

“MINDY” GETS DIRTY

A couple of weeks ago, a recent episode of “The Mindy Project,” a Fox show, opened with an implied sex scene involving Dr. Mindy Lahiri (played by Mindy Kaling) and Danny Castellano (played by Chris Messina); it was titled, “I Slipped!” The room was dark and there was moaning. Here is how the script unfurled:

Mindy: “Oh my God, Danny, this is heaven. Wait! Danny, Danny, that doesn’t go there!”

Danny: “I slipped!”

After the title sequence, the two characters were shown in an office arguing about the sexual encounter from the night before. Mindy was upset with what Danny did. Danny insisted it was a mistake. It was implied that Danny attempted anal sex.

Mindy: “Okay, so you’re innocent? You had no intent?”

Danny: “Of course no intent. I’m Catholic. Even if I think about that...”

Mindy: “They promote you to Cardinal?”

Danny: “Hey! Hey! That is all over. It’s over. Pope Frank is on the case.”

Danny: “Can we please just go talk about this in your office, please?”

Mindy: “I don’t know, Danny, because my office only has one entrance and I don’t know if that’s enough for you anymore.”

Bill Donohue offered his thoughts on this episode:

Binge drinking, like anal sex, is potentially lethal, but Hollywood only has an interest in promoting the latter. That’s because of the large number of homosexual writers who work

there. Catholics would appreciate it, however, if they would keep their dark secrets in the closet, where they belong.

FAWNING OVER MUSLIMS

The following article by Bill Donohue was published by Newsmax on October 3:

On September 29, Kansas City Chiefs safety Husain Abdullah, who is a Muslim, incurred a penalty in his game against the New England Patriots for sliding in the end zone after he scored a touchdown; he then bowed in prayer. He is man enough to admit that he was properly penalized not for praying, but for sliding. He has learned his lesson: It's okay to pray on the field after doing something heroic, as long as you, "Stop before you drop."

The problem is not Abdullah, it is his Muslim-fawning defenders. Dozens of commentators have rushed to anoint him a "devout Muslim," and quite unlike the reaction afforded Tim Tebow, a Christian who dropped to his knees after scoring, they invoked the adjective as a compliment, not as a statement of derision.

When Tebow was playing, reporters were typically snide, or much worse:

- "Sunday, as expected, a national TV audience could see pious Broncos quarterback Tim Tebow taking a silent devotion." (Cathy Lynn Grossman, *USA Today*, 10/30/11)
- "We don't know when, or if, he [Tebow] will start multiplying his loaves and fishes." (Bill Dwyre, *Los Angeles Times*, 11/27/11)

- “Most of us have learned to live with boundaries—to avoid thrusting our religion into arenas where it is unexpected or unwelcome.” “Should Tebow be so flamboyant about his faith?” (Joel Mathis, Scripps Howard News Service, 12/10/11)
- “There are a lot of LGBT people in New York City who are also football fans,” and that “the new, possibly, starting quarterback for the New York Jets wants them to move backwards 30 or 40 years.” (Dave Zirin, quoted by the Media Research Center, 3/26/12)
- “If Tebow wins the Super Bowl, against all odds, it will buoy his faithful, and emboldened faithful can do insane things, like burning mosques, bashing gays and indiscriminately banishing immigrants.” (Rabbi Joshua Hammerman, quoted by the Media Research Center, 3/26/12)

Now contrast this reaction to the fawning over Abdullah:

- “This kid [Abdullah] playing against New England gave a brief and private, dignified prayer and he was penalized for it. Tim Tebow became an icon of prayer in the end zone. Two sets of rules.” (Jesse Jackson, politics.blog.ajc.com, 10/2/14)
- “Abdullah” is “a godsend.” “We should be cheering and applauding special men like Abdullah who are a phenomenal credit to their faith and inspire Americans to give gratitude to God.” (*New York Observer*, 9/30/14)
- “The penalty is another example of America’s religious bias.” “Freedom of expression and religion are important tenets of American life. But in an age when corporations have the right to impose what they call Christian values on their secular work force, we should wonder if a Muslim boss would be granted the same permission. Considering the move of some states to ‘ban’ shariah law, we can probably guess the answer to that.” (Erika Stutzman, *Daily Camera*, 10/1/14)

- “It [the penalty Abdullah incurred] propels us to war. You have to rally the country in order to bomb a country that did nothing to you and you need to rally them and so that’s what I think that was.” (Rosie O’Donnell, “The View,” 9/30/14)
- “For anyone wondering why angry Muslims join ISIL, this whole saga could easily make the list.” (Ahmed Tharwat, *Star Tribune*, 10/1/14)

We live in a country that is approximately 80 percent Christian and 1 percent Muslim. Why, then, is Tebow bashed and Abdullah admired?

Our cultural elites have decided that Christianity, which is the font of freedom, is repressive, and Islam, which is the font of repression, is unfairly stereotyped. The furniture of the mind is fixed: Christians are victimizers and Muslims are victims. Don’t look for either logic or intellectual honesty—it’s all about political correctness.

BEN AFFLECK DISCOVERS BIGOTRY

Recently, Bill Maher had to educate Ben Affleck about the lethal differences between Islam and Christianity on his HBO show. A debate ensued between atheist author Sam Harris and Affleck over the number of Muslims who embrace jihad, prompting Affleck to opine, “You are saying that Islamophobia is not a real thing. It’s just an ugly thing to say. It’s gross. It’s racist. It’s like saying, ‘Oh you shifty Jew.’”

Affleck is such a phony. Since when does he object to bigotry? In 1999, he starred in Kevin Smith’s anti-Catholic flick, “Dogma.” The plot maintained that Mary and Joseph had sexual relations, and that Mary gave birth to a daughter who worked

in an abortion clinic. God, who was played by Alanis Morissette, and the apostles (a foul-mouthed 13th apostle was introduced) were also subjected to Smith's low-class brand of humor.

When asked about his role in "Dogma," Affleck bragged, "The film is definitely meant to push buttons." Catholic buttons, that is. Can anyone believe that he would star in a Muslim-bashing film? Not on your life.

CATHOLIC SCHOOL ATHLETICS AND SEXUALITY

The divide between Catholic sexual ethics and secular sexual ethics has been played out in Pennsylvania and Minnesota in a dramatic way.

The *New York Times* recently reported that the Diocese of Harrisburg has adopted a policy barring boys on high school wrestling teams from competing with girls from other schools; girls in Catholic schools have also been barred from football and rugby teams. The policy is not new: the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference Education Department has explicit rules on this subject. Indeed, the Archdiocese of Philadelphia previously dealt with this issue.

The issue in Minnesota involved transgender students. Because the Minnesota State High School League was recently considering a policy that was written in part by LGBT activists—boys and girls may even be allowed to shower together — the Minnesota Catholic Conference got out in front of this matter by opposing any policy that committed Catholic schools to support changes in gender identity.

In both instances, “enlightened” critics have assailed the Catholic policies as being “antiquated,” “pathetic,” and “discriminatory.”

The rationale behind the Pennsylvania policy was clear-headed: there are nature-based differences between the sexes that need to be observed. Ergo, sports that involve “substantial and potentially immodest physical contact” ought to be treated differently. All but the enlightened ones have the cognitive ability to distinguish between wrestling and ping-pong.

The rationale behind the Minnesota policy was also clear-headed: the enlightened ones need to learn that the term gender refers to social roles for the sexes that take their cues from nature. Moreover, gender identity disorder is a mental illness requiring treatment for the afflicted, not the affirmation of social institutions.

We were astonished to read that the *New York Times* ran another story the next day on this topic.

The *New York Times* had a story about the Diocese of Harrisburg’s decision to ban high school boys from competing against girls in school wrestling. This was the second day in a row that the *Times* covered this story, and there was nothing new of any substance in the last piece.

The latter news story on the Pennsylvania Catholic high school wrestling policy merited 978 words. By contrast, the same day’s *New York Times* ran a story on Oslo withdrawing from a bid to host the 2022 winter Olympics that totaled 406 words. A story on Derek Jeter starting his own web forum was a mere 599 words. Even the Major League Baseball playoff game between the Pirates and Giants didn’t out do the Catholic high school story—it was 897 words. If we add the first story on the wrestling policy to the most recent one (it was 401 words), the total figure is 1,379.

No newspaper in Philadelphia or Pittsburgh reported on this

story, and outside of *The Sentinel* (a Carlisle, Pennsylvania paper), it got almost no coverage; no national wire service or newspaper covered it.

So what's going on? This was more than political correctness at work—we know the *Times* is fixated on matters sexual—it evinces an appetite for religious profiling. But not when it comes to all religions: the *Times* has a special place for the Roman Catholic Church in its portfolio.

The *Times* recently dropped 100 people from its newsroom—7.5 percent of its staff. Nice to know that it still has the resources to monitor Catholic high school wrestling policies in Pennsylvania. It all comes down to what is a priority, and when it comes to Catholicism and women, few subjects matter more to those at the top of the *New York Times*.

TREATING FR. GROESCHEL FAIRLY

Fr. Benedict Groeschel was one of the most courageous and honorable priests Bill Donohue has ever met. His passing is a great loss.

His death did not occasion the plaudits he deserved. No doubt it has much to do with his much misunderstood statements from 2012 where he commented on males aged 14, 16 or 18 who might conceivably take sexual advantage of a priest. His critics saw this as a defense of the abusive priest. Nonsense. He clearly hypothesized that this could happen to a priest who was having a “nervous breakdown.” In this same interview, he explicitly said that priests who are sexual abusers “have to leave.” Moreover, for decades he put his Columbia Ph.D. in psychology to good use working with troubled seminarians and priests in the New York Archdiocese; this is not the kind of thing

apologists are wont to do.

If we were looking for real apologists, we didn't have to look too far. Last year atheist superstar Richard Dawkins defended what he called the "mild pedophilia" of a teacher who "pulled me on his knee [at a boarding school] and put his hand inside my shorts." He added, "I don't think he did any of us lasting harm." Two years earlier at a B4U-ACT conference, mental health experts said such things as "Assuming children are unable to consent lends itself to criminalization and stigmatization." Not surprisingly does B4U-ACT talk incessantly about "minor-attracted" adults.

Then there was Irish author Colm Toibin who looked back at his youth remarking, "Boys like me, aged 15—if one of them [priests] had...yeah, it would have been absolutely no problem for me aged 15." *New York Times* columnist Frank Bruni was on record approving of an "expert" for saying that the proper response to a kid who has been violated is to inform him "that somebody cared about you and loved you but didn't do it in the right way." Speaking of the *Times*, it recently published an op-ed on why we need to stop criminalizing pedophilia.

CONNECTICUT LAW UNFAIRLY BURDENS CHURCH

Bill Donohue recently defended the Archdiocese of Hartford:

- Jacob Doe claimed he was molested in the early 1980s by a priest, Father Ivan Ferguson, who died in 2002.
- Doe had until 1988 to file a lawsuit, but he never did.

- In 1991, the statute of limitations was amended to 17 years.
- Doe had until 2003 to file a lawsuit, but he never did.
- In 2002 the statute of limitations for civil cases was extended to 30 years; it was made retroactive.
- In 2005, the Archdiocese of Hartford paid \$22 million in a settlement with 43 people who claim they were molested by Fr. Ferguson and other priests dating back to the 1960s. Doe was not one of the parties that sued.
- Doe filed a lawsuit in 2008 after the statute of limitations was changed in 2002.
- In February 2014, a jury awarded Doe \$1 million.

There is something wrong with this picture. It is no wonder that lawyers for the archdiocese argue, among other things, that making the statute of limitations retroactive for sexual abuse cases in 1991 and 2002 violates the civil liberties of their defendant.

It was particularly disturbing to read the editorial in the *New Haven Register* that invoked Pope Francis' humble approach to sexual abuse, and his critical remarks on materialism, as a lever to criticize the archdiocese. According to its logic, the pope would counsel dioceses not to defend their interests, even in the face of palpable injustice. This is absurd. It is also a twisted reading of the pope's thoughts on these issues.

Just as disconcerting was the lack of honesty on the part of the Connecticut media: none mentioned that the amended timeline on the statute of limitations only applies to kids molested in private [read: Catholic] schools—it does not apply to kids raped in public schools.

There is nothing "Christian" about being a piñata for those who want to hold the Catholic Church to a different legal

standard. The archdiocese was right to contest this travesty of justice.

RELIGION IS THE KEY TO SOCIAL CAPITAL

Recently, the Pew Research Center unleashed a study on the issue of which values are the most important to transmit to children.

Eighty-one percent of conservatives think it is especially important to teach children about religion, but only 26 percent of liberals feel the same way. Among those who are consistently liberal, 42 percent are religiously unaffiliated, compared with only 6 percent of those who are consistently conservative.

Disaggregating by education yields striking results. College graduates, as compared to those with some college and those with a high school education or less, are less likely to stress obedience, religious faith, and being well-mannered.

We know from previous data that those who are the least charitable are the most liberal and the most secular, and that those who are the most willing to give to others—in terms of donations, voluntarism, and giving blood—are people of faith. In terms of social capital, then, it is in society's interest to abet religion. It is the faithful who contribute the most to others, even if their liberal-secular counterparts feel the best about empathizing with their plight.

The tax code which rewards people of faith for making contributions to their church and synagogue is not only

rational, it makes sense to increase the benefits.

“DEATH OF KLINGHOFFER” DISTORTS HISTORY

Recently, the Catholic League joined the protest of “The Death of Klinghoffer,” the opera that was inspired by the tragic death of Leon Klinghoffer.

The Catholic League brought a contingent to the protest of “The Death of Klinghoffer” on September 22, which was opening night of the Metropolitan Opera’s new season; the first performance of this opera was scheduled for October 20. We joined the protest partly out of solidarity with our Jewish friends, many of whom have felt the wounds of this propaganda exercise; we were also enraged that the opera falsified history.

The facts are not in dispute. In 1985, PLO barbarians picked out an innocent elderly Jewish-American passenger on the Achille Lauro, an Italian cruise ship, shot him in the face and then threw him and his wheelchair overboard. Benjamin Netanyahu, the current Prime Minister of Israel, was the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations at that time, and he correctly identified the guilty parties. “It [the hijacking and the murder] was carried out with the full prior knowledge and approval of the PLO chairman” [Yasser Arafat].

Predictably, Arafat lied about his role. He charged that the hijacking was aimed at “covering up the terrorist crime and open piracy of Israel, in conjunction with the United States, to destroy the PLO headquarters and assassinate PLO leaders.” Indeed, he claimed that this event was part of a “conspiracy

mapped out to liquidate the PLO.”

This matters because those associated with the opera have repeatedly said that they chose to be “neutral,” giving “voice to all” by not “taking sides” in the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. But not all sides have an equal claim on the truth. Moreover, when it comes to the Klinghoffer episode, the only morally legitimate side to take is the Jewish side. Consider what a terrorist in the opera, Rambo, sang to Klinghoffer: “You are always complaining of your suffering but whenever poor people are gathered they can find Jews getting fat. America is one big Jew.” This wasn’t being neutral—it was being obscene. Donohue urged all Catholics to be at the rally.

Bill Donohue brought a contingent to the protest of “The Death of Klinghoffer” that took place on the evening of September 22nd across the street from New York City’s Lincoln Center. On October 20, opening night of the opera, there was an even bigger rally in the same location. Once again, a Catholic League contingent was present.

