

ANTI-WAR CROWD EXPLOITS THE POPE

The Catholic League has taken no position on the Iraqi conflict, but it has taken a position on the way the pope's words on the war have been exploited by anti-war activists.

□ □It should come as no surprise that the pope is viscerally anti-war. But it is a grave error to label him a pacifist. Pope John Paul II has said repeatedly that war cannot be decided upon "except as the very last option." What he has not said, though such words have been attributed to him, is that there is no legal or moral justification for the war (some Vatican officials have said as much, but not the Holy Father). In any event, it is striking how many new friends the Pontiff has these days.

□□Jessica Lange is anti-war and pro-abortion. The NARAL enthusiast found it useful to praise the pope for his position on the war. What she failed to mention was that when the pope told a gathering of world leaders to say "No To War" on January 13, he began by admonishing them to say "No To Death"; he specifically cited "the incomparable dignity of every human being, beginning with that of unborn children." But Jessica chose not to hear that.

□Actor Michael Moore was quoted as saying, "The pope even came right out and said it: This war in Iraq is not a just war and, thus, it is a sin." But the pope never said this is not a just war, never mind a sinful exercise. Susan Sarandon, another fair-weather Catholic, invoked the pope's name in making her pitch against the war. And even the notoriously anti-Catholic magazine, the *Nation*, cited the authority of the bishops in making their case against the war.

The reaction of Catholic dissidents and those who claim

Catholic status was even more comical. The *National Catholic Reporter* never tires of railing against papal authority; ditto for Call to Action, an organization of Catholic malcontents. Yet both lauded the pope for his leadership on the war. Even that inveterate Catholic basher Frances Kissling spoke of the “humanitarian” vision of the Vatican and the “religious authority of the pope.” This makes us wonder—will she now convert to Catholicism?

We’ll call these people sincere when they stop exploiting the pope’s words on the war and start showing real and consistent respect for his teachings on all subjects.

EDUCATION SECRETARY UNDER FIRE

U.S. Secretary of Education Roderick Paige has come under fire by secular extremists for extolling Christian values; his comments were made during an interview with the Baptist Press. The Catholic League rushed to his defense and was the first organization in the nation to do so.

“All things being equal,” Secretary Paige said, “I would prefer to have a child in a school that has a strong appreciation for the values of the Christian community, where a child is taught to have a strong faith.” He also compared public schools unfavorably to Christian schools because of the latter’s emphasis on values.

At no time in the interview did Secretary Paige say that religion should be taught in the public schools. But this did not stop him from being blasted by Americans United for Separation of Church and State, the ADL, the ACLU, the

National Education Association, the Islamic Networks Group of San Jose and the Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network.

The most harsh comments came from Congressman Gary Ackerman of New York who accused Paige of sponsoring “the Taliban approach to education,” and from *Washington Post* columnist Richard Cohen who charged Paige with seeking to mainstream the Christian faith into the public school curriculum.

The Catholic League believes that what is going on here is much bigger than an attempt to stop Secretary Paige. His critics really want to rid society of Christianity and that is why they need to be defeated.

DEMOCRATS, BLACKS, JEWS AND WOMEN: WHAT’S HAPPENED TO OUR ELECTED OFFICIALS?

William A. Donohue

When asked about the most ennobling attributes of Democrats, African Americans, Jews and women, many would cite such things as their affinity for the least among us. These groups, it is said, maintain a strong identification with the dispossessed and thus can more readily address their grievances. But is this true?

It is important to distinguish between elites and the rank-and-file. It is one thing to say that the typical Democrat, black, Jew or woman accurately reflects the more positive stereotype about them; it is quite another to suggest that their leaders embody this view. Consider the elected officials

of each group.

The public has long looked to the Democratic Party as the party of the underdog. Whether fighting for the rights of labor, or the interests of minorities, the Democratic Party has championed the rights of the disadvantaged in a way Republicans never have. Why, then, when it comes to the rights of the most innocent and defenseless among us, do Democrats abandon their legacy?

Of the 33 members of the United States Senate who recently voted against the ban on partial-birth abortion, 29 were Democrats; there were two Republicans and one Independent. In other words, when it comes approving the killing of a child who is 80 percent born, 88 percent of those are Democrats.

The Born Alive Infants Protection Act requires doctors to give babies born alive during botched abortions the same care and protection as other babies; previously, they were allowed to die on the doctor's table without treatment. It easily passed the Congress and President George W. Bush signed it into law. But when the initial vote took place on this issue in September 2000, the vote in the House was 380-15. Thirteen of the 15, or 87 percent, were Democrats.

That the party of the oppressed would resist protection for the innocent is mind-boggling. But consider this: on March 27, the House voted 346-49 (with 23 voting "present") urging President Bush to declare a day of prayer and fasting in honor of our troops in Iraq. Of the 49 who opposed this measure, 49 were Democrats. Of the 23 who voted "present," 23 were Democrats. It is not a wild leap to conclude that a party that is increasingly indifferent or hostile to religion will put a small premium on innocent human life.

No group in American history has been more abused than African Americans. One would think that given their oppression, they would lead the fight for the underdog. But not when it comes

to protecting kids who survive an abortion: 7 of the 15 members of the House who voted to allow infanticide in 2000 were black. Add to this the two Hispanic House members who voted this way and over half the vote to kill the kids came from minorities.

How can this be explained? Six of the seven blacks who voted against the Born Alive Infants Protection Act voted against the prayer bill (the other black representative was no longer in Congress when the latter bill was passed).

The role of the church in the black community is well-known. That so many black congressmen no longer connect with their religion is disturbing. But it does cast light on their abandonment of the underdog.

Jews have suffered for centuries and pride themselves as defenders of the downtrodden. Yet 82 percent of Jewish senators (9 of 11) voted against the ban on partial birth abortion; this was disproportionately the worst record of any religious group. On the prayer issue in the House, 7 Jews voted "no" and 11 voted "present." This means that 7 in 10 Jewish congressmen (there are 26 Jews in the House) are so phobic about religion that they could not bring themselves to vote for a day of prayer for our men and women in Iraq.

It is frequently said that women are more peaceful than men. Then why is it that the majority of those in the House who voted to allow kids to die after a botched abortion were women (8 of 15) when they made up only 13 percent of the House at the time? Why is it that nearly two-thirds of the Senators who voted for partial-birth abortion (9 of 14) were women? Why is it that 30 percent of those in the House who voted against a day of prayer were women when only 16 percent of the House is made up of women? So much for the stereotype that women value peace more than men. Or that they take their religion more seriously than men.

What this means is that when it comes to the most basic of civil rights—nothing is more elementary than the right to life—and to the public expression of religion, a very large portion of Democrats, African Americans, Jews and women have lost their moorings. Tragically, we are all poorer as a result.

SOME PREJUDICES ARE MORE EQUAL THAN OTHERS

By Philip Jenkins

For readers of *Catalyst*, expressions of anti-Catholic bigotry scarcely come as a surprise. Over the years, we have come to expect that media treatments of the Church, its clergy and its faithful will be negative, if not highly offensive, and Catholic organizations try to confront the worst manifestations of prejudice. When such controversies erupt, the defenders of the various shows or productions commonly invoke a free speech defense. These productions are just legitimate commentary, we hear, so offended Catholics should just lighten up, and learn not to be hyper-sensitive. Sometimes, defenders just deny that the allegedly anti-Catholic works are anything like as hostile as they initially seem to be. All these arguments, though, miss one central point, namely that similarly controversial attacks would be tolerated against literally no other group, whether that group is religious, political or ethnic.

The issue should not be whether film X or art exhibit Y is deliberately intending to affront Catholics. We should rather ask whether comparable expressions would be allowed if they

caused outrage or offense to any other group, whether or not that degree of offense seems reasonable or understandable to outsiders. If the answer is yes, that our society will indeed tolerate controversial or offensive presentations of other groups—of Muslims and Jews, African-Americans and Latinos, Asian-Americans and Native Americans, gays and lesbians— then Catholics should not protest that they are being singled out for unfair treatment. If, however, controversy is out of bounds for these other groups—as it assuredly is—then we certainly should not lighten up, and the Catholic League is going to be in business for a very long time to come.

It is easy to illustrate the degree of public sensitivity to images or displays that affect other social or religious groups—but how many of us realize how far the law has gone in accommodating the presumed privilege against offense? Witness the legal attempts over the last two decades to regulate so-called “hate speech.” American courts have never accepted that speech should be wholly unrestricted, but since the 1980s, a variety of activists have pressed for expanded laws or codes that would limit or suppress speech directed against particular groups, against women, racial minorities and homosexuals. The most ambitious of these speech codes were implemented on college campuses. Though many such codes have been struck down by the courts, a substantial section of liberal opinion believes that stringent laws should restrict the right to criticize minorities and other interest groups.

But if these provisions had been upheld in the courts, what would they have meant for recent Catholic controversies? One typical university code defines hate speech “as any verbal speech, harassment, and/or printed statements which can provoke mental and/or emotional anguish for any member of the University community.” Nothing in the code demands evidence that the offended person is a normal, average character not over-sensitive to insult. According to the speech codes, the fact of “causing anguish” is sufficient. Since the various

codes placed so much emphasis on the likelihood of causing offense, rather than the intent of the act or speech involved, the codes might well have criminalized art exhibits like, oh, just to take a fantastic example, a photograph of a crucifix submerged in a jar of urine.

The element of “causing offense” is central to speech codes. At the University of Michigan a proposed code would have prohibited “any behavior, verbal or physical, that stigmatizes or victimizes an individual on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, sexual orientation, creed, national origin, ancestry, age, marital status, handicap, or Vietnam-era veteran status.” “Stigmatization and victimization” are defined entirely by the subjective feelings of the groups who felt threatened. In 1992, the US Supreme Court upheld a local statute that prohibited the display of a symbol that one knows or has reason to know “arouses anger, alarm or resentment in others on the basis of race, color, creed, religion or gender.” The implied reference is to a swastika or a burning cross, but as it is written, the criterion is that the symbol causes “anger, alarm or resentment” to some unspecified person. These were precisely the reactions of many Catholic believers who saw or read about the “Piss Christ” photograph, or the controversial displays at the Brooklyn Museum of Art.

Other recent laws have taken full account of religious sensibilities, at least where non-Catholics are concerned. Take for instance the treatment of Native American religions, and the presentation of displays that (rightly) outrage Native peoples. In years gone by, museums nonchalantly displayed Indian skeletons in a way that would be unconscionable for any community, but which was all the more offensive for Native peoples, with their keen sensitivity to the treatment of the dead. In 1990, Congress passed NAGPRA, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, which revolutionized the operation of American museums and galleries by requiring that all Indian remains and cultural artifacts should be

repatriated to their tribal owners. As a matter of federal criminal law, NAGPRA established the principle that artistic and historical interests must be subordinate to the religious and cultural sensibilities of minority communities.

Even so, museums and cultural institutions have gone far beyond the letter of this strict law. They have systematically withdrawn or destroyed displays that might cause the slightest offense to Indian peoples, including such once-familiar displays as photographs of skeletons or grave-goods. In South-Western museums today, one commonly sees such images replaced with apologetic signs, which explain gaps in the exhibits in terms of new cultural sensitivities. Usually, museums state simply that the authorities of a given tribe have objected to an exhibit because it considers it hurtful or embarrassing, without even giving the grounds for this opinion, yet that is enough to warrant removal. When disputes arise, the viewpoint of the minority group must be treated as authoritative. Just imagine an even milder version of this legal principle being applied to starkly offensive images like those at the Brooklyn Museum of Art. If Native religion deserves respect and restraint on the part of commentators—as it assuredly does—why doesn't Catholicism merit similar safeguards?

Beyond the legal realm, time and again we see that media outlets exercise a powerful self-censorship that suppresses controversial or offensive images, whether or not that "offense" is intended: and again, this restraint applies to every group, except Catholics. Over the years, the film industry has learned to suppress images or themes that affect an ever-growing number of protected categories. The caution about African-Americans is understandable, given the racist horrors in films of bygone years, but the present degree of sensitivity is astounding. Recall last year's film "Barbershop," in which Black characters exchange disrespectful remarks about such heroic figures as Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King, and more questionable characters like O. J.

Simpson and Jesse Jackson. Though this was clearly not a racist attack, the outcry was ferocious: some things simply cannot be said in public. Jesse Jackson and Al Sharpton led an intense campaign to delete these touchy references.

And other social groups have learned these lessons about self-censorship. Asian-Americans and Latinos have both made it clear that the once-familiar stereotypes will no longer be tolerated, and Hollywood takes their complaints to heart. By the early 1990s, too, gay groups had achieved a similar immunity. When, in 1998, the film "The Siege" offered a (prescient) view of New York City under assault by Arab terrorists, the producers thought it politic to work closely with Arab-American and Muslim groups in order to minimize charges of stereotyping and negative portrayals. Activists thought that any film depicting how "Arab terrorists methodically lay waste to Manhattan" was not only clearly fantastic in its own right, but also "reinforces historically damaging stereotypes." As everyone knew, Hollywood had a public responsibility not to encourage such labeling.

Yet no such qualms affect the making of films or television series that might offend America's sixty million Catholics. Any suggestion that the makers of such films should consult with Catholic authorities or interest groups would be dismissed as promoting censorship, and a grossly inappropriate religious interference with artistic self-expression. The fuss over whether a film like "Dogma" or "Stigmata" is intentionally anti-Catholic misses the point. The question is not why American studios release films that will annoy and offend Catholics, but why they do not more regularly deal with subject matter that would be equally uncomfortable or objectionable to other traditions or interest groups. If they did so, American films might be much more interesting, in addition to demonstrating a new consistency.

If works of art are to offend, they should do so on an equal opportunity basis. If we have to tolerate such atrocities as

“Sister Mary Ignatius Explains It All For You”—recently revived as a Showtime special—then why should we not have merry satires poking fun at secular icons like Matthew Shepard or Martin Luther King? If, on the other hand, it is ugly and unacceptable even to contemplate an imaginary production of “Matthew Explains It All,” poking fun at victims of gay-bashing, then why should we put up with Sister Mary? Some consistency, please.

Let me end with a suggestion. By all means, let the Catholic League continue to report offensive depictions of Catholics and their church. But to put these in perspective, always remember to record these many other controversies, in which other groups succeed in enforcing their right to be free from offense. Only then can Catholic-bashing be seen for what it is, America’s last acceptable prejudice.

Philip Jenkins is Distinguished Professor of History and Religious Studies at Pennsylvania State University. To order his new book, The New Anti-Catholicism: The Last Acceptable Prejudice, contact the Catholic League at (212) 371-3191 or at 450 Seventh Avenue, New York, NY 10123.

IS BUSH TOO HOLY TO BE PRESIDENT?

President George W. Bush is being criticized both at home and abroad for the role religion plays in his life. At issue is whether Bush is too holy to be president. The Catholic League does not think so, but many others disagree.

It all began when Bush cited Jesus as his favorite philosopher

during a presidential debate in 1999. From that time on Bush has been blasted for playing the religion card. The war in Iraq has provided new opportunities for Bush to mention his reliance on God. That this has upset some notables is an understatement.

"Nowhere does the Bible call for crusades," is how German President Johannes Rau replied when asked about Bush's understanding of religion. A similar remark was made by French Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin: "In no way can God be called on for a vote of confidence." A Swedish lawmaker was even more breathless when he said, "I've never seen anything like this before."

The head of the German Bishops' Conference, Cardinal Karl Lehmann, showed how thoroughly modern he is when he admonished Bush for his "careless way of using religious language"; the good cardinal advised that this "is not acceptable anymore in today's world." He did not say when the change occurred or why he thought President Bush should abide by the new code.

In the U.S., Barry Lynn of Americans United for Separation of Church and State says Bush is on a "divinely inspired" mission that is endangering our liberties. An official of the Utah chapter of American Atheists brands Bush's rhetoric as "divisive." Freedom From Religion Foundation chief, Annie Laurie Gaylor, opines that Bush is "the most recklessly religious President we've seen."

To Presbyterian minister Fritz Ritsch, Bush thinks he's "theologian in chief." *Commonweal*, a magazine of the Catholic left, accuses Bush of the sin of "moral simplicity," one that is "a dangerous illusion." Time writer Joe Klein worries that Bush's faith "does not discomfort him." Protestant theologian Martin Marty frets that "Bush's God talk will set the tinderbox that is the Muslim world on fire." Muslim American Society official, Shaker El Sayed, warns that Bush "is claiming a divine mandate." Michael Cottle of the *New*

Republic is upset that Bush “is charging into battle with the blind confidence that God will *of course* help him emerge victorious.”

This is the way the Bush-fearing gang operates. They put words in his mouth and then denounce him for saying what he never said. In virtually every case, Bush’s critics fail to cite a single statement the president has made that would substantiate their charges.

We pray the president continues to invoke God’s name whenever he sees fit and does not yield to those who tremble when he does.

CATHOLIC-BASHING PLAY OPENED ON GOOD FRIDAY

“The Children of Fatima” opened on Good Friday at Rider University in New Jersey. Written by Rider faculty member Michael Friel, the plot revolves around a Catholic schoolboy in the 1960s who fears that the world will end when the pope reveals the third secret of Fatima.

According to the *Princeton Packet*, a local newspaper, Friel admits that a friend of his called the play “Catholic bashing.” To which Friel replied, “I’m really going for the way that all institutions, whether it’s religion or government or even your parent, use fear to get what they want. By instilling fear in you, they can control you.” The play features a drunken Irish priest and a “hard-assed Sr. Regina Coeli.”

William Donohue released the following statement to the press:

“If this play has a universal message about the way institutions of any kind use fear to control people, then why, out of all the institutions in society, did Friel choose the Catholic Church to slam? Why did his friend label the play Catholic bashing as opposed to, say, institution bashing? Why is the play opening on Good Friday?

“I have faxed a letter to Rider University president Bart Luedeke asking him to do for Catholics what he recently did for Jews. On December 3, 2002, President Luedeke released a statement to the Rider community distancing the university from an upcoming appearance on campus of the anti-Semitic poet Amiri Baraka. Luedeke said Baraka’s visit to the campus ‘does not reflect a University endorsement of the beliefs and assertions attributed to him.’ He went on to say that Baraka’s statements ‘have offended many members of our community and at face value stand in stark contrast to the sense of human value so important at Rider.’

“That was a commendable statement. In the same vein, I am asking President Luedeke to reassure Catholic students that the university does not endorse this play. Beyond this, is there anyone who believes that any college would open an anti-Semitic play on Yom Kippur or an anti-black play on Martin Luther King Day?”

When we went to press, we had not yet heard from President Luedeke.

GUESS WHO’S AFRAID OF PRAYER?

On March 27, in recognition of the U.S. participation in the war in Iraq, the House of Representatives voted 346-49 (with 23 voting “present”) urging President Bush to declare a day of

prayer and fasting. We thought you'd like to know the names, party, state and religion of those congressmen who are afraid of prayer. So here it is.

The 49 who voted against the day of prayer and fasting are:

<u>Representative + Party</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Religion</u>
Calvin Dooley (D)	CA	Methodist
Sam Farr (D)	CA	Episcopal
Barbara Lee (D)	CA	No Rel. Aff.
Zoe Lofgren (D)	CA	Protestant
Lucille Roybal-Allard (D)	CA	Catholic
Hilda Solis (D)	CA	Catholic
Linda Sanchez (D)	CA	Catholic
Fortney Stark (D)	CA	Unitarian
Ellen Tauscher (D)	CA	Catholic
Maxine Waters (D)	CA	Christian
Henry Waxman (D)	CA	Jewish
Lynn Woolsey (D)	CA	Presbyterian
Diana DeGette (D)	CA	Presbyterian
Alcee Hastings (D)	FL	Methodist
John Lewis (D)	GA	Baptist
Denise Majette (D)	GA	Methodist
Jesse Jackson Jr. (D)	IL	Baptist
Bobby Rush (D)	IL	Baptist
Janice Schakowsky (D)	IL	Jewish
Tom Allen (D)	ME	Protestant
Michael Capuano (D)	MA	Catholic
William Delahunt (D)	MA	Catholic
Barney Frank (D)	MA	Jewish
James McGovern (D)	MA	Catholic

John Olver (D)	MA	No Rel. Aff
John Conyers (D)	MI	Baptist
Carolyn Kirpatrick (D)	MI	Methodist
James Oberstar (D)	MN	Catholic
Martin Olav Sabo (D)	MN	Lutheran
Frank Ballance (D)	NC	Baptist
Shelley Berkley (D)	NV	Jewish
Donald Payne (D)	NJ	Baptist
Gary Ackerman (D)	NY	Jewish
Maurice Hinchey (D)	NY	Catholic
Charles Rangel (D)	NY	Catholic
Nydia Velazquez (D)	NY	Catholic
Anthony Weiner (D)	NY	Jewish
Stephanie Tubbs Jones (D)	OH	Baptist
Dennis Kucinich (D)	OH	Catholic
Earl Blumenauer (D)	OH	No Rel Aff.
Chaka Fattah (D)	PA	Baptist
Patrick Kennedy (D)	RI	Catholic
Chet Edwards (D)	TX	Methodist
Bernard Sanders (D)	VT	Jewish
Bobby Scott (D)	VA	Episcopalian
Brian Baird (D)	WA	Protestant
Jay Inslee (D)	WA	Christian
Jim McDermott (D)	WA	Episcopalian
Adam Smith (D)	WA	Christian

The 23 who voted “present” are:

<u>Representative + Party</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Religion</u>
-------------------------------	--------------	-----------------

Victor Snyder (D)	AR	Presbyterian
Susan Davis (D)	CA	Jewish
Bob Filner (D)	CA	Jewish
Jane Harman (D)	CA	Jewish
Tom Lantos (D)	CA	Jewish
Adam Schiff (D)	CA	Jewish
Brad Sherman (D)	CA	Jewish
Mike Thompson (D)	CA	Catholic
Mark Udall (D)	CO	No. Rel. Aff.
Robert Wexler (D)	FL	Jewish
Rahm Emanuel (D)	IL	Jewish
Luis Gutierrez (D)	IL	Catholic
Baron Hill (D)	IN	Christian
Benjamin Cardin (D)	MD	Jewish
Chris Van Hollen (D)	MD	Not Known
John Tierney (D)	MA	No Rel. Aff.
Steven Rothman (D)	NJ	Jewish
Steve Israel (D)	NY	Jewish
Major R. Owens (D)	NY	Baptist
Melvin Watt (D)	NC	Presbyterian
Peter DeFazio (D)	OR	Catholic
Norman Dicks (D)	WA	Lutheran
Ron Kind (D)	WI	Lutheran

GUESS WHO'S AFRAID OF PRAYER BUT NOT AFRAID OF ALLOWING KIDS TO DIE?

On September 26, 2000, the House of Representatives voted on the Born Alive Infants Protection Act. The bill would require doctors to give babies born alive during botched abortions the same care offered other babies. The vote was 380 to 15. Of the 15 who voted no, meaning they would allow a baby to die untreated by a doctor, 7 of them either voted against a day of prayer and fasting or voted "present." Here they are:

<u>Representative + Party</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Religion</u>
Chaka Fatah (D)	PA	Baptist
Alcee Hastings (D)	FL	Methodist
Jesse Jackson, Jr. (D)	IL	Baptist
Barbara Lee (D)	CA	No Rel. Aff.
Nydia Velazquez (D)	NY	Catholic
Maxine Waters (D)	CA	Christian
Melvin Watt (D)	NC	Presbyterian

GUESS WHO SUPPORTS INFANTICIDE?

On March 13, the U.S. Senate voted 64-33 to outlaw the practice of partial-birth abortion. Here is a list of those who opposed the ban:

<u>Representative + Party</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Religion</u>
Barbara Boxer (D)	CA	Jewish
Diane Feinstein (D)	CA	Jewish
Christopher Dodd (D)	CT	Catholic
Joseph Lieberman (D)	CT	Jewish
Bob Graham (D)	FL	United Church of Christ
Bill Nelson (D)	FL	Episcopalian
Daniel Inouye (D)	HI	Methodist
Daniel Akaka (D)	HI	Congregationalist
Tom Harkin (D)	IA	Catholic
Richard Durbin (D)	IL	Catholic
Edward Kennedy (D)	MA	Catholic
Paul Sarbanes (D)	MD	Greek Orthodox
Barbara Mikulski (D)	MD	Catholic
Susan Collins (R)	ME	Catholic
Olympia Snowe (R)	ME	Greek Orthodox
Carl Levin (D)	MI	Jewish
Deborah Stabenow (D)	MI	Methodist
Mark Dayton (D)	MN	Presbyterian
Max Baucus (D)	MT	Protestant
Jon Corzine (D)	NJ	Christian

Frank Lautenberg (D)	NJ	Jewish
Charles Schumer (D)	NY	Jewish
Hillary Clinton (D)	NY	Methodist
Jeff Bingaman (D)	NM	Methodist
Ron Wyden (D)	OR	Jewish
Lincoln Chafee (R)	RI	Episcopalian
Jack Reed (D)	RI	Catholic
James Jeffords (I)	VT	Congregationalist
Patty Murray (D)	WA	Catholic
Maria Cantwell (D)	WA	Catholic
Russell Feingold (D)	WI	Jewish
Herb Kohl (D)	WI	Jewish
John Rockefeller (D)	WV	Presbyterian

CANDY CANE CONTROVERSY ENDS

In the last issue of *Catalyst*, we reported on the disciplining of six students from Westfield High School in western Massachusetts. Their offense? Distributing candy canes with a religious message on them at Christmastime. For this alleged infraction of separation of church and state they were suspended.

Kudos to the students who sued the school, and to the Bush administration for filing a friend-of-the-court suit. They won. A federal court in Massachusetts has ruled that the students had their free speech rights violated when school administrators sought to punish them for their expression.

While this satisfies the Catholic League, it would have been an even better outcome had intolerant, pro-gag rule school administrators been fired for harassing the students.