCH BOYCOTT

As soon as the U.S. Postal Service announced that it would celebrate the centenary of Mother Teresa's birthday with a commemorative stamp, it drew fire from atheists. No organization was angrier than the Freedom from Religion Foundation: it called for a boycott of the stamp. The Catholic League joined the fight, assailing the group.

Annie Laurie Gaylor is co-president, with her husband Dan Barker, of the atheist group; she is leading the atheist crusade against the Mother Teresa stamp. She reasons that the Post Office should not honor a religious figure. The Post Office replies that Mother Teresa was selected because of her humanitarian work.

When asked about a previous stamp honoring Malcolm X, a leader of the Nation of Islam, Gaylor said, "Malcolm X was not primarily known for being a religious figure." She is correct in this observation. But she sounded like a white racist when she dressed down Rev. Martin Luther King: she said he "just happened to be a minister."

As we said to the media, "We'd like to hear her explain that to African Americans at a Sunday service. Perhaps she can get the NAACP to recast King as a secular orator, and not as a black clergyman, during Black History Month."

What is really driving Gaylor's hatred of Mother Teresa, besides her virulent anti-Catholicism, is the saintly nun's opposition to abortion. Gaylor accused the Albanian nun of making an "anti-abortion rant" during her Nobel Prize acceptance speech. In fact, the "rant" amounted to her saying that "abortion was the greatest destroyer of peace in the world."

Gaylor was not above trotting out some of Christopher Hitchens' criticisms of Mother Teresa. But neither he, nor Gaylor, we told the press, has ever laid a glove on her.

We pointed out to the media why abortion hits a nerve with Gaylor. Her mother, Annie Nicol Gaylor, founded the Freedom from Religion Foundation in 1978. And just two years after the U.S. Supreme Court legalized abortion-*on-demand*, she released a book titled, *Abortion Is a Blessing*. This kind of book, we said, "could only be written by someone who sees abortion as a positive good." Her daughter is obviously cut from the same cloth.

Gaylor is not alone in protesting the Mother Teresa stamp. Elizabeth Tenety, who writes for the *Washington Post's* "On Faith" blog, weighed in against the nun on similar grounds. The Catholic League will not only lead the defense of Mother Teresa, we will bestow our own honors when the stamp is released on August 26.

DONOHUE ON "SIMPSONS"

"The Simpsons' 20th Anniversary Special" aired on January 10th and drew some 20 million viewers. Here's how it was flagged by the *New Haven Register*: "And what a mix of celebs and places it is: John Waters, Sting, the theme-song musicians, Dan Rather, Seth Myers, Mike Judge, Trey Parker and cohort Matt Stone, James L. Brooks (producer and godfather of the show) and even Bill Donohue of the Catholic League."

Donohue was interviewed for the Anniversary Special in October. Though the animated series has managed to offend one segment or the other in the course of 450 episodes, the

Catholic League has had only a few complaints, and two of the three dealt with ridiculing the Eucharist.

We protested two episodes of “The Simpsons” in the late 1990s and didn’t issue another news release until last fall, right around the time the film crew came to our New York City office. On October 19th, we went public with our complaint regarding the show that aired the night before. “Mocking the heart of any religion always crosses the line,” Donohue said, “and mocking the Eucharist does it for Catholics.”

The clip they aired of the interview, conducted over a two-day period, fairly showed Donohue registering his misgivings. It did not take his words out of context or attempt to caricature his remarks.

Donohue quipped, “What are Catholics supposed to be—piñatas? Are we supposed to be like the guy that you can just beat up on?” Not on your life.

BLACKS, JEWS, GAYS AND CATHOLICS

Every demographic group has its Catholic League equivalent, namely a civil rights organization that fights for the rights of its constituents. But we’re different, at least in one respect: we not only defend individuals, we defend an institution. And quite frankly, most of what we do is fight defamation against the institutional Church; we defend individual Catholics, too, but on that score our society has made great progress. Regrettably, Catholic bashing in the form of defaming the Church is a thriving business.

This issue of *Catalyst* provides a good summary of Catholic bashing that has taken place in the first five weeks of this year. Before examining some of the issues, consider what blacks, Jews and gays have been dealing with so far this year. Practically nothing. How do I know? All one has to do is go online and read the news releases of the NAACP, ADL and GLAAD, the leading civil rights organizations representing African Americans, Jews and homosexuals, respectively. I did, and here is what I found.

The NAACP, the ADL and GLAAD each listed one complaint. The NAACP protested racial disparities in cocaine sentencing; the ADL denounced swastikas scrawled on its Boulder, Colorado office; and GLAAD took a stand against a ban on gay adoption in Florida. That was it.

Good for them. Racism, anti-Semitism and gay bashing should not be tolerated. I hasten to add, however, that of the three examples cited, only the swastikas on the ADL's office were clearly a case of bigotry: racial disparities in sentencing may be a function of discrimination, but it may also be a reflection of reality; and banning homosexuals from adopting children is a policy choice not dissimilar from banning single persons from adopting. Now consider what we've been confronted with so far this year.

Brit Hume is a deeply religious man, and the loss of his son in the 1990s (he committed suicide) had a profound effect on him. When he left his post full-time at the Fox News Channel, he said he wanted to spend more time developing his faith. So when he opined that Tiger Woods might benefit from Christianity in seeking forgiveness, he was speaking from the heart. Some criticized him for doing so, and that is fine. But to call him the Taliban and to take the opportunity to lash out at Christianity in general, as many did, is entirely unfair.

Bob Shrum is a Democratic consultant, so it was hardly

surprising that he would be critical of the bishops for opposing abortion funding in the health care bill. But when he accused all bishops of encouraging priests to molest children, he sounded like a bigot. That Shrum is himself a Catholic means nothing: some Catholics are quite good at Catholic bashing.

Martha Coakley is a Shrum Catholic. She lost in her bid to replace Sen. Ted Kennedy in Massachusetts, but not before telling Catholic nurses and doctors who refuse to perform abortions that they have no right to do so. So much for religious liberty.

Protestants and Jews who travel on Celebrity Cruises usually have religious services available only on high holy days, while Catholics have benefited from priests who celebrate Mass on a daily basis. This was never a problem until recently: some non-Catholics were quite angry about the disparity and said so. It is important to note that no one from Celebrity ever said that ministers and rabbis could not offer daily services. The fact that Celebrity caved in and gave the bigots what they wanted was disgraceful.

Mother Teresa will be honored later this year with a U.S. stamp to celebrate her centenary. Almost everyone is happy, save for the atheists at Freedom from Religion Foundation. They slammed the saintly nun for making an "anti-abortion rant" during her Nobel Prize acceptance speech and denigrated her heroic work. It doesn't get much lower than this.

Sarah Silverman uses vulgar terms to describe the pope, libels him and is hailed by other anti-Catholic bigots on TV for doing so. Furthermore, she suffers no penalty whatsoever.

Dawn Johnsen was renominated by President Obama even after we disclosed that she once went into court trying to strip the Catholic Church of its tax exempt status. She is not content to simply disagree with us on abortion—she wants to silence

us.

When I debated feminist attorney Gloria Allred on the Alan Colmes radio show on the propriety of the Tim Tebow pro-life Super Bowl ad, she got so wound up that she began denouncing the ad because of its alleged “religiously informed” qualities (as if that should be a disqualifier). They did something similar at the Proposition 8 trial: lawyers in favor of gay marriage questioned the rationality of religious conservatives, including Catholics, to reject the right of homosexuals to marry.

Why are blacks, Jews and gays getting a fair shake these days, relatively speaking, and Catholics are getting dumped on? Just look at the common denominator in most of the Catholic-bashing cases. Sex. The Catholic Church’s teachings on abortion and marriage explain much of the vitriol. It’s sick and it’s inexcusable. And it also explains why we are so busy.

POLISH VICTIMS OF NAZISM

Thaddeus C. Radzilowski

The study of the non-Jewish victims of the genocidal and racial policies of the Nazi regime is a comparatively neglected topic. It is complex and at times a controversial issue. To treat them as victims of the Holocaust along with the Jews is to tread into a minefield. Even to compare the Jewish with the gentile experience can raise angry criticism in some quarters. There were, as we know, some very heated and emotional debates on this issue when the Holocaust Museum was being created.

All of the objections were rooted in the idea of the uniqueness of Shoah as an experience of Jewish martyrdom. The arguments range from the simple empirical fact that all historical events are unique to characterizations of the Holocaust in terms that are nothing short of metaphysical. I might note that I do accept the first notion of the historical uniqueness of the Jewish martyrdom during the Second World War. It was unprecedented in its scope, in the ambitious evil of its perpetrators and in the number of its victims relative to the entire Jewish population. As a historian I am, however, not competent to speak of the Holocaust in any spiritual or metaphysical sense or as an event that in some way transcends historical understanding.

The Nazi regime persecuted and killed for reasons based on racial ideologies, often rooted in ancient and modern prejudices that predated the Nazi period. The conflict between Hitler and his first enemies and victims, the communists, and his struggle with Christianity, especially Catholicism was, to be sure, ideological, but the ideology was not racist. It should be noted; however, that Nazi obsession with racist theories did color Nazi anti-communist and anti-Christian beliefs. Both Christianity and communism, for example, came to be equated with Jewishness. For example, in an October 21, 1939 meeting with Martin Bormann, Hitler spoke at great length about Christianity and Bolshevism and condemned them as two versions of the eternal Jewish threat.

Most of Nazi racial theories were developed about Poles, their closest neighbors, and extended to the other groups of Slavs. There is much less commentary in Nazi and German sources about the other groups. They were all uniformly regarded as *unttermenschen* [subhuman]. It has to be also remembered that the direct Nazi encounter with most of the Eastern Slavs came after June 1941, almost two years after they had begun a fierce racial war of mass murder and enslavement against the Poles. The ferocity of the actions against Poles carried over

and increased the aggression against the other civilian populations on the Eastern front.

In the fall of 1939, Hitler and Stalin invaded and conquered Poland in about five weeks. As a result, for Christian Poles World War II is the story of martyrdom at the hands of two genocidal regimes, not one. The military losses suffered by Poland in the invasion by Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union are heavy: about 67,000 were killed and 134,000 were wounded. More than half a million Polish soldiers were taken prisoner, about two-thirds captured by the German army. Polish civilian losses as a result of military action were considerable.

At the beginning of the war, the Nazi plan was to inflict terror on the population and break Poland's will to resist. As he gathered his generals, Hitler ordered them to "kill without pity or mercy all men, women and children of Polish descent or language . . . only in this way can we achieve the living space we need." Mobile killing squads would follow the main body of troops, shooting prisoners and any Poles who might organize resistance. The Soviets planned a similar campaign.

The campaign against Poland was conducted with a cruelty previously unknown in modern European warfare. Polish civilians and prisoners of war were systematically shot by German and Soviet forces. Although the Nazi SS and the Soviet NKVD committed the worst crimes, regular army and air forces of both totalitarian states were full and willing participants in the slaughter. The German use of special action units in Poland was a test run. Later these same units would play an even more terrible part in the Holocaust of East European Jewry.

From the beginning of the German Occupation of Poland, it was clear that it would differ from every military occupation previously known in modern history. The murderous policies carried out against civilians during the actual military campaign had already signaled the demonic character that it

would take. During the first four months of the occupation more than 50,000 civilians were executed by the new Nazi Regime. The majority of these victims—about 43,000—were Christians. Nazi policies in Poland were based primarily on a perverse pseudo-scientific racist ideology that relegated Poles and Jews to sub-human categories.

The occupation of Poland targeted Jewish and Christian citizens of Poland in different ways. During the first two years it was the Christians who in many ways bore more heavily the brunt of Nazi terror as the occupiers sought to exterminate the leadership and intelligentsia, turn ordinary citizenry into slave laborers of the Reich and begin the process of replacing the rural population with German settlers. SS commanders, including Reinhold Heydrich, saw ethnic Poles as their main foe rather than the Jews of Poland during the early part of the occupation. The first task for Hitler's minions was to eliminate any Christian Poles who could be considered leaders.

The half of Poland that was taken by Nazi Germany in 1939 was divided into two parts. The Polish Territories, which were part of Imperial Germany until 1918, were incorporated directly into the Nazi Reich. Ninety percent of the population of this area, which was slated for thorough Germanization, was ethnically Polish. After the leading citizens, clergy and intelligentsia of the region were either killed or incarcerated in camps, the Germans began a wholesale deportation of Poles from the area. Over a million Poles had their farms, homes, businesses and property seized and turned over to the Germans and many were then deported to Central Poland. Those who were left behind were subjected to denationalization. They were no longer to speak Polish or consider themselves Polish. This mass deportation of Christian Poles was the dress rehearsal that allowed the Nazi Regime to perfect its techniques for the later wholesale shipment of Europe's Jews to death camps in Poland.

It was soon apparent to the Nazi leadership that the scale of their plans to eliminate the Polish leadership would overwhelm their existing systems of prison and concentration camps, so a series of new camps were created. The most infamous of those was located near Kraków in the town of Oświęcim, known by its German name, Auschwitz. The Auschwitz camp was designed to house Polish political prisoners, and inmate labor built the initial camp out of an old army base. It opened in June 1940 and remained a place of incarceration and martyrdom, particularly for Christian Poles, until 1942 when it also became the site of the most terrible massacre of Jews during the Holocaust. It remains for both people a preeminent symbol of martyrdom and tragedy.

After an attack on the USSR, the Germans also attempted to create all-German colonies in the General Government part of Poland by deporting or exterminating the local inhabitants and bringing in German settlers. In late 1942, Nazi racial theorists sought to clear part of the region around Zamość of Poles and bring in ethnic Germans to create a German colony. Whole villages were rounded up, inhabitants executed, sent to concentration camps or slave labor. Over 150,000 people (30 percent of the population) were displaced from their homes. A similar attempt on a smaller scale occurred in Białystok where some 40,000 were displaced.

An ancillary part of the campaign of deportation and German colonization was the organized kidnapping of Polish children who had "Germanic" characteristics to be raised as Germans. In all, during the war, about 50,000 children were seized and deported to the Reich. Those who were found unsuitable upon subsequent examination were executed at camps such as Auschwitz.

In February 1940, the NKVD began its second phase of occupation, the mass deportation of Poles from the Soviet occupation zone. Over the course of the next 15 months about 500,000– 750,000 Polish men, women and children were packed

into unheated cattle cars and sent to the gulags where many died of hunger, disease, overwork and execution. They were soon joined by many Jews, Ukrainians and Belarussians. Polish POWs who had fallen into Soviet hands met an even worse fate. Approximately 22,000 Polish officers, mostly well-educated reservists, were executed on Stalin's orders.

World War II was a catastrophe for Poland on a scale that few other countries have experienced at any time in human history. The Nazi occupation lasted five and a half years. About six million Polish citizens were killed. Of these, three million were Jewish. This total represents 17 percent of the pre-War population—the highest percentage of any country in Europe. Poland's ancient Jewish community, with a history stretching back to the early Middle Ages, was virtually wiped out. The Nazis killed two million Polish Christians, the Soviets perhaps almost a million, and about 60,000 were killed by Ukrainian nationalists. The city of Warsaw alone lost more people—170,000 to 200,000 civilians died in the Warsaw Uprising—than Britain, Belgium, Czechoslovakia and the USA put together. One and one-half million Poles were conscripted to service the Reich.

In conclusion, as we look at this dreadful catalog of mass murder and persecution, we can begin to understand better the scope and nature of Nazi genocide and, in the case of the unprecedented horror of the occupation of Poland, the role of the Soviet Union as Hitler's accomplice. There is a relationship between the motives, ideologies, and methods of the mass murders of gentile populations and the Holocaust that allows the stories to illuminate each other and give us a fuller understanding of one of the most terrible periods of human history.

Thaddeus C. Radzilowski is president of the Piast Institute: a National Institute for Polish and Polish American affairs. This article is adapted from a longer piece he wrote on the Gentile victims of Nazism.

BISHOPS STAND FAST ON HEALTH CARE

A day before the State of the Union address, the U.S. bishops released a letter imploring Congress to move forward with health care reform. A plea for the president to do the same was issued by 23 progressive religious leaders. The difference between the letters was striking, and the reaction to the bishops was sharp.

The bishops reiterated their call for universal health care, standing fast on the need to protect conscience rights and the rights of the unborn. *New York Times* journalist David D. Kirkpatrick, however, called out the bishops by claiming, “Now that the legislation appears to be near death, the bishops are on the other side.”

The bishops never switched positions: No organization in the nation has been more consistent in its support for health care reform than them. It is hardly a new position that the bishops don’t support federal funding of abortion and the protection of the conscience rights of health care workers. Practicing Catholics believe that abortion is “intrinsically evil,” thus it has no legitimate place in any health care legislation.

Sarah Posner, a left-wing writer, was furious with the bishops. She spoke derisively of their commitment to “life-giving” health care; she argued that their real “motive” is to “normalize and expand their agenda on reproductive care”; she accused them of pursuing a “divide and conquer strategy”; she contended that they seek “to portray themselves as the heroes” after “they’ve absolved themselves of responsibility for holding the House bill hostage”; and so forth. In other words,

she considers them opportunists.

The letter by religious progressives never mentioned any objection to abortion or the need for conscience rights, though it did conclude by citing their dedication to “helping the vulnerable.” It’s sad that the unborn were not counted among the vulnerable.

TIME IS RIPE FOR CONSCIENCE RIGHTS

Although the health care bill in the House is better than the one in the Senate on the issue of federal funds for abortion, neither adequately provides protection for the conscience rights of health care workers. It is important to recognize that one of the issues which hurt Martha Coakley in her run for the Massachusetts Senate seat was her adamant rejection of conscience rights: she effectively told Catholic doctors and nurses that they either perform abortions or look for another job. This didn’t go over big with Catholics, as well as many others in the Bay State.

At Notre Dame, President Obama declared that he fully supports conscience rights for health care workers. But there is no evidence that he is working to secure these rights in either the House or Senate bill. Even when he invoked the name of Rev. Martin Luther King in January while pushing for health care reform, he never cited what King had to say about conscience rights.

King strongly believed that “an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and who willingly accepts

the penalty of imprisonment in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for the law.” King’s plea, which is an application of Catholic teaching on natural rights, needs to be heeded by Obama and the Congress. Rather than forcing Catholic health care workers to break the law—which they most certainly will do, if pushed—it would be more prudent to guarantee their conscience rights in these bills.

King understood how important these rights are. It’s time those who lean on his legacy adopted them as well.

BOB SHRUM THROWS MUD AT THE BISHOPS

In a recent article posted on TheWeek.com, Democratic consultant Bob Shrum took a shot at the Catholic bishops.

Shrum began the article by bashing Bart Stupak, the congressman whose amendment in the House version of the health care bill bans abortion coverage. Shrum falsely claimed that Stupak’s amendment “prevents Americans from purchasing abortion coverage with their own money.” As Stupak recently wrote in the *New York Times*, “The amendment does not prevent private plans from offering abortion services and it does not prohibit women from purchasing abortion coverage with their own money.”

Shrum got nasty when he took issue with Stupak’s religiously informed conscience. He contrasted Stupak unfavorably with Ted Kennedy and Mario Cuomo, both of whom thumbed their noses at Catholic teachings on abortion. Then he laid into the bishops

for interfering in politics by criticizing two other Catholic dissidents, John Kerry and Joe Biden. He was at his demagogic best when he played the anti-Catholic card by suggesting the bishops are hostile to democracy, warning that they may even push to outlaw divorce.

Shrum got really dirty when he slandered all Catholic bishops: "Having abetted thousands of priests in molesting children, they're now set on abusing health reform." Imagine an opponent of gay marriage citing gay leaders who abet the frequent use of bathhouses, the lethal sex acts that take place there, and the diseases they generate.

We called for an apology. Shrum couldn't fight the bishops on the merits of the issue, so he resorted to mud throwing to silence them.

OBAMA RENOMINATES ANTI-CATHOLIC LAWYER

After Dawn Johnsen's nomination to head the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel was sent back to the White House at the end of last year, President Obama quickly decided to renominate the anti-Catholic lawyer.

Most of Johnsen's critics have focused on her strong pro-abortion record. While that is disturbing, a pro-abortion president can be expected to staff his administration with such a person, and no one has doubted the president's position on this subject. But, as we have pointed out in the past, it is an entirely different matter when a president selects bigots to work for him.

Dawn Johnsen is not someone who simply takes issue with the Church's pro-life position: she wants to punish the Church. In the late 1980s, she joined a cadre of anti-Catholics to strip the Catholic Church of its tax exempt status. The charge? The Church was guilty of violating IRS strictures because it took a strong pro-life position. The lawsuit failed.

The person who led this assault was Lawrence Lader, co-founder of NARAL with Dr. Bernard Nathanson. (Nathanson later dropped his pro-abortion stance, became a strong pro-life advocate and converted to Catholicism.) At the time NARAL was founded, Lader, according to Nathanson, liked to refer to the Catholic Church as "our favorite whipping boy," maintaining that his goal was to "bring the Catholic hierarchy out where we can fight them. That's the *real* enemy." (*Italics in original.*) That was in the late 1960s. Twenty years later, Lader published a vicious book assailing the Catholic Church, and it was at this time that he launched his bid—assisted by Johnsen—to break the Church.

This is the real Dawn Johnsen. She is a person so fueled by hatred for the Catholic Church that she would like to destroy it. Having failed to secure her appointment last year, Obama has decided that he just can't proceed without her. How telling.

If someone were nominated to serve in a major legal position in a Republican administration who previously tried to take away the tax exempt status of Islamic mosques and institutions—for purely political reasons—everyone knows that he or she would never be given a hearing.

Yet despite this information on her, the *New York Times* audaciously asserted that the "baseless objections" and "baseless concerns" of Johnsen's critics should be ignored.

Since when are objections to proven instances of bigotry considered "baseless"? Would it be "baseless" to object to

someone who wants to deny Muslims the same tax exempt status afforded Catholics, Protestants, Jews and others? Would not such a person be branded a bigot who is unfit to serve in any administration, especially in a high post in the Justice Department?

The answer is obvious. Which begs the more important question: Why is her nomination even alive?

TIME TO CLOSE FAITH-BASED PROGRAMS

Recently we called on President Obama to shut down the Office of Faith-based and Neighborhood Partnerships.

The goal of the faith-based initiative launched by President George W. Bush was to put an end to the long-standing discriminatory practice of allowing federal monies to be spent on secular social service agencies, but not religious-based programs. While the outcome of this effort was less than noble, its purpose certainly was. Under President Barack Obama, it is now clear that this program has a new agenda, and it is not one that is religion friendly.

It was just in January that *Washington Post* journalist William Wan reported that a group within the faith-based office was considering whether to ban the display of religious symbols in those religious institutions that receive federal funding.

It did not matter what the final decision was—we already knew enough. The mindset that is in place is sufficient reason to close down the entire faith-based office. And it's not just

because of this development.

On July 1, 2008, while campaigning for the presidency, Obama said that if he were elected to office, he would not allow faith-based programs to hire just their own people. In other words, he declared his interest in gutting the faith element in faith-based programs: religious social service groups could not staff their offices with their own people when ministering to people of their own religion.

Last April, the Obama advance team told Georgetown University that the president would not speak there unless they put a drape over religious symbols. The school complied and placed a cover over a monogram of the name of Jesus.

Last month, it was reported that a serious debate ensued in the White House whether to display a manger scene at Christmastime. They eventually decided to erect the crèche. Now they're wondering whether to tell Catholic charitable offices to put up a sheet over crucifixes.

We know what they really want, and that is good enough to call for the dismantling of all faith-based programs in this administration.

ALLRED SEEKS TO KILL SUPER BOWL AD

In the weeks leading up to the Super Bowl, there was no lack of controversy surrounding a pro-life ad featuring college football star Tim Tebow and his mother, Pam. One of the most outspoken opponents of the ad was feminist lawyer Gloria

Allred who wrote to CBS attempting to get the network to drop the ad.

Gloria Allred is no stranger to the subject of abortion, so it was not surprising that she wanted to kill this pro-life ad. Her letter to Leslie Moonves of CBS stated that the ad should be pulled because it was guilty of "misleading advertising."

Allred, who had not seen the ad, charged that when Pam Tebow, while pregnant with Tim, was being advised by doctors in the Philippines to consider an abortion (she was on antibiotics for a pregnancy illness), it was illegal there to have one. In a monumental stretch, Allred reasoned that the ad should disclose this information; otherwise she said it was "misleading."

What was really misleading was Allred's duplicity. Several years ago, she represented Amber Frey in a case related to the death of Laci Peterson; Peterson's husband, Scott, was convicted of murdering both her *and* the baby she was carrying, a boy they had named Connor. In an interview she gave on June 5, 2003 on the Fox News Channel's "Hannity and Colmes," Allred found it useful to her case to emphasize the humanness of Peterson's baby: "And the fact that there are two individuals who are dead there, Laci and Connor, that has to be the most important consideration of everything." For once, she was right.

Allred's confession in 2003 undercuts her credibility—to say nothing of her ethical standing—to make this case against Tebow's Super Bowl ad. She knows that Tim Tebow is alive today because his mother did not abort him, despite the advice from doctors. To top it off, she couldn't even respectfully deal with this issue. Her snide remark, which was in the letter to Moonves, was classic. "As the story is reported," she said, "Tim's mother decides to take her pregnancy to term anyway and give birth to Tim. Apparently they have lived happily ever after since that time." And apparently, Allred has no shame.

We asked our members to contact CBS and to let the network know of their support for the ad.