

WAGING WAR ON TWO FRONTS: MILLER AND "GOLDEN COMPASS"

It is not unusual for the Catholic League to be fighting a war over a big issue, even as it tackles several minor ones. What is unusual is to be waging war on two fronts simultaneously. Such is the case with our battle against the Miller Brewing Company and our campaign against the upcoming film, "The Golden Compass."

Last spring we were alerted to the likelihood that "The Golden Compass" was going to be a problem. After doing some preliminary research, we concluded that we should spend the better part of the summer gearing up for what would prove to be a long fall and a busy Christmas season. That is why we prepared the booklet on the movie. What we didn't count on was Miller's sponsorship of an obscene and patently anti-Catholic festival.

There is something sick going on in our culture. On the one hand, we have a prominent American corporation underwriting a blatant attack on our religion; and on the other hand, we have prestigious movie producers teaming with a militant English atheist, Philip Pullman, trying to poison the minds of our youth.

We have very specific outcomes in mind for both issues. We want Miller to assure us that it will never be associated with another anti-Catholic event. And we want "The Golden Compass" to be a bust (ditto for Pullman's books).

While it may be too early to say how things will turn out, it is not too early to say that we have already won on the PR front: thanks to the tremendous publicity we have received from the print and electronic media, Miller's reputation has suffered and the public is fast learning about the agenda

behind “The Golden Compass.”

We have also been emboldened by the support we have received from people of all faiths. Both the Miller issue and the movie have inspired people from all walks of life to voice their enthusiasm for our efforts. And they have surely let the offending parties—especially Miller—know exactly how they feel.

The key to winning is persistence. We started our campaign against “The Golden Compass” two months before it opens on December 7, and that’s because it takes time to mount an effective nationwide protest. As for Miller, every week we are hitting another segment of the Milwaukee population with the incriminating photos of the Folsom Street Fair in San Francisco.

So stay tuned. Anyone who knows the Catholic League knows that we don’t run away from a fight. As a result, our reputation has grown by leaps and bounds by jumping on these twin issues. And, of course, we’re not simply joining two nationwide protests—we’re leading both of them.

AMICUS BRIEF FILED

The Catholic League recently filed a friend-of-the-court brief regarding a case that involves mistreatment of the dead.

After being contacted by the Painesville, Ohio law firm of Dworken & Bernstein, we decided to join with them in an unusual case. The firm is representing a family whose son died in an accident.

When the body of the deceased, Christopher Albrecht, was taken

to the Clermont County Coroner's Office for autopsy, the brain was removed from the corpse and held for testing. The rest of the body was then returned to Albrecht's parents for burial, but since they did not know that their son's brain had been removed, they buried him. They sued when they learned of this outrage.

The lawsuit challenges the right of a coroner's office to unilaterally remove body parts for testing. Astonishing as it may sound, efforts are under way to change the current law that offers protection to bodies and body parts of the deceased. Those pushing for change want to discard body parts as "medical waste," preferring the euphemism of "dead carcass" to refer to a deceased body.

This is an incredible abuse of power, one which shows nothing but contempt for the right of family members to honor their deceased loved ones. It also shows how the culture of death has evolved. But if it is legal to throw unborn babies in the trash, we should not be surprised by this development.

REQUEST FOR APOLOGY DENIED

William A. Donohue

Last spring I received a letter from a congressman asking for my help in mobilizing public support for an official apology for slavery and segregation. I immediately said no. I've been waiting for a response ever since, but none has been forthcoming.

Congressman Steve Cohen represents Tennessee's 9th District. Prior to his letter of April 17, I had never heard of him. His letter not only struck me as morally obtuse and historically

inaccurate, there was a smart alecky tone to it that I didn't like. As indicated, he said he wanted my help in "organizing both grassroots and bipartisan support for passage of H.Res. 194, an apology by the United States government for its role in sustaining slavery and Jim Crow segregation." He then got a little too cute: "I know that you have good working relationships with Republicans and I would welcome any assistance that you can provide."

To begin with, I am not a Republican. Nor am I a Democrat. While I was once both—first a Democrat and then a Republican—I have stayed happily independent for about a decade and a half, with no plans to ever rejoin either party. Do I have good working relationships with some Republicans? Certainly. Indeed, I have better relationships with Republicans than Democrats, but that has more to do with the fact that Republicans have reached out to me more than Democrats.

More seriously, Cohen said that "slavery was protected by our Constitution and laws for much of our history, and we as a Nation are still grappling with its legacy of racism against African-Americans (as demonstrated most recently by Don Imus's remarks about the Rutgers University Women's Basketball Team)."

On April 23, I responded by quoting his remark regarding the way "slavery was protected by our Constitution and law for much of our history." To which I said, "This is flatly wrong: the U.S. Constitution never protected slavery." I then offered him a challenge he could not win: "If you think I'm wrong, please identify where in the Constitution slavery is protected."

Cohen's error is all too common. As I further instructed, "The infamous decision of Chief Justice Roger Taney in the 1857 Dred Scott case was a classic example of judicial activism—Taney read into the Constitution a substantive due process argument that nowhere appears in the Constitution

itself.”

Continuing, I added, “Slavery, of course, was an affront to liberty, but those responsible for this condition are long dead, as are the slaves. Apologies make sense when the offender apologizes to the offended, but since this is not possible in this instance, I fear that your concern that such an apology would constitute ‘an empty gesture’ is very real.” I closed with, “And besides, since some African Americans owned slaves in the U.S., how will you know whose descendants merit an apology for what happened to their ancestors?”

Hand-wringing and chest-pounding displays of contrition are not my style, especially when made in public. Cohen’s proposal is nothing more than an attempt to buy goodwill on the cheap. If he, and others like him, want to do something to help African Americans, they can begin by supporting ways that keep black men out of prison and black girls out of clinics. Crime and illegitimacy are the real enemies of African Americans these days, not Don Imus.

Racism still exists (and as we saw from the Duke lacrosse case, whites can be victims, too) but it is not even close to being the prime problem in the black community. Family disintegration is. To wit: in the 1950s, when segregation was legal, 85 percent of black kids were raised in a two-parent family. Today, after great legal strides have been made, only 30 percent of black families are intact.

In other words, when racism was commonplace, the black family was strong. Now that racism has receded, the black family is in disarray. No, legal progress did not cause family dissolution—changes in public policy and culture did—but it is folly to think we can write laws to fix today’s conditions. Even worse is Cohen’s approach: he thinks passing resolutions about yesterday’s problems will correct today’s maladies.

This issue gets under my skin because I saw firsthand in the

1970s what really works for black kids: Catholic education. Catholic schools in the inner city instill a discipline and a dedication to excellence that public schools have never matched, and they do so with the added bonus of grounding students in religion. If Cohen and his ilk really wanted blacks to succeed today, they would promote school vouchers. Instead, they routinely work against them.

So there will be no apology, and no effort to mobilize Catholics. But there will be straight talk. That's something Republicans and Democrats both need to hear, and that's something the Catholic League is prepared to deliver. Look for matters like this to grow, especially now that the race for the White House is ready to go into first gear.

AN ANTI-CATHOLIC LAW'S TROUBLING LEGACY

As they went to the polls on November 7, 1922—85 years ago this month—the voters of Oregon were asked to approve an amendment to the state's education laws that read in part:

"...Any parent, guardian or other person in the state of Oregon, having control or charge or custody of a child under the age of 16 years and of the age of 8 years or over at the commencement of a term of public school of the district in which said child resides, who should fail or neglect or refuse to send such child to a public school for the period of time a public school shall be held during the current year in said district shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and each day's failure to send such a child to a public school shall constitute a separate offense..."

Translation: if you send your child to a private school instead of a public one, you face a fine, imprisonment, or both.

Nowhere in that law was the word "Catholic" mentioned, but the goal was clear: to shut down all Catholic schools and to steer their students into public schools, where threatening "papist" views could be safely blanching from the youngsters' minds.

The law was championed by the Ku Klux Klan and other zealous nativists who believed that Catholic immigrants threatened to bring bolshevism to America after World War I. Grand Dragon Fred Gifford, a chief advocate of the school statute, believed that "the American public school, non-partisan, non-sectarian, efficient, [and] democratic," was "for all the children of all the people." (By "non-sectarian," he meant "non-denominational Christian;" public schools, though drenched in religion at the time, were of a "non-sectarian" type.) Gifford went so far as to say that immigrants ("mongrel hordes") "must be Americanized. Failing that, deportation is the only remedy."

Anti-Catholic nativists believed that Catholics could overthrow the government at a moment's notice, turning Americans into knaves of the Roman pope. They believed that only by attending a government-controlled school could children learn to be true Americans, and become properly grounded in American history and the principles of liberty.

The campaign for the Oregon law included a mix of hysteria and grand theater. An ages-old anti-Catholic device—lectures by an "escaped nun"—was trotted out. "Sister Lucretia" was taken around the state, sometimes speaking in public schools themselves, to denounce Catholicism and stir up audiences against the Roman church.

An anti-Catholic, pro-public school booklet entitled *The Old Cedar School* was circulated as well. This allegorical tale

included the story of a farmer's son who converts to Catholicism and sends his children to the "Academy of St. Gregory's Holy Toe Nail," where they study "histomorphology, the Petrine Supremacy, Transubstantiation, and...the beatification of Saint Caviar."

The story isn't content to merely ridicule Catholics and what they believe. It paints a picture of a Catholic bishop who actually burns down a public school.

The message was hardly subtle—Catholics and their schools were not just threats to the public schools, but a mere matchstick away from destroying them entirely. It was no wonder, then, that the King Kleagle of the Pacific Klan declared that the battle for the Oregon School Law was about "the ultimate perpetuation or destruction of free institutions, based upon the perpetuation or destruction of the public schools."

In short, if you sent your kids to private schools, particularly Catholic ones, you were against public schools and against what America stood for.

Ironically, though the nativists feared bolshevism, their insistence on one government-controlled school system actually smacked of the very communism that they sought to avoid, a point made by Archbishop Michael J. Curley of Baltimore. "The whole trend of such legislation," wrote Curley, "is state socialism, setting up an omnipotent state...on the principles of Karl Marx."

Catholic defenders felt compelled to point out the obvious—that Catholic schools were absolutely American, that English was the language spoken in the schools, and that even their mottos were American ("For God and country").

These arguments failed to persuade. Oregonians passed the law by a vote of 115,506 to 103,685.

But the arguments continued, this time in the courts of law,

where Catholic plaintiffs challenged the new law as unconstitutional.

The lawyer for the state of Oregon told one court that juvenile delinquency had increased as attendance at non-public schools increased. Thus, he said, forced attendance at public schools was the only way to ward off “the moral pestilence of paupers, vagabonds, and possibly convicts.” He, like the anti-Catholic nativists who had championed the law, also warned of bolshevism. Children educated in private schools would be inclined to adopt the principles of “bolshevists, syndicalists, and communists,” he contended. And he went on to warn that if the law was not upheld, cities across the country would be dotted with “elementary schools which instead of being red on the outside will be red on the inside.”

Despite such heated rhetoric, reason eventually prevailed. On June 1, 1925, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that “the child is not the mere creature of the state,” overturning the Oregon law and settling once and for all the question of whether Catholic schools had a right to exist in America.

In the unobstructed view of retrospect, it’s hard to understand the fear-mongering that led to the passage of the Oregon law. Even if one were to accept the preposterous claims of the law’s anti-Catholic supporters—that Catholics, out to destroy the Republic, were using their schools to advance their plan—Oregon’s demographics should have put nervous xenophobes at ease.

At the time, fewer than 10 percent of Oregon’s inhabitants were Catholic, and only 13 percent were foreign-born. Of the students attending school, 93 percent were in public schools already.

But the Oregon law was only the tip of a much larger iceberg that had been gaining heft for nearly a century.

From the mid-1800s until the battle for the Oregon law, the

very formation and growth of America's public school system was intertwined with an unsavory nativist movement that sought to use the newly-formed "common schools" to turn immigrants—mostly Catholics—into true Americans. Unfortunately, these reformers' vision of what made a true American didn't include the tenets, the rituals, the prayers, or even the Bible of the Roman Catholic Church. Instead, they wished to inculcate children with a non-denominational brand of Protestant Christianity.

In these new common schools, Catholic children were forced to recite Protestant prayers, sing Protestant hymns, and use the King James, rather than the Douay, version of the Bible. Resisting students were punished, and the punishment was upheld by the courts.

Not surprisingly, this led to the blossoming of the Catholic school system; Catholic schools became havens for new immigrants. And while English was the language spoken in the schools, some classes were also offered in the immigrants' native tongues. My father's Catholic elementary school in Baltimore, for example, taught religion classes in Polish.

While the Oregon School Law might have died in 1925, the anti-Catholic sentiments that spawned it still leave a troubling legacy. Today, the only K-12 schools that are cost-free to students in America are public ones. Unlike our post-secondary system, where students can use public funds in the form of grants, scholarship, GI Bill money, and the like at the institutions of their choice, the only schools automatically getting public funding at the K-12 level are public ones.

Nativist entanglement with the school law also led to the passage of so-called Blaine Amendments in several states. Enacted in the late 1800s, these amendments prohibited the use of public funds for sectarian schools or institutions. For all practical purposes, "sectarian schools" was code for "Catholic schools." As explained previously, "non-sectarian" meant the

non-denominational brand of Protestant Christianity taught in public schools.

Even today, Blaine Amendments still stymie voucher and school choice advocates in the courts. And even in states without such amendments, courts will sometimes interpret state and federal law as if Blaine Amendments were on the books.

In addition, today's voucher opponents, when making their case, often unwittingly use the language of the proponents of the Oregon law, by asserting claims about the necessity for enshrining the public school in a special place in American life because such schools teach us how to be Americans.

Even a current mainstream organization that attempts to block voucher programs has some roots in a movement to stop Catholics. Americans United for Separation of Church and State, a prominent voucher opponent in the public square and in the courtroom, started out with a different name—Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. Formed in 1947, the organization didn't change its name until 1971.

This is not to say that those who oppose vouchers today are anti-Catholic. But they might be surprised to learn that they are standing shoulder-to-ideological shoulder with an unsavory cadre from history—those who, 85 years ago, sought to make the public school the preeminent educational institution in America by quashing diversity and stifling Catholics.

Making education free and available to all children was a noble goal. Had it not been overrun by distasteful political forces, parents might have been allowed to choose where that education would take place, without incurring a financial penalty.

Libby Sternberg is the former head of Vermonters for Better Education, a school choice organization. She is an Edgar-nominated author of several teen mysteries. Her new book, The

Case Against My Brother, is set in 1922 Oregon against the backdrop of the campaign for the state's School Law. See p. 2 for ordering information.

DAVID E. KELLEY–TINSELTOWN'S ACE BIGOT

The October 9 episode of ABC's "Boston Legal" featured a 15 year-old girl who is enrolled in an abstinence-only sex education program, contracts HIV and then sues her school, blaming it for her condition. At the trial, the school's principal, the girl's attorneys and the judge all tout the virtues of condoms, fingering Christian activists—who else?—for her irresponsibility.

This is surreal. A half-century ago, sex education, condoms and sexually transmitted diseases were all uncommon. Since that time, students have learned the art of putting condoms on cucumbers, and have been introduced to sexual techniques that are as deviant as they are injurious. The results of which are illegitimacy and AIDS. But this is obviously over the head of "Boston Legal" producer David E. Kelley, Tinseltown's ace bigot.

Kelley has long hated Catholicism. That is why he finished his number by ridiculing a nun in habit (it's always nuns in habit whom the Hollywood gang likes to slam). The nun is portrayed translating the words of a Mexican immigrant charged with cockfighting. Referring to the rooster as a "champion cock," she comments how "it would bring me such joy to hold him." Then, to the astonishment of the court, the sister says, "To hold that beautiful cock in my own two hands."

Were it not for people like Kelley, millions of Americans would not hold Hollywood in contempt. It is the Kelleys of this world who purposely craft a libertine milieu—one which inexorably leads to spiritual, psychological and physical death—only to perversely blame Catholics for the fruits of their labor. Sadly, they will go to their deathbeds never having figured it out. That’s why they need to read the Catholic Catechism before it’s too late.

In the 1990s, Kelley had a series of exchanges with Bill Donohue, but the dialogue obviously didn’t work.

It is striking that two different network dramas—see the “Cold Case” article below—would treat the issue of abstinence with the same attitude of scorn and disdain. It just goes to show how well-coordinated the assault on the practice of abstinence really is.

WE HAVE AN IDEA FOR “COLD CASE”

The September 30 episode of CBS’ “Cold Case” featured sexually active teens enrolled in a Christian abstinence program. In the episode, a girl was stoned to death by the other teens for breaking her chastity vow. To top it off, the Jerry Bruckheimer production depicted a minister preaching the virtues of abstinence while masturbating.

We have an idea for “Cold Case.” Do an episode where kids reject abstinence and use condoms. But do an honest episode. Depict the way teenagers normally use condoms—which is to say improperly—and then show pictures of the aborted babies. Also, show a Planned Parenthood counselor doing what they so often

do—covering up cases of statutory rape. Bet Bruckheimer never thought of that one.

BAN ON ABSTINENCE PROGRAMS PROTESTED

The above two stories dramatize Hollywood's war on abstinence. The one below shows a real-life version. The following is an excerpt of Bill Donohue's letter to New York State Senators:

I am appealing to you to introduce legislation that would reinstate the right of New York State to receive federal funding for abstinence-only sex education. This is needed because of the unilateral decision made by New York State Health Commissioner Dr. Richard F. Daines to reject \$3.5 million a year in federal grants for such programs. His decision is not only without merit (he provided absolutely no evidence for his position), it would, if not overturned, have an adverse impact on Catholic institutions.

It may be a matter of coincidence—or it may not be—that the very same day Dr. Daines rendered his ruling, September 20, the New York Civil Liberties Union (NYCLU) just happened to have come to the same conclusion. In its report, “Financing Ignorance: A Report on Abstinence-Only-Until-Marriage Funding in New York,” the NYCLU maintains, on the basis of pure conjecture, that federal funding to schools that promote abstinence smacks of religious bias. Its reasoning: 53 percent of the schools that receive public monies for abstinence programs are religious.

On p. 37 of its report, the NYCLU lists 17 religious-affiliated organizations that receive federal grants for

abstinence programs. Fourteen of them, or 82 percent, are Roman Catholic institutions. Thus, it is evident that such entities would bear an undue burden if Dr. Daines' decision were to go unchallenged. While his motive may be without religious bias, the effect of his ruling surely would not be.

If legislation is not passed restoring the status quo ante, Catholic institutions will be presented with a Hobson's choice: either they violate their doctrinal prerogatives and accept the money, or they stick to principle and be punished for doing so. That is why I am urging you to do what you can to see to it that Catholic institutions are not penalized for being Catholic.

“GOLDEN COMPASS” PROTEST IGNITES

On October 5, the Catholic League kicked off its campaign against “The Golden Compass.” The first interview that Bill Donohue granted was to Raymond Arroyo, EWTN's host of “The World Over.” He then did two Fox News Channel shows back-to-back: “The Big Story” with John Gibson and “Fox and Friends.”

Approximately 500 media sources were sent a copy of the league's booklet on the film. In addition, copies are flying off the shelf as orders from our members and interested parties are coming in at a rapid pace. In other words, we are getting the word out fast: the movie is “bait for the books,” i.e., it is designed to lure parents into thinking that Philip Pullman's trilogy, *His Dark Materials*, would make a great Christmas gift. Not if we can help it!

Our introductory statement to the media read as follows:

“New Line Cinema and Scholastic Entertainment have paired to produce ‘The Golden Compass,’ a children’s fantasy that is based on the first book of a trilogy by militant English atheist Philip Pullman. The trilogy, *His Dark Materials*, was written to promote atheism and denigrate Christianity, especially Roman Catholicism. The target audience is children and adolescents. Each book becomes progressively more aggressive in its denigration of Christianity and promotion of atheism: *The Subtle Knife* is more provocative than *The Golden Compass* and *The Amber Spyglass* is the most in-your-face assault on Christian sensibilities of the three volumes.

“Atheism for kids. That is what Philip Pullman sells. It is his hope that ‘The Golden Compass,’ which stars Nicole Kidman and opens December 7, will entice parents to buy his trilogy as a Christmas gift. It is our hope that the film fails to meet box office expectations and that his books attract few buyers. We are doing much more than hoping—we are conducting a nationwide two-month protest of Pullman’s work and the film. To that end, we have prepared a booklet, ‘*The Golden Compass: Agenda Unmasked*,’ that tears the mask off the movie.

“It is not our position that the movie will strike Christian parents as troubling. Then why the protest? Even though the film is based on the least offensive of the three books, and even though it is clear that the producers are watering down the most despicable elements—so as to make money and not anger Christians—the fact remains that the movie is bait for the books. To be specific, if unsuspecting Christian parents take their children to see the movie, they may very well find it engaging and then buy Pullman’s books for Christmas. That’s the problem.

“We are fighting a deceitful stealth campaign on the part of the film’s producers. Our goal is to educate Christians so that they know exactly what the film’s pernicious agenda really is.”

ANTI-MILLER CAMPAIGN IN FULL GEAR

The Catholic League is employing two strategies to get the Miller Brewing Company to issue a pledge never again to sponsor an anti-Catholic event: a boycott of Miller beer and an anti-Miller PR campaign. Both are in full gear.

We have mailed a select group of photos taken from the Folsom Street Fair to the 211 Catholic parishes in the Archdiocese of Milwaukee (home of Miller Brewing), as well as to Milwaukee Archbishop Timothy Dolan. We also hit all 166 Protestant churches in Milwaukee and blanketed all the synagogues and mosques as well. Next on our list are all the Milwaukee civic associations. We want all the major parties in Milwaukee to know exactly what Miller stands for—S&M and Catholic bashing.

Not to be outdone, we sent several of the most shocking photos—ones that we cannot put on our website—to the top officers at Miller. If this doesn't shake them, nothing will.

When we learned that Molson Coors was planning to merge with Miller—it will be called MillerCoors—we sent all the officers at Molson Coors the shocking pictures as well. The pictures literally show men having sex in the street in broad daylight. The police were under orders not to arrest anyone.

Not only are we receiving the support of many advocacy organizations like the Thomas More Law Center, we are pleased to say that our Internet service provider, Catholic Online, has informed us that our website is receiving unprecedented traffic. No wonder—people cannot believe what they're seeing.

Additionally, priests across the nation are advising their

parishioners not to buy Miller beer. And, most importantly, a beer store owner from Lake Orion, Michigan, Mike Setto, has cancelled all orders of Miller beer. He appeared on several TV and radio shows, most prominently "Fox and Friends."

We will not back away from this fight. We're in it for the long run. You can help by contacting Miller yourself. Here's the information:

Tom Long
Chief Executive Officer
Miller Brewing Company
3939 W Highland Blvd.
Milwaukee, WI 53208-2816

Phone: 414-931-2000 or
1-800-MILLER 6
Fax: 414-931-3732
Email: tlong2@mbco.com

CATHOLIC LEAGUE VS. MILLER BREWING

September 25: "We have contacted Miller Brewing and expect that they will cooperate and do what is ethically right."

-Bill Donohue, regarding Miller Brewing's logo on a Folsom Street Fair poster featuring half-naked gay men mocking the Last Supper

September 26: "We understand some individuals may find the imagery offensive and we have asked the organizers to remove our logo from the poster effective immediately."

-Miller Brewing news release

September 26: "Tomorrow night, the group that Miller is funding via the festival will hold 'The Last Supper With the Sisters,' an event that will ridicule this sacred moment in history. Indeed, on its website it describes this sick stunt as the best way 'to prepare your mortal flesh for the kinkiest weekend on Earth.' (Its emphasis.)"

-Bill Donohue, referring to the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, a group of gay men who dress up as nuns and ridicule the Catholic Church

September 26: "Apparently, Miller has decided to side with a small band of depraved and bigoted gays against Catholics (25 percent of the population) and Protestants (60 percent of the nation). This is an ethical and marketing fiasco of colossal proportions....The collision course that Miller wants with Christians is now on."

-Bill Donohue, after the Catholic League learned that Miller decided to continue its sponsorship of the Folsom Street Fair

September 27: "Miller leaves us with no options: we are calling on more than 200 Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, Buddhist and Hindu organizations to join with us in a nationwide boycott of Miller beer. We feel confident that once our religious allies kick in, and once the public sees the photos of an event Miller is proudly supporting, the Milwaukee brewery will come to its senses and pull its sponsorship altogether."

-Bill Donohue, after Miller again refused to withdraw support of the fair even after learning that some money raised at the event was going to the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence

September 28: "Miller Brewing will now be known as S&M Miller, and that is because it has apparently decided to drop anchor with the sadomasochistic festival that it is proudly sponsoring on Sunday [Sept. 30] at the Folsom Street Fair...If S&M Miller doesn't pull its sponsorship, we will announce a game plan on Monday that will make the company regret it ever

decided to insult Christians.”

–Bill Donohue, on Miller’s continued refusal to drop its support of the fair

October 1: “We regret that our failure to adhere to our own policy led to an inappropriate use of our trademark and apologize to anyone who was offended as a result, particularly members of the Christian community who have contacted us to express their concern. We are conducting an immediate audit of our procedures for approving local marketing and sales sponsorships to ensure that this does not happen again.”

–Miller Brewing news release

October 1: “We called Miller today asking for clarification of this statement, and we are pleased to note that a full-scale review of all its promotional policies is underway...We expect that Miller will resolve this issue before too long.”

–Bill Donohue, responding to Miller’s statement

October 4: “If Miller wants to be so bold as to throw Catholics and Protestants overboard for the sake of siding with the most morally depraved persons in our society—persons with whom no self-respecting heterosexual or homosexual would ever associate—then it must suffer the consequences. The boycott is on, and now the campaign to blanket religious and secular leaders in the Milwaukee community with the evidence of Miller’s complicity in this sordid affair has begun.”

–Bill Donohue, after Miller failed to promise never again to sponsor an anti-Christian event

October 9: “It is hard to imagine the Coors family, with its stellar reputation, as well as the Molsons, a distinguished Canadian family, wanting to support public displays of religious bigotry and sodomy. That is why we are asking them to carefully examine Miller’s promotional policies and pledge that sponsorship of these kinds of morally indefensible events will never happen again.”

–Bill Donohue, after Miller and Molson Coors Brewing announced

they would combine U.S. operations as early as the end of 2007