

COLORADO MUSEUM UNDER FIRE; VILE JESUS ART SMASHED

Last month, we learned that the Loveland Museum in Loveland, Colorado was hosting an exhibit that featured a piece by a Stanford University professor, Enrique Chagoya, called "The Misadventures of the Romantic Cannibals." The artwork depicts a man performing oral sex on Jesus. It was part of an exhibit, "The Legend of Bud Shark and his Incredible Ink," that was scheduled to run through November 28.

Immediately, we wrote to Colorado Governor Bill Ritter and to the Colorado state legislature asking them to justify this use of tax-supported dollars. We pointed out, that on July 1, Ritter signed legislation establishing Colorado Creative Industries. A week later, this enterprise announced grants to various organizations and government agencies, among them being the Loveland Museum; it received \$8,500.

We received a call from Ritter's office saying that the monies for the museum were earmarked for some other exhibit. However, we stuck to our guns, supplying his office and the media with evidence to the contrary.

Our central point was this: how can it be that there are no dollars to fund religious programs with public monies, but there are dollars to fund anti-Christian hate speech?

While this issue was being debated, a Montana truck driver, Kathleen Folden, took a crowbar to the Plexiglas case that housed the artwork and then ripped it to pieces. Bill Donohue released another statement to the media, saying, "Had the art depicted a man performing fellatio on Muhammad, the museum may have been blown up by now. So it is lucky that Ms. Folden is a Christian."

Donohue also noted the way those who defended the obscene art

responded to Folden. "I am appalled by the violence," said Loveland's director of Cultural Services Susan Ison. Donohue observed, however, that she was not appalled by the portrayal of Jesus having a man perform oral sex on him. Indeed, she simply called it "very complex."

Similarly, Bud Shark, the organizer of the display, was more upset with those who protested this obscenity than he was with the art. He also played fast and loose. "The controversial image has been demonized as 'pornographic,' 'obscene' and 'depicting Jesus in a sex act' when none of this is true." But if Shark were right about this, then why did those who work at KDVR-TV decided to blot out the oral sex part when they showed it on air?

Following this incident, museum officials pulled the exhibit. Had they any decency, they never would have allowed it in the first place.

CNN SMEARS POPE

It was billed as a documentary, but it came across as pure propaganda. CNN's September 25 one-hour special was nothing more than an extension of what the *New York Times* tried to do last spring: blame Pope Benedict XVI personally for the sexual abuse scandal. Though it failed, it succeeded in smearing him. For Bill Donohue's critical analysis of the show, see pp. 4-6; his article was sent to many bishops.

Ironically, most Vatican observers have credited the Holy Father with doing a better job addressing this issue than his predecessor did, Pope John Paul II. Yet many in the media want to pin the scandal on Benedict.

The documentary was disturbing on several levels. It was rife

with guilt by innuendo and conjecture, a tactic that could be used against any leader. Moreover, it focused on decades-old stories, treating them as if they were of great currency.

As we have said many times, if the media want to focus on all major secular and religious institutions, going back decades to find examples of sexual abuse, the Catholic League would not complain. But when only the Catholic Church comes under scrutiny, such treatment is manifestly unfair.

The two lowest points in the special came when it was implied that the pope was guilty of obstructing justice, and when the host charged that the pope was more interested in stamping out dissent than in stamping out sexual abuse. Neither accusation can be substantiated, and CNN knows it. Shame on them.

ARE THERE NO PRINCIPLES LEFT?

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

William Donohue

Catholic League members are not unfamiliar with the raging hypocrisy that governs our cultural elites. We know all about their unlimited tolerance for Catholic bashing, and their equally unlimited intolerance for bigotry aimed at the protected classes. But in the last month alone, the chasm has widened significantly. Consider the following, all of which demonstrate that there are no principles left.

In the run-up to the October 5 episode of the Fox program, "Glee," we learned that the show tackles the "tricky subject" of religion. As it turned out, there was nothing tricky about the show for Jews to worry about; they only endured light jabs. Muslims had less to worry about as they were invisible

throughout. Christians, on the other hand, were the subject of ridicule, with special treatment afforded Catholics. Similarly, the October 12 show also mocked Catholicism, giving all other religions a pass.

The artwork at the Loveland Museum showing a man performing oral sex on Jesus did not seem to bother the director of Cultural Services, Susan Ison, but she was “appalled” when the art was smashed with a crowbar. Others, including the man who organized the exhibition, and an art writer for the Huffington Post, chose to lie: they said the offensive graphic was not in the display. We know they lied because a local TV station showed the art with the sex scene blotted out.

African American ministers can stump for politicians right from the pulpit, and they can do so with impunity: no newspaper will accuse them of violating separation of church and state. This happened recently when the *New York Times* ran a news story on how gubernatorial candidate Andrew Cuomo was endorsed at a black Baptist church. Not surprisingly, the reporter never noted the blatant abuse and there was no editorial on the subject. Yet when Washington Archbishop Donald Wuerl simply held the annual Red Mass, with Supreme Court Justices and other lawyers present, he was blasted on the Internet for mixing politics and religion. And when St. Paul-Minneapolis Archbishop John Nienstedt spoke out against gay marriage, he was cited by ABC News.

The trailer for the movie, “The Dilemma,” had a scene where the lead character said, “Ladies and Gentlemen, electric cars are so gay.” Gays at the studio, Universal, were fine with it, and so, apparently, was a gay rights group. But when CNN’s Anderson Cooper objected, the gay group changed its mind and joined the protest. The director of the movie, Ron Howard, had no problem making the change, though when the Catholic League asked him to put a disclaimer in the movie “The Da Vinci Code”—saying it was based on fiction—he got his artistic back up and said no.

The Westboro Baptist Church is anti-Catholic, anti-gay, anti-Semitic and anti-military. In October, the U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments about the right of the Church to engage in an obscene protest outside a Catholic church where a funeral for a slain Marine was taking place. It was the anti-military animus of the Church that motivated the protesters to be there. Yet in its coverage, the *New York Times* never missed an opportunity to mention the anti-gay elements of Westboro Baptist, without citing its anti-Catholic legacy. We checked back to see if it had ever written about the Catholic-bashing history of the Church, and found that in a total of twenty stories, it never did (though it did mention anti-Semitism a few times).

Recently, Rick Sanchez of CNN was interviewed on the radio and called Comedy Central's Jon Stewart a "bigot." At that point, the host told Sanchez that Stewart is Jewish, a member of a "minority" group. Sanchez responded with ridicule, noting the influence of Jews in the media, saying they are hardly an oppressed minority. For that he was fired. The previous week, in a CNN documentary, they implied that the pope is more interested in punishing dissident Catholics than he is in punishing pedophile priests. But for that scripted insult, no one was fired.

In October, one newspaper after another refused to run a cute cartoon that was totally innocent. The reason? At the bottom, there was the question, "Where's Muhammad"? But the Muslim prophet was nowhere depicted. That didn't matter. These same papers all have a history of publishing anti-Catholic cartoons.

This fall, a teacher in El Paso, Texas, was arrested for videotaping himself having sex with almost 70 children; more than 200 videos were found. In New York City, the same day that a teacher admitted to her recent past as a prostitute, she was awarded tenure (by a board which knew of her status). In a Chicago elementary school, two parents sought to transfer

their children after their teacher allowed kids to have sex in the classroom. Finally, the teacher was fired, but when new sexual abuse problems surfaced, the parents' request for a transfer was still denied. But don't look for Jay Leno, Joy Behar or Bill Maher to joke about any of these stories. They're just interested in decades-old stories about priests.

No one can rationally justify such duplicity. Quite simply, there are no principles left.

RESPONSE TO CNN DOCUMENTARY ON THE POPE

Bill Donohue

The CNN documentary, "What the Pope Knew," which aired September 25, deserves a response.

The program begins with music and graphics that set the tone: those who think Pope Benedict XVI has been adept at combating priestly sexual abuse must realize that there is "a darker, more complicated story." Dark, yes, but from CNN's perch, the story is not all that complicated: the pope is guilty of "foot-dragging and, perhaps, obstruction."

We learn from CNN host Gary Tuchman that "For decades, before he became pope, Joseph Ratzinger was a high-ranking Vatican official who, more than anyone else beside Pope John Paul, could have taken decisive action to stem the sexual abuse crisis." Similarly, author David Gibson says the pope "always took the stalling tactic."

It is simply not true that Ratzinger was in charge of this

issue “for decades.” In fact, he wasn’t given the authority to police the sexual abuse problem until 2001. What is truly astonishing is that Tuchman concedes as much later in the program. After he notes that “By 2001, the sexual abuse crisis was beginning to engulf the Catholic Church,” he says, “The pope gave Cardinal Ratzinger and the CDF (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith) the power to cut through the bureaucracy and handle all sexual abuse cases directly.”

In other words, Tuchman was incorrect the first time when he said that “for decades” Ratzinger “could have taken decisive action.” He couldn’t have been in charge “for decades” if he wasn’t given police powers until 2001 (he became pope in 2005).

Nowhere in the program is there any evidence that the pope was guilty of obstruction of justice. This is a serious charge—the most serious made in the course of the documentary. Yet to throw this out, without ever producing evidence to substantiate it, is malicious. It won’t cut it to say that he was “perhaps” guilty of obstruction. CNN intentionally planted this seed and never explicitly addressed the subject of obstruction of justice again.

Gibson’s quip that the pope “always took the stalling tactic” suggests the pope acted irresponsibly. Now this may play well with those unfamiliar with the process of determining innocence or guilt, but anyone who knows better will find his accusation flatulent at best, and unfair at worst. More than any institution in history, the Catholic Church’s development of canon law, which became the basis of many rights in civil law, has long championed the rights of the accused. Why is it that when suspected terrorists are afforded generous rights, over a period of several years, it is generally regarded as an example of America’s commitment to freedom, but when accused priests are given their day in court, charges of “stalling tactics” surface?

The program focuses on four miscreant priests. The first is

Peter Hullermann. In 1986, he was convicted of sexually abusing boys while serving in Grafing, Germany. His case is central to the documentary because it questions the pope's culpability.

After Hullermann was convicted, he was transferred to Munich for therapy. It should be noted that therapy was the preferred method for dealing with abusers at the time, both inside and outside the Catholic Church. Abusers were not seen, as they are today, as offenders deserving of punitive action; rather, they were seen as disturbed persons who could be rehabilitated via therapy. No matter, after his transfer, Hullermann was placed in a new parish.

The critical question is: Did Archbishop Ratzinger know that Hullermann was a convicted molester who was moved to another parish? We know he approved the transfer, but that's about it. The Vatican maintains that it was Ratzinger's deputy who placed Hullermann in the new parish. Importantly, CNN makes no claim to the contrary. Moreover, when the *New York Times* broke this story in March, the best it could do in establishing culpability was to say that Ratzinger's office "was copied on a memo." The *Times* also said that Church officials said the memo was routine and "unlikely to have landed on the archbishop's desk."

So if CNN has no evidence tying the pope to Hullermann, why bother trotting out this story one more time? And why does reporter John Allen imply that the pope knew about the transfer to the new parish? He has no evidence, either. Worse is Gibson. "If Cardinal Ratzinger in Munich did not know about Father Peter Hullermann, he should have. That's one of the things that an archbishop does. You always know where your priests are."

In the real world, no leader of any large-scale organization can possibly know where his employees are. It's not as though priests, or school teachers, walk around with a GPS device

around their necks, allowing bishops and school administrators to track their every move. For example, how many school superintendents know that a sexually abusing teacher in their district has been transferred to another district? How many heads of multinational corporations know where their employees are and why they were transferred? We know one thing: in 1980, there were 1,717 priests in the Munich archdiocese.

Gibson then goes for the jugular by asking, "How many other abusive priests may have come under his jurisdiction while he was in Munich as archbishop? We don't know." But we don't need to know. All we need to know is that Gibson has indicted the pope by conjecture. CNN did not make the charge because it had no data finding the pope guilty, so it simply passed the baton to Gibson to lay the suspicion.

The case of Father Stephen Kiesle was included not to prove guilt on the part of the pope, but to add to the suspicion that he did not do enough.

CNN reports that Kiesle's bishop, John Cummins, wanted him defrocked in 1981 after he was convicted of sexually abusing boys. Vatican officials, however, wanted more information; Cardinal Ratzinger had taken over as the head of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith a week after the Vatican office made its ruling. Following Church norms that existed at the time, Ratzinger said he could not defrock Kiesle because no one under 40 could be laicized, and he was in his thirties. Kiesle could have been ordered to stand trial, but because he was so close to turning 40 (and a trial is not a speedy process), a decision was made to wait. On February 13, 1987, the day before Kiesle's 40th birthday, he was defrocked.

What CNN did not report is that Kiesle was removed from ministry following his conviction. Nor did it mention the curious fact that in 1982, while still technically a priest, Kiesle married the mother of a girl he had abused in 1973. But

to mention such an oddity may have shifted blame away from the pope, thus muddying the bottom line.

Father Lawrence Murphy, who allegedly molested some 200 deaf boys in Wisconsin in the 1950s, is covered in depth. But it didn't go far enough. What was omitted is startling.

Tuchman reports that "Father Murphy's case would come to the *direct attention* of Cardinal Ratzinger." (My emphasis.) The viewer then waits in vain for evidence that Murphy's case came to the *direct attention* of the pope. There isn't any. We know that Terry Kohut, who was one of Murphy's victims, wrote to Ratzinger's office, but neither CNN nor the *New York Times* (which first reported on this story) has ever provided evidence that Ratzinger was personally involved in this case.

Jeffrey Anderson, who has made tens of millions suing the Catholic Church, and hates the Church with a passion, is asked point blank by Tuchman, "Do you think Cardinal Ratzinger knew about the case of Father Murphy?" Anderson parses his words in textbook lawyerly fashion. "Well, we know the letters went to his secretary, [Tarcisio] Bertone." This is not in dispute. But was Ratzinger directly involved? Anderson adds, "Thus, that Ratzinger was directly involved." So because Bertone fielded the letters, *thus* Ratzinger was *directly involved*? That Tuchman never challenged Anderson is telling.

Here is what CNN did not tell the viewer. The crimes alleged against Murphy extend to the 1950s, yet the civil authorities were not formally asked to investigate until the mid-1970s; following a probe, the police dropped the case. Fast-forward to 1996, the first time the Vatican is notified. The Vatican decides to ignore the fact that the statute of limitations has expired and orders a trial. Melodramatically, CNN characterizes the internal inquiry a "secret church trial," as if internal probes at CNN for employee wrongdoing are televised.

CNN, like the *New York Times* before it, never bothered to interview the one person who may have known about Ratzinger's knowledge of the case, Father Thomas Brundage. He was the Judicial Vicar, the one who presided over the case between 1996-1998. When asked this year about Ratzinger's role, he said, "At no time in the case, at meetings that I had at the Vatican, in Washington, D.C. and in Milwaukee, was Cardinal Ratzinger's name ever mentioned." Brundage added that he was "shocked" when the media tried to tie Ratzinger to the Murphy case.

In CNN's eyes, if there was one hero in this case, it was the Archbishop of Milwaukee at the time, Rembert Weakland. It credits him writing to Ratzinger in 1996 asking how to proceed against Murphy, noting that Weakland acceded to the Vatican's request to stop the trial, knowing the priest was dying; Murphy died two days later. But there is much the viewer does not learn.

Weakland was anything but a hero in dealing with sexual abuse. In 1984, he branded as "libelous" those who reported cases of priestly sexual abuse, and was rebuked by a judge for doing so. In 1994, he accused those who reported such cases as "squealing." Moreover, he had to resign when his lover, a 53-year-old man, revealed that Weakland paid him \$450,000 to settle a sexual assault lawsuit (Weakland fleeced church coffers to pay the bill).

With regard to the Murphy case, Weakland is again anything but a hero. Last spring, in a section called "Documents Trail" posted on the website of the *New York Times* (alongside an article by *Times* reporter Laurie Goodstein) there is a revealing letter from the Coadjutor Bishop of Superior, Wisconsin, Raphael M. Fliss, to the Vicar for Personnel of the Archdiocese of Milwaukee, Father Joseph A. Janicki. Bishop Fliss says, "In a recent conversation with Archbishop Weakland, I was left with the impression that it would not be advisable at this time to invite Father Murphy to work among

the deaf." The letter was dated July 9, 1980. So why did it take 16 years for Weakland to contact the Vatican about Murphy? CNN does not say.

The last case involves Father Alvin Campbell, an Illinois priest who pleaded guilty to sexual abuse of boys in 1985. Bishop Daniel Ryan visited Campbell in prison, asking him to leave the priesthood. After Campbell refused, Ryan asked Cardinal Ratzinger to defrock him. CNN reports that the request was refused because it did not come from Campbell.

This sounds strange, but there is more to the story. Bishop Ryan wanted Campbell defrocked quickly because he wanted to spare the victims a trial. This is understandable at one level, but there is still the matter of civil liberties: the accused are entitled to their day in court. What CNN omitted from its coverage was that Bishop Ryan had the authority to remove Campbell from ministry, or go forward with the trial, recommending defrocking. He elected not to do so.

As CNN acknowledges, Ratzinger learned from the Campbell case and pressed Pope John Paul II to make serious changes in the way these cases were handled. "And from 2001 forward," says Allen, "the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith became the beachhead for the Vatican for an aggressive response to the crisis." True enough. And 2001 was the year that Pope John Paul II charged Cardinal Ratzinger with overseeing this issue. It is not by accident that these changes occurred on Ratzinger's watch: he made them happen.

Finally, there is the matter of Father Thomas Reese, the editor of *American* magazine, who was forced to resign. CNN frames his ouster this way: "His crime? Publishing a magazine." But as CNN likes to say, it's a "more complicated story." In actual fact, Father Reese was accused of publishing a series of articles challenging the settled teachings of the Catholic Church. He says he tried to "encourage a conversation, a dialogue, a debate in the magazine about

issues facing the church.” The issues he focused on were abortion and gay marriage.

Tuchman uses the Father Reese case to conclude, “Cardinal Ratzinger was passionate about stamping out dissent. But there was never any public indication he was passionate about getting rid of pedophile priests.” This, along with the suggestion that the pope was guilty of obstruction of justice, marks the lowest point in the documentary.

If it wasn’t passion that provoked the pope to speak of the “filth” within the Church—he did so right before being elected—what was it? A cerebral exercise? And what was it that triggered him to reopen the case of Father Marcial Maciel, the founder of the Legionaries of Christ, and then seek to reform the Legionaries? Was it boredom?

Tuchman opines that “Vatican experts say Ratzinger silenced, censored or otherwise punished dozens of theologians during his reign at CDF.” The charge is risible on the face of it: there is infinitely more tolerance for dissent in the Catholic Church than exists in the typical American college or university.

Besides a stint in the Air Force, and a year at The Heritage Foundation, I have spent my entire life teaching in a Catholic school or college, or serving as president of the Catholic League, and I can say without reservation that the attempts to silence speech that challenges the prevailing wisdom are more frequently employed in the academy than in the Catholic Church.

From top to bottom, what CNN did was the televised version of what the *New York Times* did in print form earlier in the year. The goal was to tarnish the image of Pope Benedict XVI, making him out to be a co-conspirator in the scandal. Though it came up empty handed with proof of his culpability, there was enough innuendo to convict Snow White.

The timeline of the scandal, it needs to be said, was from the mid-1960s to the mid-1980s. Ironically, those within the Catholic Church who pushed for “progressive” reforms, e.g., making the case for more relaxed sexual strictures in the seminaries, and who then recommended therapy to treat molesters—most of whom were homosexuals—are the very ones today pointing fingers at the pope for the scandal. That’s the real scandal, though it is not likely to be covered by CNN.

NEWSPAPERS NIX “MUSLIM” CARTOON

On October 12, we commented on the decision by editors at the *Washington Post* not to run a cartoon that mentioned, but did not depict, Muhammad. We referred to our October 8 release that noted how Universal decided to nix the words, “electric cars are so gay,” from the trailer of “The Dilemma.” We ended that statement by saying, “There are protected demographic groups in society, and people of faith, save for Muslims, are not among them.”

Two days later, the *Washington Post* proved our point: it decided not to publish a totally inoffensive cartoon [left], one that shows kids and animals frolicking about in a park, simply because it asks, “Where’s Muhammad?”

According to the *Post*’s Style editor Ned Martel, the reason for not printing the “Non Sequitur” strip by Wiley Miller was that “it seemed a deliberate provocation without a clear message”; executive editor Marcus Brauchli agreed.

So the problem was that Miller didn’t have a clear message. Maybe Tom Toles, the *Washington Post* cartoonist, should have

brought him up to speed. On March 29, the *Post* printed a cartoon [bottom right] by Toles that showed a picture of Jesus with the words, "Let the Little Children Come to Me" and a priest saying, "What a Great Recruitment Poster!" Nothing unclear about that: all priests are child molesters.

We brought this issue to the attention of the executive editors at the nation's leading newspapers, and to the deans of the nation's leading schools of journalism. Both the Toles cartoon, and the Miller cartoon, were submitted for their review. We said it was time to have a national discussion on what passes as offensive fare these days. Or, more pointedly, whose sensibilities are to be protected, and whose are to be assaulted.

The day after we sent the letter to the nation's top newspapers and journalism schools, we found out that many more newspapers refused to publish the inoffensive cartoon.

Thanks to James Rainey at the *Los Angeles Times*, we learned that the cartoon was pulled from his own newspaper, as well as from the *Dallas Morning News*, the *San Francisco Chronicle*, the *Boston Globe* and many other papers.

When presented with this information, Bill Donohue said, "Every time Catholics complain about some Catholic-bashing artwork, movie, television show, play or cartoon, we are told that 'art is in the eye of the beholder'; 'it's open to interpretation'; 'it's done to make people think'; 'it's complex'; and other dodges. But when it comes to Muslim sensibilities, it is sufficient to censor anything that might possibly tick them off, even if every person not housed in the asylum knows the work is innocuous."

Unfortunately, those who are not cowards in dealing with this issue are in the minority. A book can be published about the Danish cartoons, but the cartoons cannot be reproduced in the same volume. Matt Stone and Trey Parker at Comedy Central can mock Jesus on "South Park," but can't joke lightly about

Muhammad. And now we have newspapers galore that would rather prostitute everything they stand for before ever making Muslims feel uneasy.

It is obvious that they no longer stand for anything.

OBAMA OMTS “CREATOR” FROM SPEECH

Recently, President Obama addressed the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute’s at its 33rd Annual Awards event. In his remarks, he made reference to the Declaration of Independence. Obama said, “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, endowed with certain inalienable rights: life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.”

There are several errors here, though only one that really matters. On a small scale, Jefferson chose “unalienable” instead of “inalienable,” and following the word “rights” there is no colon: instead it should read, “that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.” What really matters, however, is the omission of any reference to God: after “equal” it should read, “that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights....”

Some blamed the president for this error, but it was his speechwriters, and those who vetted his address, who were to blame.

The prepared remarks, as released by the White House, omit the word “Creator.” Since this got by so many in the White House, it makes us wonder whether only incompetence was at work. While Obama may be given a pass, it is striking nonetheless

that this omission got by a former constitutional law professor.

There are four references to God in the Declaration. God is the author of the “laws of nature and nature’s God”; he is the “Creator” who “endowed” us with “unalienable rights”; he is “the Supreme Judge of the world”; and he provides “the protection of Divine Providence.”

Bill Donohue, a former professor of political science, said, “I made sure my students understood this, but evidently none of those who write or vet the president’s speeches learned this in college.”

They should pay more attention, especially given the suspicion that President Obama likes his religion lite.

NEW YORK TIMES PROMOTES PRIEST ENVY

With Halloween just passing, many boys and girls dressed up, playing make believe. If some dressed as a priest or nun, they were looked upon with great amusement. But when grown women dress up like priests, and they really believe they have become one, it is cause for calling 911. They need help.

Those at the *New York Times* apparently never heard of 911. The paper recently ran a silly article about a woman suffering from priest envy suggesting that she is not the only one in need of help. The reader was introduced to an Italian woman who as a child pretended she was a priest, dispensing cookies and chips for communion. Sadly, the story recounts how she never grew up: she still thinks she is a priest. It did not

say whether she still favors cookies and chips for communion, though it is possible she now favors meatballs.

After sounding positively delusional, the *Times* tried to get serious. It said that the Catholic Church recently equated the ordination of women to pedophilia, ascribing the same penalty. In actual fact, what the Church decreed was that sexual abuse and the profanation of any sacrament will not be tolerated. Does not the *New York Times* have the same penalty for those who sexually harass a colleague and those who intentionally misrepresent their credentials? In all four cases, the offenses are different but the penalty is the same.

What is going on, of course, is a game. The game is to manipulate public opinion against the Church. It's a game because the *Times* never takes aim at Orthodox Jews or Muslims for not having women clergy. Just Catholics.

TIME GOES BATTY FOR WOMEN “PRIESTS”

Recently, the website of *Time* magazine has featured articles on the absence of women clergy in the Catholic Church.

It is one thing for *Time* to be intoxicated with the fiction of women priests, quite another for it to enlist on an agenda. Many religions reserve the clergy for men, though *Time* has no interest in berating them on this subject. Instead, they focus solely on Roman Catholicism.

At the end of September, Dawn Reiss wrote on the website of *Time* about an old woman, Alta Jacko, who thinks she is a priest. Reiss even referred to her as “an ordained priest in

the Roman Catholic Church.” Bill Donohue responded by saying, “She knows full well that the 81-year-old lady is no more a priest than I am Cardinal Donohue.”

A week later, Tim Padgett wrote about yet another elderly woman who thinks she is a priest, saying that there are now “more than 100 other women who claim to be Catholic priests in the U.S. and abroad.” He did not say whether the senior citizens had seen Elvis lately.

They can dress up and play make-believe all they want, but at the end of the day, the octogenarians are neither priests nor Catholics: they’ve been excommunicated for their stunts. But not all is lost as they are now available to join the mainline Protestant denominations. They would make splendid ministers, though apparently no one has called.

“GLEE” TACKLES RELIGION

On a recent episode of the Fox show “Glee,” the producers decided to address religion. A gay atheist was treated with sympathy for his victim status, the victimizer being Christianity, especially Catholicism. Judaism was treated with kid gloves and Islam got a pass. In other words, it was the usual Hollywood stuff.

The show revolved around a football player who sees an image of Jesus in his grilled cheese sandwich, labeling it “Grilled Cheesus.” Throughout the show the audience was treated to such lines as “I think God is kind of like Santa Claus for adults. Otherwise, God’s kind of a jerk, isn’t he?”; “Asking someone to believe in a fantasy [religion]...however comforting, isn’t a moral thing to do. It’s cruel.” References to Catholicism included mocking quips about “Sweet Holy Mother of God

Academy.”

The pivotal remark, which set the tone, was made by the gay atheist: “The reason I don’t go to church is because most churches don’t think very much of gay people. Or women. Or science.”

The very next week, “Glee” followed up by bashing Christian sensibilities again. This time it featured the character Finn as a Catholic priest, and Rachel as a nun in provocative attire. They were shown singing “With You I’m Born Again.”

According to a review on tvsquad.com, this was another “emotional episode about religion,” one in which Finn and Rachel were in a duet competition “wearing a super inappropriate costume set.”

Actually, neither episode was about religion, in general: both were about Catholicism, and both were meant to mock. Why not admit it?

Why do the writers and producers of “Glee” loathe diversity? Why weren’t they more “inclusive” (as they love to say) and choose Muslim characters? Just think of all the fun they could have with an imam and a Muslim woman performing a silly duet “wearing a super inappropriate costume set”!

These episodes were a reflection of what Hollywood scriptwriters and producers believe. Back in 1986, S. Robert Lichter, Stanley Rothman and Linda Lichter wrote a landmark book, *The Media Elite*. The three social scientists, not affiliated with conservative causes, found that the media elite had nothing in common with most Americans on the subject of religion: while 94 percent of Americans identified themselves as religious, only 50 percent of the media elite did. Even more striking, while 86 percent of the public said religion was important to them, 86 percent of the media elite said they seldom or never attend church. Studies since have shown that nothing much has changed.

Homosexuality and atheism are all the rage these days with the cultural elite. And as “Glee” demonstrated, so is ripping on Christians.

MATT DAMON SLANDERS GAY PRIESTS

On the September 23 season premiere of the NBC program “30 Rock,” there was an exchange between characters played by Matt Damon and Tina Fey; the two are romantically involved and are trying to get to know each other better:

Matt Damon: Alright, let’s each say one thing about ourselves that the other person doesn’t know on the count of three.

Tina Fey: Alright.

Damon: Ready? One, two, three.

(They speak at the same time)

Fey: I’m on a waiting list to adopt a kid.

Damon: I was touched by a priest—it’s fine.

The assault by Hollywood celebrities on homosexuals should be renounced by everyone. We all know that the sexual abuse scandal in the Catholic Church—which largely ended a quarter century ago—was mostly the work of homosexuals. But that was yesterday. For Matt Damon to trot out homosexual priests one more time, slandering all of them in one swoop is despicable. He owes all Catholics, especially homosexual priests, an apology.

We asked our members to contact John Eck, president of NBC
Network TV: john.eck@nbcuni.com