

# ELECTION WATCH

By the time you read this article, the election may have already been decided. Here is a quick look at the most important issues of critical importance to Catholics.

Voters in Arizona, California, and Florida will decide whether to support the traditional idea of marriage as a union between a man and a woman. An enormous amount of money and lobbying has been done in these states by both sides, and this is especially true of California.

South Dakota will decide whether abortion should be limited to rape, incest and the life of the mother, voters in Michigan are grappling with allowing public funding of embryonic stem cell research and the state of Washington has an initiative permitting assisted suicide on the ballot. Coloradoans will decide whether to amend the state constitution to say that personhood begins at conception.

Catholic bishops in all these states are standing fast on Catholic principles, and this certainly includes Archbishop Charles Chaput of Denver: for wholly prudential reasons, Chaput, along with the National Right to Life, are not endorsing the personhood measure. They see it as a bad tactical move (at this time) that could easily secure the ruling in *Roe v. Wade* even further.

The situation in Washington has triggered an anti-Catholic backlash against Catholics fighting for a culture of life. A group called Death with Dignity has been the most offensive, drawing fire from the Catholic League. The results in all these states will have dramatic effects.

---

# **EUCCHARIST DEFILED ON VIDEOS; YouTube REACTS TO PROTEST**

In what has become a disturbing pattern this year, over 40 videos depicting the desecration of the Eucharist were posted on the Internet site, *YouTube*. After a Catholic League protest, some restrictive measures were taken. Other steps are being weighed.

A young man, Dominique (who goes by “fsmdude”), made the videos and posted them on *YouTube*. This is a popular Internet site that is available to anyone who wants to post a video; it is also used to show clips from TV shows, etc. What he did was to flush the Eucharist down the toilet, put it in a blender, feed it to an animal, drive a nail through it, etc.

On September 29, Bill Donohue wrote to *YouTube* CEO Chad Hurley in San Bruno, California, asking him to take down these offensive videos. When he didn’t hear back, he called Hurley on October 3. After no reply, a video of Donohue registering his protest was posted on *YouTube* on October 6; a news release on this subject was issued the next day.

After being pummeled by angry Catholics responding to our news release, as well as our *YouTube* video, an official called Donohue on October 15. The conversation was productive; she listened attentively while Donohue explained in some detail the basis of the league’s outrage. She responded by saying that a decision had been made to “age-gate” the videos, meaning that they are not available to the general public—age confirmation is required. Moreover, the viewer is informed that the material may not be appropriate.

The *YouTube* official stressed that this was a “preliminary step,” part of an ongoing review process. In other words, they are taking the complaints made by the Catholic League

seriously, and may yet decide to implement stronger strictures.

In the course of the conversation, Donohue told the official that we do not object to making fun of Catholics, if it is done in good taste. What we object to are situations where it is obvious that the whole purpose of the communication is to deliberately insult Catholics. It is one thing for an avowed atheist to lecture Catholics about their beliefs, quite another for someone to intentionally desecrate the Eucharist. The latter represents malice, having nothing to do with discourse.

On October 16, we issued a press release on our partial victory; we also posted a video on *YouTube* wherein Donohue discussed the outcome. While we appreciate the seriousness that *YouTube* has shown to our concerns, we hope they conclude that these videos violate their guidelines on matters like these.

---

## KERRY KENNEDY CATHOLICS

**William A. Donohue**

A Pew survey recently revealed that no religion has lost more adherents, proportionately speaking, than Catholicism. That may be true, but it is also true that no other religion is beset with more ex-patriots who refuse to walk out the exit door. They prefer to hang out. Psychologically, that is.

Kerry Kennedy, daughter of Robert F. Kennedy, is an expert on such matters. Her book, *Being Catholic Now*, is chock full of tales from ex-Catholics, and those with one foot out the door, that would make the heads of practicing Catholics spin. And

not just them. Few non-Catholics would recognize these people as Catholic. Oh, yes, included in her book are some genuine, practicing Catholics. But they are not as much fun to read about as the malcontents who dominate her work.

These men and women, all of whom were raised Catholic, cannot stop thinking of themselves as Catholics. Take Kennedy. She disagrees with the Catholic Church on immigration, contemporary interpretations of the just war doctrine, the role of women in the Church, homosexuality, birth control, abortion, euthanasia, stem cell research, etc. And so do most of the authors in her book. When asked why she chose to title her book *Being Catholic Now*, Kennedy said the other title she was thinking about was *We Are All Good Catholics*. Revealing.

I like steaks. That's why I don't call myself a vegetarian. Now consider this: Suppose I were to tell vegetarians that despite my fondness for dry-aged steaks, I consider myself to be a vegetarian. In all likelihood, they might conclude that I was hallucinating. Or simply delirious. Perhaps they would call 911. Who could blame them?

Why anyone would persist in identifying himself with a group that he manifestly rejects is an interesting psychological question. More important, however, is the fact that self-identification is not all that matters: What matters is whether those who are members in good standing accept as a colleague those who reject the tenets of their group.

Don't these Kennedy Catholics understand that they are not the final arbiters of their religious identification? We make that decision, and by we I mean practicing Catholics who accept the teachings of the Magisterium. Frankly, their opinion counts about as much as a steak-eating "vegetarian's" opinion counts in the real world.

What's bugging the malcontents? The usual stuff. The book describes the angry Irish author, Frank McCourt, as someone

who “no longer follows the Catholic faith.” Similarly, actor Gabriel Byrne “is no longer a practicing Catholic.” Ex-priest James Carroll, who regularly maligns the Catholic Church, says “My beloved Roman Catholic tradition is full of things I reject.” Bill Maher is boastfully identified as someone who has “consistently been listed in the Catholic League’s Annual Report on Anti-Catholicism.” Some are not well known. Ingrid Mattson made the cut despite (because of?) the fact that she is president of the Islamic Society of North America. Her scarf, wrapped around her head, looks nice.

“Throughout her career,” the introductory note says, “[Susan] Sarandon has promoted progressive causes, including gay, transgender, and transsexual rights.” In her own words, Sarandon expresses her nostalgia for times past. “I loved the incense. I loved the whole spectacle of it.” It’s just the teachings she objects to. Anne Burke, who previously said that accused priests should not be given due process rights, is also in the book. Andrew Sullivan is introduced as an “HIV-positive, gay, libertarian.” Not just gay, but “HIV-positive.”

Catholic feminists, we have long known, are more feminist than Catholic. This book is loaded with them. Anna Quindlen, the only type of Catholic the *New York Times* will ever hire as a columnist, protests against what she calls the Church’s “gynecological theology.” Sister Joan Chittister tells us that when she decided to junk her habit, she posed the question, “Are you or are you not a Benedictine in the bathtub?” Sister Laurie Brink is angry that she cannot advocate women’s ordination at the seminary where she teaches, and Nancy Pelosi and Cokie Roberts both see the priesthood through the lens of power, not spirituality.

Most of these people are pro-abortion and some, like the late Father Robert Drinan, have been known to defend the legality of partial-birth abortion. Some like bestiality. Correction: They would like it if cats and dogs could consent. Here is what actor Dan Aykroyd says: “I’d embrace gay and lesbian

priests, because I don't believe homosexuality is immoral. I draw the line at bestiality because it's unfair to the dog or the cat. If the dog or the cat had consciousness, then that'd be OK with me. Sexuality has nothing to do with morality." Warning: Don't leave Fido with this guy when you go away for a weekend.

Reared Catholic, these so-called progressives are the most reactionary persons in our society—they are stuck in neutral, unable to move forward. They simply can't find it within themselves to admit that it just didn't work out. That would be the manly thing to do, but manliness is not one of their notable virtues.

---

## **I'M CATHOLIC, STAUNCHLY ANTI-RACIST, AND SUPPORT DAVID DUKE**

*The following is Bill Donohue's tongue-in-cheek reply to Nick Cafardi's serious article, "I'm Catholic, Staunchly Anti-Abortion, and Support Obama." Donohue's article first appeared on [insidecatholic.com](http://insidecatholic.com) and is reprinted here with permission. We wanted to run Cafardi's piece side-by-side but we were unable to do so, and that is because the National Catholic Reporter (where Cafardi's article was printed) never responded to our multiple requests asking permission to reprint it. It seems the dissident Catholic newspaper lacks both orthodoxy and a sense of humor.*

*Cafardi stunned orthodox Catholics, as did another Catholic constitutional scholar before him, Doug Kmiec, when he made public his support for Barack Obama. Cafardi served as Dean of*

*Duquesne Law School and on the bishops' National Review Board. When he aligned himself with Obama, it created a problem at Franciscan University of Steubenville, on whose board of trustees Cafardi served. In short order, he resigned after it became obvious that he had alienated his base of support.*

*What Donohue did, in essence, was to use almost the identical language that Cafardi used to show his support for Obama and flip it around to show how David Duke could be supported. Where Donohue writes of racism, Cafardi wrote of abortion.*

I believe racism is an unspeakable evil, yet I support David Duke, who is pro-racism. I do not support him because he is pro-racism, but in spite of it. Is that a proper choice for a committed Catholic?

As someone who has worked with minorities all his life, I answer with a resounding yes. Despite what some say, the list of what the Catholic Church calls "intrinsically evil acts" does not begin and end with racism. In fact, there are many intrinsically evil acts, and a committed Catholic must consider all of them in deciding how to vote.

Last November, the United States bishops released "Forming Consciences for Faithful Citizenship," a 30-page document that provides several examples of intrinsically evil acts: abortion, euthanasia, embryonic stem-cell research, torture, racism, and targeting noncombatants in acts of war.

Duke's support for racist rights has led some to the conclusion that no Catholic can vote for him. That's a mistake. While I have never swayed in my conviction that racism is an unspeakable evil, I believe that we have lost the racism battle—permanently. A vote for Duke's opponent does not guarantee the end of racism in America. Not even close.

Let's suppose the 1964 Civil Rights Act is overturned. What would happen? The matter would simply be kicked back to the states—where it was before 1964. Overturning the 1964 Civil

Rights Act would not abolish racism. It would just mean that racism would be legal in some states and illegal in others. The number of racist incidents would remain unchanged as long as people could travel.

Duke's opponent has promised to appoint "judicially activist" judges who would presumably vote not to overturn the 1964 Civil Rights Act. But is that sufficient reason for a Catholic to vote for him? To answer that question, let's look at the rest of the Church's list of intrinsically evil acts.

Both Duke and his opponent get failing marks on embryonic stem-cell research, which Catholic teaching opposes. The last time the issue was up for a vote in the Senate, both men voted to ease existing restrictions.

There's another distinction that is often lost in the culture-war rhetoric on racism: There is a difference between being pro-choice [e.g., the right to choose racist practices] and being pro-racism. Duke supports government action that would reduce the number of racist incidents, and has consistently said that "we should do everything we can to avoid unprovoked confrontations that might even lead somebody to consider racist behavior." He favors a "comprehensive approach...where we teach the tenets of civility to our children." And he wants to ensure that therapy is an option for bigots who might otherwise choose to commit a racist act.

What's more, as recent data show, racist incidents drop when the social safety net is strengthened. If Duke's economic program will do more to reduce racism than his opponent's, then is it wrong to conclude that a Duke presidency will also reduce racism? Not at all.

Every faithful Catholic agrees racism is an unspeakable evil that must be minimized, if not eliminated. I can help to achieve that without endorsing the immoral baggage associated with the Party of Duke's opponent. Sustaining the 1964 Civil



Rights Act is not the only way to end racism, and a vote for Duke is not somehow un-Catholic.

The U.S. bishops have urged a “different kind of political engagement,” one that is “shaped by the moral convictions of well-formed consciences.”

I have informed my conscience. I have weighed the facts. I have used my prudential judgment. And I conclude that it is a proper moral choice for this Catholic to support David Duke’s candidacy.

---

# REMEMBERING A CATHOLIC HEROINE

By: Dr. Richard C. Lukas

Most people had never heard of the tiny, blue-eyed lady until she passed away at ninety-eight years of age in Warsaw on May 12, 2008. Those who were aware of her inspiring story knew that she was a moral giant.

Irena Sendler had been raised a Roman Catholic by a father who taught her to respond to the needs of the poor and oppressed. “When someone is drowning,” he said, “extend a helping hand.” He practiced what he preached. At the risk of his own life, he treated poor Jews and Poles in the town of Otwock for Typhus when other physicians refused to do so. He died of the disease in 1917.

When the Germans defeated and occupied Poland in 1939, they forbade Polish welfare assistance to Jews who were locked up in ghettos and separated from gentiles. In the Warsaw Ghetto,

malnutrition, disease, lack of medical assistance and overcrowding took the grim toll of 5,000 lives every day. There weren't enough gravediggers to keep up with the corpses.

Despite the fact that Poland was the only German-occupied country where aiding a Jew carried the death penalty, Sendler risked her life to help Jews.

She headed the Children's Bureau of Zegota, the code name for the Rada Pomocy Zydom (Council for Aid to Jews), an underground organization that the Poles established exclusively to aid Jews. This group was provided with funds mostly from the Polish government, forced into exile in Great Britain by the German invasion.

Sendler witnessed the special hell the Nazis created for the Jews. "The worst [hell] was the fate of the children, the most vulnerable human beings," she said. Disguised as sanitation workers from the city of Warsaw, she and her close associate, Irena Schultz, entered the Warsaw Ghetto to rescue Jewish children from certain death.

There were four ways to exit the ghetto, all of them dangerous for the children and their rescuers. Two of them included escorting the children through a labyrinth of cellars of buildings on both sides of the ghetto and through the corridors of the Polish Court that straddled the ghetto and Warsaw itself. Another way was to get older children to a tram station near the ghetto, where a member of Zegota drove them to safety. The fourth method was by an ambulance, also driven by a Zegota operative, who took the children out of the ghetto in gunnysacks, body bags and even in coffins. Sometimes, children had to be drugged to stifle their sad cries.

Once outside the ghetto, countless numbers of altruistic Poles helped to make Sendler's operation a success. "I couldn't have done it alone," Irena admitted, observing that it took ten Poles to save one Jewish child. Some people provided temporary

safehouses, others more permanent homes for the children. When German suspicions were aroused about a family, Zegota had to move the Jewish child to another home. One Jewish boy had to be moved so often that he tearfully asked Irena, "How many mothers is it possible to have because I'm going to my thirty-second one."

Sendler's incredible operation resulted in saving approximately 2,500 Jewish children, few of whom even knew Irena's name because she, like other Zegota members, used a nom de guerre. Sendler's was "Jolanta."

Sendler had written the names of her rescued children on narrow pieces of tissue paper. She kept them in a bundle near her bed at night, intending to throw it out the window to a garden below if the Gestapo paid an unexpected visit. But on the night of October 20, 1943, the Gestapo suddenly burst into her apartment before she had the chance to throw the list of names out the window. She managed to throw the list to her friend, who was visiting her that evening. She had the wit to hide the incriminating information in her undergarments.

Imprisoned and beaten at the infamous Pawiak Prison, where hundreds of Poles had died, she refused to reveal anything to the Gestapo. Thanks to a well-placed bribe by Zegota, a Gestapo officer freed Irena on the way to her execution. She went underground, retrieved the list of names, and buried it in a bottle under an apple tree in a friend's garden. She dug up the list after the war and gave it to the Jewish Committee, which took charge of the children.

Because of the hostility of the postwar Communist regime toward any person or group which had been involved in the pro-western and anti-Communist Polish Underground, Sendler's story remained largely unknown until the 1980's and 1990's, when Poland became a democracy. Many belated honors came to her, including a Nobel Peace Prize nomination in 2007.

Irena Sendler deserves an historian and a filmmaker such as Spielberg to tell us her compelling story of sacrifice and courage. We desperately need her and other exemplars of good to teach all of us about goodness. Irena Sendler not only saved Jewish children but also humanity's soul.

*Dr. Richard C. Lukas is a retired professor of history. He has taught at universities in Florida, Ohio and Tennessee and is the author of eight books. Two of his most acclaimed books are: The Forgotten Holocaust and Did the Children Cry?*

---

## TRIBUTE TO POPE PIUS XII

By: Sister Margherita Marchione

The career of Eugenio Pacelli ended when people were awakened in Rome soon after dawn, Thursday the 9th of October 1958. Pius XII died at 3:51 a.m., in a plain white iron bed, overhung with a white canopy, in his room on the second floor of the Papal villa in Castelgandolfo, his summer residence.

During the hours he lay in state in Castelgandolfo, mourners filled the main square in front of the building as well as roads leading from the countryside.

The Italian Government ordered three days of national mourning in Rome. Not only were Italian flags at half-staff, but all theatres and amusement places were closed.

A motorcade proceeded along the Appian Way. Pius XII's body was taken first to the Basilica of St. John Lateran, the Pope's titular church in his capacity as Bishop of Rome. Then it was taken in solemn procession to the Vatican where he laid in state for three days under Michelangelo's gigantic dome in

the Basilica of St Peter.

Deep emotion was evident and many shed tears as mourners passed near Pope Pius XII's corpse. People of all races knelt in prayer. Nine solemn funeral Masses were sung in St Peter's Basilica. On the 13th, the doors were closed at noon to prepare for the funeral ceremonies which began at 4 p.m. Diplomats accredited to the Holy See and representatives from governments around the world were present, as well as his family and Sister Pascalina, who served him for forty years. A final tribute was read and buried with Pius XII: "With his death a great light went out on earth and a new star was lit in heaven."

Fifty years later, in spite of five decades of misinformation and calumny, Catholics throughout the world continue to venerate Pius XII whose efforts during World War II saved thousands of Jews from the Holocaust.

Pius XII was not a "silent pope." He explicitly condemned the "wickedness of Hitler" citing Hitler by name, and spoke out about the "fundamental rights of Jews." The wisdom of his words and actions is supported by the evidence. In his testimony at the Adolf Eichmann Nazi War Crime Trials, Jewish scholar Jeno Levai stated: "Pius XII—the one person who did more than anyone else to halt the dreadful crime and alleviate its consequences—is today made the scapegoat for the failures of others."

Pope Pius XII's peace efforts, his denunciation of Nazism and his defense of the Jewish people have been clearly documented. Albert Einstein concluded in *Timemagazine* (December 23, 1940): "Only the Church stood squarely across the path of Hitler's campaign for suppressing the truth." Countless expressions of gratitude, on the part of Jewish chaplains and Holocaust survivors, give witness to the assistance and compassion of the Pope for the Jews before, during and after the Holocaust.

Rabbi David Dalin states that “to deny the legitimacy of their collective gratitude to Pius XII is tantamount to denying their memory and experience of the Holocaust itself, as well as to denying the credibility of their personal testimony and judgment about the Pope’s role in rescuing hundreds of thousands of Jews from certain death at the hands of the Nazis.”

Personally and through his representatives, Pius XII employed all the means at his disposal to save Jews and other refugees during World War II. As a moral leader and a diplomat forced to limit his words, he privately took action and, despite insurmountable obstacles, saved hundreds of thousands of Jews from the gas chambers. Broadcasting in German in April 1943, Vatican Radio protested a long list of Nazi horrors, including “an unprecedented enslavement of human freedom, the deportation of thousands for forced labor, and the killing of innocent and guilty alike.”

Throughout World War II, Pius XII so provoked the Nazis that they called him “a mouthpiece of the Jewish war criminals.” Jewish historian and Holocaust survivor, Michael Tagliacozzo, wrote a letter to the daily newspaper *Davar* (Tel Aviv, April 23, 1985) which states: “Little known is the precious help of the Holy See. On the recommendation of Pius XII the religious of every order did their best to save Jews.”

All experts who witnessed that era agree that if Pius XII had stridently attacked the Nazi leaders, more lives would have been lost. Fifty years later, I interviewed Carlo Sestieri, a Jewish survivor, who was hidden in the Vatican. In a letter to me he suggested that “only the Jews who were persecuted understand why the Holy Father could not publicly denounce the Nazi-Fascist government. Without doubt—he stated—it helped avoid worse disasters.”

Pius XII’s virtuous life speaks for itself. On December 13, 1954, a picture story entitled “Years of a Great Pope,”

appeared in *Life* magazine. The author states that Pius XII was deserving of the title “Great Pope” because he sought “peace for the world and the spirit” during World War II.

He was truly a “Great Pope,” and it is high time everyone gave him his due.

*Sister Margherita Marchione is the author of many books and articles on Pope Pius XII. She is one of the world’s foremost authorities on the subject.*

---

## **RALLY AGAINST CHRISTIAN APPEASERS; AHMADINEJAD WELCOMED**

On September 25, there was a press conference and a rally outside the Grand Hyatt Hotel in New York City to protest the five Christian organizations that welcomed Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The Catholic League took part in the rally and Bill Donohue spoke at the event.

The organizations that hosted Ahmadinejad were the World Council of Churches, Religions for Peace, the American Friends Service Committee, Mennonite Central Committee and the Quaker United Nations Office; they held a Ramadan fast-breaking dinner (Iftar).

Over 50 organizations joined the protest, representing Catholic, Protestant and Jewish groups, along with many non-sectarian organizations; it was sponsored by Women International. Donohue explained to the press why the Catholic League was participating:

"The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has secured evidence from 10 countries demonstrating Iran's nuclear development activities. Because Iran is not cooperating with IAEA inspectors, the U.N. Security Council has thrice imposed sanctions on Ahmadinejad's regime. The concerns are obvious: the Iranian president has said that Israel 'must be wiped off the map.' Moreover, Iran is now about to formalize its stricture on apostasy: this would mean certain death to any Muslim who converts. But none of this matters to the Christian appeasers who will greet him tomorrow.

"The most prestigious organization welcoming Ahmadinejad is the World Council of Churches (WCC). Its politics are so radical that its agenda could easily be endorsed by any Marxist atheist. It was not for nothing that Jewish interreligious leader Israel Singer once branded the WCC 'the head office for the dissemination of antisemitic statements.' Indeed, after Yasser Arafat died, the WCC stated that the Arab terrorist 'came to the recognition that true justice embraces peace,' something that many Israeli mothers must have found mind-boggling.

"To appease someone like Ahmadinejad is sickening, but for it to be done in the name of Christianity is enough to induce vomiting. We strongly encourage Catholics and others to attend the rally."

Demonstrators lined the street near Grand Central Station and the press conference was covered by some of the media. In a story in *National Review Online*, Kevin Williamson wrote the following about the rally:

"It [was] a rare thing to see a Catholic out-preach a Baptist, but the Catholic League's Bill Donohue received a rockstar's welcome, including applause from a few 'Gays Against Ahmadinejad' protesters, as he announced: 'This bum shouldn't even be in this city,' Donohue shouted. 'These clueless Christians are sitting down with him, for dialogue. You can't



have a dialogue with the devil.' He was especially colorful in his condemnation of the World Council of Churches. 'The WCC are not neutral. They're the same bunch who praised Arafat, that terrorist. If I were there at that dinner, I'd probably vomit all over my plate.'"

Ahmadinejad, of course, is not just bent on killing Jews: he has persecuted many Christians, and has certainly not held back on persecuting his own people. In any event, we were only too happy to join with this outstanding coalition of concerned Americans from all faiths.

On September 25, there was a press conference and a rally outside the Grand Hyatt Hotel in New York City to protest the five Christian organizations that welcomed Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The Catholic League took part in the rally and Bill Donohue spoke at the event.

The organizations that hosted Ahmadinejad were the World Council of Churches, Religions for Peace, the American Friends Service Committee, Mennonite Central Committee and the Quaker United Nations Office; they held a Ramadan fast-breaking dinner (Iftar).

Over 50 organizations joined the protest, representing Catholic, Protestant and Jewish groups, along with many non-sectarian organizations; it was sponsored by Women International. Donohue explained to the press why the Catholic League was participating:

"The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has secured evidence from 10 countries demonstrating Iran's nuclear development activities. Because Iran is not cooperating with IAEA inspectors, the U.N. Security Council has thrice imposed sanctions on Ahmadinejad's regime. The concerns are obvious: the Iranian president has said that Israel 'must be wiped off the map.' Moreover, Iran is now about to formalize its stricture on apostasy: this would mean certain death to any Muslim who converts. But none of this matters to the Christian

appeasers who will greet him tomorrow.

"The most prestigious organization welcoming Ahmadinejad is the World Council of Churches (WCC). Its politics are so radical that its agenda could easily be endorsed by any Marxist atheist. It was not for nothing that Jewish interreligious leader Israel Singer once branded the WCC 'the head office for the dissemination of antisemitic statements.' Indeed, after Yasser Arafat died, the WCC stated that the Arab terrorist 'came to the recognition that true justice embraces peace,' something that many Israeli mothers must have found mind-boggling.

"To appease someone like Ahmadinejad is sickening, but for it to be done in the name of Christianity is enough to induce vomiting. We strongly encourage Catholics and others to attend the rally."

Demonstrators lined the street near Grand Central Station and the press conference was covered by some of the media. In a story in National Review Online, Kevin Williamson wrote the following about the rally:

"It [was] a rare thing to see a Catholic out-preach a Baptist, but the Catholic League's Bill Donohue received a rockstar's welcome, including applause from a few 'Gays Against Ahmadinejad' protesters, as he announced: 'This bum shouldn't even be in this city,' Donohue shouted. 'These clueless Christians are sitting down with him, for dialogue. You can't have a dialogue with the devil.' He was especially colorful in his condemnation of the World Council of Churches. 'The WCC are not neutral. They're the same bunch who praised Arafat, that terrorist. If I were there at that dinner, I'd probably vomit all over my plate.'"

Ahmadinejad, of course, is not just bent on killing Jews: he has persecuted many Christians, and has certainly not held back on persecuting his own people. In any event, we were only

too happy to join with this outstanding coalition of concerned Americans from all faiths.

---

## RANK BIAS AT THE DAILY NEWS

In one of the most egregious examples of hypocrisy and unevenness, the New York *Daily News* ran a front-page story on October 11 about a priest who was arrested for sending pornographic pictures of himself through e-mail to an undercover cop; there was a follow up on this story the next day. Only a few days earlier, on October 7, the *Daily News* buried a story about a rabbi who had sex with his daughter for 10 years, beginning when she was 9.

Bill Donohue wrote to the *Daily News*' editor-in-chief, Martin Dunn, asking him why the story about the priest garnered front-page attention, but the story about the rabbi was relegated to page 18. Donohue also mentioned that neither the *New York Times* nor the *New York Post* covered the story about the priest, yet Dunn's paper decided to make it a lead story.

In his letter Donohue said, "What is disturbing is the flagrantly different standard that the *Daily News* uses in running stories on clergy sex scandals." Donohue concluded his letter by asking Dunn, "Could you please explain why the *Daily News* decided not to do a front-page story on a rabbi who raped his daughter?"

We commend the efforts of New York Assemblyman Dov Hikind who has tried to stop the problem of clergy abuse in the Jewish community. The New York politician says that an "avalanche of people" have come forward with reports of the sexual abuse of minors at the hands of Orthodox Jews.

---

# PUNDITS SLAM PALIN ON WITCHCRAFT

At the end of September, reports surfaced that an African minister once asked God to protect Republican vice-presidential hopeful Sarah Palin from witchcraft. After we saw the unwarranted attacks that followed these reports, we immediately issued a news release pointing out the duplicity of those who made them.

In 2005, Sarah Palin went to church and found that a visiting minister from Kenya, Bishop Thomas Muthee, was performing the service. He offered a prayer asking Jesus to keep her free from “every form of witchcraft.” Palin said nothing—she simply kept her head bowed throughout the blessing. Why this was newsworthy is one issue, but why it quickly became the subject of scorn is another.

For the past two decades, Americans have been lectured by educators and the chattering class that we must respect cultural, religious, racial and ethnic diversity. It seems that exceptions to the creed of multiculturalism are only made when it suits the ideological agenda on the left. Enter Keith Olbermann: He exploited this incident, on his September 24 show, as a brush to paint Palin as an extremist. Moreover, he used this single blessing to unfavorably contrast the African minister to Barack Obama’s spiritual mentor, Rev. Jeremiah Wright. The MSNBC commentator incredibly said that Wright—who spewed hate speech in front of Obama for 20 years—“seems pretty mainstream by comparison.”

Bill Donohue commented to the media by saying: “Witchcraft is a sad reality in many parts of Africa, resulting in scores of

deaths in Kenya over the past few decades. Bishop Muthee's blessing, then, was simply a reflection of his cultural understanding of evil. While others are not obliged to accept his interpretation, all can be expected to respect it. More than that—Muthee should be hailed for asking God to shield Palin from harmful forces, however they may be manifested. And for this he is mocked and Palin is ridiculed.”

We finished our statement by saying, “We know that many cultural elites have a hard time embracing religion, but is it too much to ask that they show some manners when discussing subjects which most Americans hold dear?”

When Ben Smith of *Politico* got wind of our release he contacted Donohue and tried to trip him up on the wording from our statement; the line he had trouble with was, “Witchcraft is a sad reality in many parts of Africa...” Donohue told Smith that he was speaking sociologically and wasn't saying that he believed in witches. Harvard professor Jacob K. Olupona echoed Donohue's statement saying, “His [Muthee's] prayer reflects his own background and his own training and his own world view. America may not believe in witchcraft, but witchcraft is a reality (in Africa).”

It is clear that the disingenuous pundits will stop at nothing to silence the religious crowd. They preach multiculturalism, but proceed to slam a cultural tradition. It is this same crowd that will try to slip us up on anything they can; too bad for them, we can see right through it.

---

## ROSIE O'DONNELL TO HOST NBC

# SHOW

On Wednesday, November 26, Thanksgiving eve, comedian Rosie O'Donnell will host a special on NBC, "Rosie's Variety Show." Reportedly, it has a strong chance of becoming a weekly show on Sunday nights at 8:00 p.m. beginning next year.

When this news broke, we wasted no time in giving NBC a heads-up.

NBC wouldn't dare hire one of its icons, Michael Richards, to do a special, never mind give him serious consideration for a weekly show on Sunday nights. That's because the "Seinfeld" actor made bigoted remarks *one night* in 2006 while performing a comedy routine. By contrast, O'Donnell has made a slew of the most viciously bigoted remarks, year after year. But the officials at NBC think she's okay.

Moreover, Richards made his comments in a private comedy club; O'Donnell made her numerous comments on national television. Let us mention that African Americans were the target of Richards' bigoted statements; O'Donnell's repertoire is mostly limited to attacking Catholics and the Catholic Church. She once ripped Asians, but then quickly issued an apology. She has never apologized to Catholics for her non-stop bigotry.

If Michael Richards were to be given the same opportunity that O'Donnell is being given, the NAACP, Al Sharpton and others would waste no time in scheduling a protest. And by comparison, Richards is positively angelic next to O'Donnell.

Sponsors had better beware. If O'Donnell resorts to her Catholic-bashing antics, one of them will pay. Bet on it. Ironically, it was on Thanksgiving eve of 2006 that NBC aired a concert from Madonna's "Confessions Tour." Deleted from the show was the "Mock Crucifixion" scene we objected to. That's because NBC got the message about the boycott we planned with the Media Research Center (we said we would boycott one

sponsor, to be identified after the show).

NBC would be wise not to pick up O'Donnell's show in 2009.

We urge our members to contact NBC's CEO Jeff Zucker at [jeff.zucker@nbcuni.com](mailto:jeff.zucker@nbcuni.com)