

ATTACKS ON MEL GIBSON GROW; SO DOES HIS SUPPORT

Mel Gibson's movie, "The Passion of Christ" (recently retitled from "The Passion"), won't be released until Lent, but the reaction to it hasn't abated since the first salvo was launched against the Hollywood star last spring.

Lining up against Gibson is the ad hoc committee of New Testament scholars, both Catholic and Jewish, who are furious that they have had to confine their comments to a stolen script of the film. Comedian Bill Maher, an inveterate anti-Catholic, charged that Gibson was "anti-Semitic." Rabbi David Rosen of the American Jewish Committee also joined the debate when he said this is "a battle between the more traditional and the more liberal wings within the Catholic Church, and the relationship with the Jewish community has become a football in this fight."

One person in the Jewish community who is not sitting on the sidelines is Abraham Foxman of the Anti-Defamation League (ADL). In *The Jewish Week*, he recently accused Gibson of being anti-Semitic. Foxman also attacked Gibson's father for saying that fewer than 6 million Jews died in the Holocaust (something many Jewish scholars concede).

Foxman was upset with Gibson's comment that the ADL and others would come after him had he not excised the passage from Matthew which reads, "His blood be on us and on our children." Foxman also objected to Gibson's comment to Peter Boyer in *The New Yorker* that "modern secular Judaism wants to blame the Holocaust on the Catholic Church." For Foxman, this amounts to "classic anti-Semitism."

The Catholic League immediately charged Foxman with seeking "to poison relations between Catholics and Jews." "Similarly,"

we offered, "it is no secret that extremely secular Jews have teamed up with profoundly alienated Catholics to blame the Catholic Church for the Holocaust. Quite frankly, most Catholics are fed up with the lies of Goldhagen and Cornwell."

What is particularly disturbing is to read that in the September 15 *New Yorker*, Foxman said, "Per se, I don't think that Mel Gibson is an anti-Semite." Yet in the September 18 edition of *The Jewish Week*, he said Gibson was anti-Semitic. After we blasted Foxman the same day for his irresponsible remark, he told AP on September 19, "I'm not ready to say he's [Gibson] an anti-Semite."

Keep your eyes on this one-it's an issue that will only intensify.

"HAIL MARY" BAR NIXED

There will be no "Hail Mary's Last Chance Sports and Spirits" bar in Rock Island, Illinois. Here's what happened.

Two entrepreneurs, Bruce Millage and Jeffrey Guthrie, recently purchased a building that housed a former synagogue in Rock Island. They planned to turn it into a sports bar by the name, "Hail Mary's Last Chance." Their intent was to borrow the famous football quip about a "Hail Mary" pass and use it as the name of their new bar. But area Catholics weren't amused.

Priests like Father James Ramer of St. Anne's in East Moline quickly complained, as did many area lay Catholics. Bishop Daniel Jenky of Peoria, Illinois made public his criticism. Then the Catholic League entered the fray.

William Donohue wrote to Jeff Guthrie explaining what the

Catholic League is all about. He then said, "What you and Mr. Millage are planning to do is disturbing, but perhaps it is not too late for you to reconsider." He ended by saying, "Please let me know what your plans are regarding this important matter as it will impact on my decision."

Just days after the letter was mailed, Donohue fielded a phone call from Bruce Millage. He said there was never any intent to offend Catholics, and that is why he and his partner have dropped the name "Hail Mary" from the bar's name. They are now running a contest to decide what would be an appropriate name.

THE CASE AGAINST GAY MARRIAGE

William A. Donohue

As a kid who grew up in New York in the 1950s, I had no idea what a homosexual was. There were a few effeminate boys, of course, but they were simply regarded as sissies; the most exaggerated of this group were known as fairies. What this conveyed was an inability to be one of the guys. For example, these boys didn't know how to put on a baseball glove, and things like that. The idea that they were sexually attracted to other boys was something so foreign as to be unbelievable.

It wasn't until I was in the U.S. Air Force (during the Vietnam war) that I first encountered homosexuals. To my knowledge, only one of the young men with whom I worked was homosexual. We got along fine. After work, he went his way and I went mine. To be more accurate, he socialized with other homosexuals on the base—often in their rooms with the door closed—and I headed to the Airmen's club for a beer.

Though homosexuals could technically be thrown out of the Air

Force (and given a bad conduct discharge), the only ones who were ever expelled were those who made an explicit issue of their sexuality and sought to be discharged. And when they were, they were uniformly given a general discharge: this meant they were entitled to all the benefits of an honorable discharge (on appeal they could also be granted an honorable discharge). That's the way it was handled. In short, "Don't ask, don't tell" was always the rule—it's just that it wasn't formalized in writing.

But those were the days when homosexuals simply wanted to be left alone. At most, they wanted tolerance. Today, tolerance is a dirty word among homosexuals—they want society to affirm their lifestyle. But as gay activist Larry Kramer has astutely observed, it would be more accurate to call it a deathstyle: the diseases they carry, and the high mortality rate they sport, is testimony to Kramer's characterization.

Nothing shows how much our culture has changed in my lifetime than the contemporary push for same-sex marriage. Gays can, of course, sign a legal contract binding themselves to each other, but this is not what they seek. What they want—it's more like a demand—is that society permit them to marry. It is not a request that should be honored.

To be pro-same-sex marriage is to be against marriage. How so? Explain to someone who served in the armed services that the veterans' benefits he justly earned are now going to be extended to those who never served. Explain to senior citizens who get discounts in many different venues that their benefits are going to be made available to everyone, regardless of age. And then tell veterans and seniors that the new policy has no effect on them.

If something is special, it cannot be universally distributed. This is what our society must decide: if marriage is special, then it must be treated as such in custom and law. If it doesn't matter, then let the politics of inclusion prevail.

But history warns against such nonsense.

The mores, and later the laws, in every society in the history of the world—in both eastern and western civilizations—have re-served marriage for heterosexuals. Moreover, not one world religion has ever endorsed the idea that two men should be allowed to marry. Now given the extraordinary diversity that has existed over the centuries, and in so many different cultures, it is astounding that not one place on earth has ever sanctioned the idea of two men getting married. This alone ought to give the proponents of gay marriage pause.

Those who advocate same-sex marriage like to emphasize that all that matters is that two people love each other. But if a loving and committed relationship is the *sine qua non* of marriage, then a brother and sister who “fall in love” would qualify for marriage. Polygamy would have to be legalized as well. And what if Tom and Dick are courting and they both fall in love with Harry. Why can't Tom, Dick and Harry get married? To deny them would be to discriminate.

If marriage is to be treated as if it were nothing more than an alternative lifestyle, cohabiting men and women will have less reason to marry. Unfortunately, this does not bode well for children. The social science evidence overwhelmingly demonstrates that children do best when raised by a mother and father in the institution of marriage. Indeed, the data show that the physical, psychological, emotional and social well-being of children is so better served in this context that it is preposterous to argue otherwise; substitutes are theoretically available, but in reality there are none.

In short, if marriage is special it cannot be treated as if it were but one selection on a sociological smorgasbord. On the contrary, it must be granted a privileged position in society.

THE MEL GIBSON CONTROVERSY AS SEEN THROUGH THE EYES OF AN ORTHODOX JEW

By Rabbi Daniel Lapin

Never has a film aroused such hostile passion so long prior to its release as has Mel Gibson's "Passion." Many American Jews are alarmed by reports of what they view as potentially anti-Semitic content in this movie about the death of Jesus, which is due to be released during 2004. Clearly the crucifixion of Jesus is a sensitive topic, but prominent Christians who previewed it—including good friends like James Dobson and Michael Novak, who have always demonstrated acute sensitivity to Jewish concerns—see it as a religiously inspiring movie and refute charges that it is anti-Semitic. While most Jews are wisely waiting to see the film before responding, others are either prematurely condemning a movie they have yet to see or violating the confidentiality agreements they signed with Icon Productions.

As an Orthodox rabbi with a wary eye on Jewish history which has an ominous habit of repeating itself, I fear that these protests, well intentioned though some may be, are a mistake. I believe those who publicly protest Mel Gibson's film lack moral legitimacy. What is more, I believe their actions are not only wrong but even recklessly ill-advised and shockingly imprudent.

For an explanation of why I believe that those Jews protesting "Passion" lack moral legitimacy we must take ourselves back in time to the fall of 1999. That was when Arnold Lehman, the

Jewish director of the Brooklyn Museum, presented a show called "Sensation." It featured, from the collection of British Jew Charles Saatchi, several works which debased Catholicism, including Chris Ofili's dung-bedecked "Madonna."

You may wonder why I highlight the Jewish ethnicity of the players in the Brooklyn Museum saga. My reason for doing so is that everyone else recognized that they were Jewish, and there is merit in us knowing how we ourselves appear in the eyes of those among whom we live. This is especially true on those sad occasions when we violate what ancient Jewish wisdom commends as the practice of Kiddush HaShem, which is to say, conducting our public affairs in a way best calculated to bring credit upon us as a group. Maintaining warm relations with our non-Jewish friends is a traditional Jewish imperative and the *raison d'être* of the organization I serve, Toward Tradition.

Almost every Christian organization angrily denounced the vile bigotry sponsored by the Brooklyn Museum. Especially prominent was William Donohue, president of the Catholic League, a good friend who has always stood firmly with Jews in the fight against genuine anti-Semitism, yet now, in his fight against anti-Catholicism, he appealed to Jewish organizations in vain. Almost every Christian denomination helped vigorously protest the assault that the Brooklyn Museum carried out against the Catholic faith in such graphically abhorrent ways. Even Mayor Rudolph Giuliani expressed his outrage by trying to withhold money from the museum. Where was the Jewish expression of solidarity against such ugliness?

Only a small group of Orthodox Jews joined their fellow Americans in protest at this literal defilement of Christianity with elephant feces. And were other Jews silent? No, unfortunately not. In actuality a small but disproportionately vocal number of them were defending the Brooklyn Museum and its director in the name of artistic freedom.

You may also remember Martin Scorsese's 1988 film "The Last Temptation of Christ." Then too almost every Christian denomination protested Universal's release of a movie so slanderous that had it been made about Moses, or say, Martin Luther King Jr., it would have provoked howls of anger from the entire country. As it was, Christians were left to defend their faith quite alone other than for one solitary courageous Jew, Dennis Prager. Most Americans knew that Universal was run by Lew Wasserman. Most Americans also knew Lew's ethnicity. Perhaps many now wonder why Mel Gibson is not entitled to the same artistic freedom we accorded Lew Wasserman?

When the Weinstein brothers, through their Miramax films (named after their parents, Mira and Max Weinstein), distributed "Priest" in 1994, Catholics were again left to protest this unflattering depiction of their faith alone while many Jewish organizations proclaimed the primacy of artistic freedom. Surely Jewish organizations would carry just a little more moral authority if they routinely protested all attacks on faith, not only those troubling to Judaism.

Oddly enough, Jewish organizations did find one movie so offensive as to warrant protest. It was Disney's "Aladdin" that was considered, by Jews, to be needlessly offensive to Arabs!

Now I do have one possible explanation for why one might consider it more important to protest "Passion." It is this: in Europe, anti-Semitic slander frequently resulted in Catholic mobs killing Jews. Our hyper-sensitivity has a long and painful background of real tragedy. In any event, Jewish moral prestige would stand taller if we were conspicuous in protesting movies that defame any religion. Furthermore, opponents of "Passion" argue that this movie might cause a backlash against the Jewish community. Yet when so-called art really does encourage violence, for Jewish spokesmen, artistic freedom seems to trump all other concerns. Here is what I mean.

During the nineties, record companies run by well known executives including Michael Fuchs, Gerald Levin, and David Geffen produced obscene records by artists like Geto Boys and Ice-T that advocated killing policemen and raping and murdering women. During that decade of shockingly hateful music that incited violence, our Jewish organizations only protested Michael Jackson's song "They Don't Care About Us" and the rap group Public Enemy's single "Swindler's Lust," claiming that these songs were anti-Semitic. It is ignoble to ignore the wrongs done to others while loudly deploring those done to us.

In truth however, even though Catholics did kill Jews in Europe, I do not believe that the often sad history of Jews in Europe is relevant now. Why not? Because in Europe, Catholic church officials wielded a rapacious combination of ecclesiastical and political power with which they frequently incited illiterate mobs to acts of anti-Jewish violence. In America, no clergyman secures political power along with his ordination certificate, and in America, if there are illiterate and dangerous thugs, Christianity is a cure not the cause. In America, few Jews have ever been murdered, mugged, robbed, or raped by Christians returning home from church on Sunday morning. America is history's most philo-Semitic country, providing the most hospitable home for Jews in the past 2,000 years. Suggesting equivalency between American Christians today and those of European history is to be offensive and ungrateful.

Quite frankly, if it is appropriate to blame today's American Christians for the sins of past Europeans, why isn't it okay to blame today's Jews for things that our ancestors may have done? Clearly both are wrong, and doing so harms our relationships with one of the few groups still friendly toward us today. Jewish groups that fracture friendship between Christians and Jews are performing no valuable service to American Jews.

These protests against "Passion" are not only morally indefensible, but they are also stupid, for three reasons. The first reason is that that they are unlikely to change the outcome of the film. Mr. Gibson is an artist and a Catholic of deep faith of which this movie is an expression. Does anyone really believe that Gibson is likely to yield to threats from Jewish organizations?

The second and more important reason I consider these protests to be ill-advised: While Jews are telling Gibson that his movie contradicts historical records about who really killed Jesus, Vatican Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos has this to say: "Mel Gibson not only closely follows the narrative of the Gospels, giving the viewer a new appreciation for those Biblical passages, but his artistic choices also make the film faithful to the meaning of the Gospels, as understood by the Church."

Do we really want to open up the Pandora's Box of suggesting that any faith may demand the removal of material that it finds offensive from the doctrines of any other faith? Do we really want to return to those dark times when Catholic authorities attempted to strip from the Talmud those passages that they found offensive?

Finally, I believe the attacks on Mel Gibson are a mistake because while they may be in the interests of Jewish organizations who raise money with the specter of anti-Semitism ... they are most decidedly not in the interests of most American Jews who go about their daily lives in comfortable harmony with their Christian fellow citizens. You see, many Christians see all this as attacks not just on Mel Gibson alone or as mere critiques of a movie, but—with some justification, in my view—they see them as attacks against all Christians.

Right now, the most serious peril threatening Jews, and indeed perhaps all of Western civilization, is Islamic fundamentalism. In this titanic 21st century struggle that

links Washington, D.C., with Jerusalem, our only steadfast allies have been Christians. In particular, those Christians who most ardently defend Israel and most reliably denounce anti-Semitism, happen to be those Christians most fervently committed to their faith. Jewish interests are best served by fostering friendship with Christians rather than cynically eroding them. Rejecting flagrant anti-Christianism on the part of Jews claiming to be acting on our behalf would be our wisest course as a community. Doing so would have one other advantage: it would also be doing the right thing.

Radio talk show host Rabbi Daniel Lapin is president of Toward Tradition, which is dedicated to bridging the divide between Christians and Jews by applying ancient solutions to modern problems in areas of family, faith, and fortune. The complete article is also posted on the organization's website, www.towardtradition.org.

NEW VATICAN ARCHIVAL EVIDENCE VINDICATES POPE PIUS XII

by Sister Margherita Marchione

The following article, written by Sister Margherita Marchione, discusses new evidence from the Vatican Archives that shows the heroism of Pope Pius XII. Sister Margherita is no stranger to Catholic League members: we have published many of her articles on Pius XII. And she is certainly no stranger to the subject, having authored several books on Pius. Here, then, is her latest contribution.

The Catholic Church survived persecutions for two thousand

years and continues its mission of evangelization. However, today the anti-Catholicism prevalent in the media and the negative propaganda about Pope Pius XII mislead many Catholics who do not understand the present controversy claiming "silence," "moral culpability," or "anti-Semitism." The political and ideological attacks on Christianity are charges that can be refuted by anyone who examines the evidence carefully.

Pius XII was not "silent," and his courageous acts during World War II are incontestable. When Vatican Archives were opened in February 2003 for the period 1922-1939, the media expected to find documents supporting the claim that Pope Pius XII did not do all he should have done to save the victims of the Holocaust. On the contrary, the new material confirms that Pius XII was indeed a champion for peace, freedom, human dignity; a pastor who encouraged Catholics to look on Christians and Jews as their brothers and sisters in Christ, all children of a common Father.

The opening of the Vatican Archives has already proven that accusations against Pius XI and Pius XII are baseless. A letter dated November 14, 1923, to Vatican Secretary of State Cardinal Pietro Gasparri written by Eugenio Pacelli (later Pius XII) when he was Nuncio in Bavaria, refers to Adolf Hitler's failed attempt to take over the local government of Munich. He denounces the National Socialist movement as an anti-Catholic threat and notes that the cardinal of Munich had already condemned acts of persecution against Bavaria's Jews.

Documents reveal that in 1933, as Secretary of State, Pacelli reviewed Nuncio Cesare Orsenigo's New Year's discourse and by secret code told him to remove the words "Leader of the German people" and to eliminate a paragraph that praised Hitler. In 1936, when invited by Hitler to attend the Nazi Congress, the nuncio again sought advice. So that he would not be obliged to attend, Pacelli suggested that he take a vacation so that he could absent himself. Pacelli corrected the nuncio's

communications and told him not to participate with the Diplomatic Corps. Other corrections prove that Pacelli was not sympathetic toward Hitler whom he considered possessed by the devil and even attempted to exorcize him.

Historians and archivists confirm the authenticity of this document which demonstrates that, early on, the Vatican protested on behalf of Jews in Nazi Germany. It confirms the testimony of Father Robert Leiber who, in 1962, wrote an article on Pius XI's papal encyclical of 1937, *Mit Brennender Sorge*, which appeared in the German periodical *Stimmen der Zeit*. Leiber wrote: "It is significant that the first initiative of the Holy See toward the government in Berlin concerned the Jews. As early as April 4, 1933, ten days after the Enabling Act, the Apostolic Nuncio in Berlin was ordered to intervene with the government of the Reich on behalf of the Jews and to point out all the dangers involved in an anti-Semitic policy."

The Catholic Church, therefore, did not simply protest on behalf of Church interests during negotiations of the Concordat, but protested on behalf of persecuted Jews when the new Hitler regime announced a major boycott of Jewish businesses.

During World War II and the horrors of the Holocaust, millions of Jews and other Europeans suffered and were killed by the Nazis. In 1943, the Eternal City was occupied by the Nazis and bombed by the Allies during a two-hour attack. The Holy Father hurried from the Vatican to the streets of Rome. He stood in the midst of the terrorized people as buildings collapsed in piles of smoldering rubble, and bombs exploded on all sides. The Romans ran toward him for guidance and strength. With hands and cassock smeared with the blood of the dead and the wounded, he blessed and consoled them, and took care of their immediate needs. While Pius XII joined his flock, civil authorities fled. The people acclaimed him, "Defensor Civitatis."

Pius XII operated a vast underground railroad. Although horrible to recall, it is important that the lessons of the Holocaust be retold accurately, and to recognize those who helped the persecuted. In occupied Europe, the Nazis killed 67 percent of the Jews. Millions of Christians did not escape Nazi terror during Hitler's attempt to exterminate all Jews. While Italy was being devastated by Allied bombs, the Nazis were killing innocent people. Eighty-five percent of Italian Jews were saved. Throughout Europe, sixty-five percent of the Jews were exterminated.

There is an abundance of evidence testifying to Pius XII's courage and integrity, as well as to his efforts to prevent the war and to shelter countless victims, including Jews. This generation should be talking about the debt of gratitude it owes Pope Pius XII, not maligning him.

It is crucial that any judgment of Pius XII look closely at the broadcasts of Vatican Radio. It has enjoyed a long history of world recognition and credibility, supporting both the sacred and secular objectives of the Church throughout the religious and political turmoil. It has been the daily "voice" of the Pontiffs—a bridge uniting Shepherd with his flock. It not only broadcasts the teachings of the Roman Pontiff, but it also gives information on the activities of the Holy See, reports on Catholic life throughout the world, and indicates the Church's point of view on current issues and her readiness to respond to the signs of the times. Vatican Radio announces the Christian message freely and efficiently and links the center of Catholicism with the different countries of the world.

The wartime organization, *The Sword of the Spirit*, led by Cardinal Hinsley of Great Britain, was inspired by Pope Pius XII and approved by the Vatican. This group published a monthly bulletin which tried to bring together Catholics, Protestants and Jews. Topics included freedom, education, social and economic problems. With monograms by Christopher

Dawson, John Murray, SJ, Barbara Ward and other well-known writers, the group published a series of leaflets on wartime activities. These offer proof of Pope Pius XII's embrace of all peoples and faiths.

Among the pamphlets of this ecumenical organization, one title is: "Voice of the Vatican" by Robert Speaight. In it the author answers the question, "What is the Pope's attitude towards the belligerent nations and the issues for which they are fighting?" He analyzes the policy of Vatican Radio and shows how uncompromisingly it spoke on the moral and spiritual problems raised by the war. In "The Pope and the Jews," A.C.F. Beales describes the struggle of the Catholic Church against anti-Semitism during the war. Certainly, such contemporary commentaries deserve to be carefully considered.

Documents reveal that Jan Hermann and Dr. Max Perelès, from the Ferramonti-Tarsia concentration camp, went to the Vatican on October 29, 1944, to thank Pope Pius XII. They gave him a letter which read in part: "While our brothers were hunted, imprisoned and threatened with death in almost every country in Europe, because they belonged to the Jewish people, Your Holiness ...fearlessly raised his universally respected voice, in the face of our powerful enemies, in order to defend openly our rights to the dignity of man. ...When we were threatened with deportation to Poland, in 1942, Your Holiness extended a fatherly hand to protect us, and stopped the transfer of Jews interned in Italy, thereby saving us from almost certain death."

Shortly after the Pope's death, Secretary of State Cardinal Domenico Tardini wrote in his book *Pio XII*: "Pius XII will go down in history as a Pontiff who was a wise reformer and brave innovator. He was a voice of truth, of justice, of love. Pius XII was a holy person, a symbol of mercy and of hope during a period of lies, despair and hatred. Everyone appreciated his intelligence and his extraordinary capacity to comprehend the dangers of Nazism and his efforts to alleviate the sufferings

of humanity. His messages attempted to unite the world. His contemporaries listened to his inspiring words, as he spoke of brotherhood, of love, and of peace at a time of spiritual poverty and material destruction of exceptional dimensions.”

Pius XII was engaged in the greatest Christian rescue program in the history of the Church. Editorials of the time attest to the fact that he saved hundreds of thousands of Jews and Christians from death in the concentration camps and served as a beacon of hope throughout his pontificate. We join his contemporaries and express our gratitude.

My new book, *Man of Peace: Pope Pius XII* (Paulist Press), summarizes the issues. Another book, *Pope Pius XII*, published in Milan, Italy (Ancora Press), reveals his saintly and virtuous life; his scholarship and peace-making efforts; his commitment as the defender and protector of the victims of war and hatred which drenched Europe in blood during World War II.

Pope Pius XII was a moral beacon to mankind. He resisted the clamor to accommodate the Catholic Church to the world. His voice was heard around the world during the twenty years of his pontificate. It was the “Voice” of a tireless world leader whose contribution to humanity during the Holocaust is incontrovertible.

Man of Peace: Pope Pius XII will be published in January 2004. For information on how to order it and Sr. Margherita's other books, including Consensus & Controversy: Defending Pope Pius XII, contact Paulist Press: 1-800-218-1903.

Anti-Catholicism in America: The Last Acceptable Prejudice

by *Mark S. Massa, S.J.*

The following is an excerpt taken from the publisher of Father Massa's book:

Massa's new book on anti-Catholicism in the United States from World War II to the present has been described as "a work of scholarly rigor, storytelling, and humor...[an] authoritative study that reveals how American Catholics' distinctive way of viewing the world is constantly misunderstood—and attacked—by outsiders.

He takes on those who hate the Catholic people and the Catholic Church for what makes them distinctive, as well as those who deny the distinctiveness of Catholicism. Massa goes behind the well-known stories of the ways Catholics have been vilified and mistreated in American society, boldly suggesting that Catholics *really* are different, looking at the world in fundamentally different ways than their non-Catholic neighbors. This difference explains a number of conflicts between Protestants and Catholics, including important aspects of the current priestly abuse scandals in Boston and around the country.

In an introductory chapter entitled, "Varieties of Anti-Catholicism in the United States," Massa offers a brief historical overview of what has been termed "America's deepest prejudice" by examining the major events and figures in U.S. anti-Catholicism from the Puritans in seventeenth century New England to Al Smith's ill fated presidential campaign in 1928. That historical chapter is followed by another that examines the "New Anti-Catholicism"—that is, the reappearance of negative portrayals and overt attacks on the Catholic Church

in the United States in the past two decades from a wide variety of cultural sources—from “upscale” magazines like *Vanity Fair* and the literature produced from Planned Parenthood, to movies like “Dogma” and “Stigmata,” and to the portrayal of priests and nuns on prime-time television programming.

Chapter Four provides the “glue” for the entire work, and builds on the work of the famous American Catholic theologian David Tracy. Tracy argued in his book *The Analogical Imagination* that Catholics and Protestants actually understand the essentials of Christian teaching, worship, and authority in sometimes radically different ways because of a basic “conceptual language” that shapes their entire religious worldview. Building on Father Tracy’s idea, Massa explores various ways in which such conceptual languages contributed in significant ways to shaping anti-Catholic prejudice in the U.S.

Chapter 5 begins the book’s post-World War II account by examining the publication of what many scholars consider the most sustained intellectual attack on U.S. Catholicism in the twentieth century—Paul Blanshard’s 1949 “classic,” *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. Massa explores Blanshard’s accusations regarding Catholicism’s purported “totalitarian threat” to the fragile freedom of Cold War America. He also discusses the philosophical and theological responses to Blanshard’s most famous Catholic debate partner, Jesuit political theorist John Courtney Murray.

In a chapter entitled “The Power of Negative Thinking,” the book recounts the secret campaign master-minded by famed preacher and author Norman Vincent Peale against John F. Kennedy in 1960. Peale, nationally famous for his best-seller *The Power of Positive Thinking*, is less well known today for his plan to use “Reformation Sunday” in 1960 (a week before election day) to marshal the aid of Protestant ministers across the U.S. to preach against a Catholic in the

White House. Peale and his fellow ministers involved in what has come to be known as the “Montreaux Meeting Plot” were exposed by the press, and Massa explores how the anti-Kennedy episode affected their subsequent careers.

Chapter Seven in the book examines the anti-Catholic cartoon publishing empire of Jack Chick—arguably the most successful anti-Catholic publishing venture in history, which by its own estimate has produced 400 million “Chicklets” (dollar-bill sized cartoon stories of 16 pages) left on the subways, Laundromats, and interstate restrooms, cartoons that regularly target Catholicism as the “anti-Christ” foretold in the Book of Revelation.

Massa also explores evidence of anti-Catholicism in academic circles in a chapter on one of the most famous articles published in 1974 in *Science* magazine. This sociological article supposedly offered “scientific” reasons as to why Catholics were so statistically under-represented among the ranks of academic scientists.

Chapter Nine (“Why Does He Say Those Awful Things About Catholics?”) focuses on the career of evangelical revivalist Jimmy Lee Swaggart, whose famous televangelistic crusades sought to win over “false Christians” like Catholics in both the United States and in Latin America.

The second part of Massa’s study focuses on the Boston clergy sexual abuse scandal, placing the revelations of clergy misconduct within the larger context of Catholics as “outsiders” to mainstream U.S. culture.

To order Father Massa’s book, contact the Catholic League at (212) 371-3191.

JUDGING THE POPE BY THE POLLS

On the day Pope John Paul II celebrated his Silver Jubilee, the results of two new polls on his performance were released. For the purpose of simplicity, the USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup poll will be called the first poll; the Washington Post-ABC poll will be named the second poll.

Though both polls were conducted by reputable organizations, the sample size of Catholics was unusually small: there were 227 in the first poll and 504 in the second one. Thus there was a margin of error of 7 percent and 5 percent, respectively.

Fifty-three percent of Catholics in the first poll, and 62 percent of those in the second poll, said the pope is 'out of touch' with the views of American Catholics. Yet 63 percent in the first poll, and 80 percent in the second, said they approve of his leadership. Indeed, almost 90 percent of Catholics in the second poll (the first did not ask this question) gave the pope high marks for "preserving the church's traditions." What gives?

It is too easy to say that Catholics like the pope personally but don't like some of his teachings. To begin with, there is a strong correlation between Catholics who attend Mass on a regular basis and support for the Church's teachings. The obverse being true as well, it means little to factor non-practicing Catholics into any survey of Catholics (vegetarians who eat hot dogs at baseball games do not provide insight into the sentiments of vegetarians).

So what gives? Many Catholics are somewhat conflicted: they admire the pope for being the steady moral anchor that he is while continuing to express some of the more secular values of the dominant culture. What seems not to be understood is that if the pope sought to bring the Church's teachings more into

line with the values of the dominant culture, he would lose the respect of the very same people who voice a desire for change. People respect leaders for doing what is right—not for appeasing their preferences.

Furthermore, to suggest—as some aging dissidents have—that most practicing Catholics are up in arms over the absence of certain reforms is not only absurd (Catholics can leave and join any number of religions that have succumbed to the culture), it suggests a reluctance to credit them with good judgment for approving the pope's performance.

One more point: in 1995, the Catholic League commissioned its own poll of Catholics (with a sample size of 800), and we found that although many Catholics expressed a preference for some changes, 83 percent said their commitment to the Church would be as strong—if not stronger—if the Church *did not change its teachings*.

The only way to understand this is to make a distinction between a preference and a demand. For example, many Catholics may prefer celibacy to be optional, but they are not going to bolt if nothing changes. A preference is not a demand and should not be construed as such. Most of those who misconstrue this do so on purpose: their agenda is to upend the Church's teachings on sexuality, and they will distort the data to make their point.

In any event, the teachings of the Catholic Church are not subject to a referendum. The magisterium of the Church gets some additional help from upstairs that is not available on demand for everyone else.

BIGOTED JUDGE CENSURED

In the summer of 2002, a New York City judge rejected a woman's request that money being held by the court be used for her teenage daughter's Catholic school tuition. The judge, Luther V. Dye, said he wouldn't send his kids to a Catholic school given the scandal in the Church. The woman contacted the Catholic League, and we immediately filed a complaint against the judge. At about the same time, Judge Dye insulted a Jewish lawyer in his courtroom.

On October 3, the judge was publicly censured for both matters. The judge agreed to step down from the bench. The *New York Times* ran a story with a quote from Louis Giovino, the league's director of communications

LONG ISLAND CATHOLICS RALLY TO SUPPORT BISHOP MURPHY

On July 25, we began a petition drive of Catholic League members in Nassau and Suffolk counties on Long Island in support of Rockville Centre Bishop William F. Murphy. We did so after Voice of the Faithful on Long Island called for the bishop to resign. Two months later, we had amassed more than 6,000 signatures.

It has been the position of the Catholic League all along that there was nothing in the report by Massachusetts Attorney General Thomas Reilly that warranted the resignation of Bishop Murphy. In addition, in the book released by the *Boston Globe* on the subject, *Betrayal: The Crisis in the Catholic Church*, there was nothing incriminating said about Bishop Murphy. In

short, he's innocent.

Unfortunately, this wasn't enough to satisfy those bent on "paying back" the Church: their anger is such that they have lost all sense of rationality and proportionality. That is why Voice of the Faithful, at least on Long Island, can no longer be taken seriously—it has discredited itself by engaging in a witch hunt against Bishop Murphy.

We answered the accusations of Voice of the Faithful with a point-by-point refutation of its charges; our report is available on our website ([here](#)). We proudly stand by that report.

It is amazing to see the names of thousands of priests, brothers, nuns and lay people who signed the petition and wrote letters of support. Like other Catholics, they are outraged at those responsible for the scandal. But what makes our supporters different is their ability to discern the difference between innocence and guilt. That is why they are justly angry at those who seek to exploit the scandal to further their own political agenda.

One of the sidebar stories to this issue is the way *Newsday*, the Long Island daily, blacked us out. There was no story in the newspaper on September 26, the day following our news release. To make matters worse, *Newsday* ran a piece on September 25 about an upcoming meeting of Voice of the Faithful that was basically an announcement blown into a news story.

William Donohue immediately called the new editor-in-chief, Howard Schneider, to register a complaint. Schneider asked Donohue if *Newsday* had run a story on the commencement of the petition drive. He told him it had. Schneider expressed surprise that it didn't do the follow up on the results. But still no article was run.

Newsday and Voice of the Faithful lose credibility when they

give away their hand. Both lay claim to being neutral yet their behavior belies something else is at work. That the Catholic League received several times as many signatures in support of Bishop Murphy—from only our own people—than Voice of the Faithful can claim in total membership on Long Island, is a reality that cannot be squashed.

BOSTON ELITES SEEK TO POLICE CATHOLIC CHURCH

A group of elites in the fields of law, psychology and social work has petitioned the Archdiocese of Boston for permission to oversee cases of alleged clergy sexual abuse. They have been denied. That is because the archdiocese already has two groups of Catholics who are discharged with this duty. Nonetheless, the elites object to this archdiocesan prerogative. Moreover, the critics are unhappy with the rule that members must be in “full communion” with the Church.

On October 9, we released the following comment to the press:

“This is only the latest example of elites who are exploiting the homosexual scandal in the Catholic Church to service their own agendas (95 percent of the cases of priestly sexual abuse in Boston are male-on-male sex—see the Boston Globe, February 7, 2003). On the one hand, the elites commend Archbishop Sean O’Malley for his good work; on the other hand, they insist he must anoint them if he is to succeed.

“It is striking that the very people who gave the bishops lousy advice in the first place—namely shrinks who thought they could ‘cure’ homosexual molesters—are leading the charge to stick their nose into the internal affairs of the Catholic

Church. If they are truly interested in protecting young people from molesters, they should immediately investigate public school employees and abortion providers: 15 percent of public school kids are molested, and Planned Parenthood staffers can provide leads on statutory rape that are indispensable.

“The elites bared their hand when they objected to the rule that Catholics must be in ‘full communion’ with the Church as a condition of serving on the review boards. While their idea of what constitutes a good Catholic has been corrupted by simply living in Massachusetts, it is no excuse for trampling on the First Amendment. Massachusetts Attorney General Thomas Reilly, who is leading this crusade, obviously has no respect for separation of church and state. But two can play the same game: I am writing him today asking his permission for the Catholic League to police the internal affairs of his office. We offer our services pro bono.”

Donohue made good on his pledge, but he did not receive a reply from Attorney General Reilly. However, our offer still stands. Maybe Reilly will surprise us and give us a ring some day. After all, who else would agree to do this dirty work for nothing?