

EXCUSING ANTI-CATHOLICISM

There was a time, not too long ago, when Catholics on the left could be expected to at least feign outrage over anti-Catholicism. But no more. Some find excuses for it, while others cheer it on. Few are principled in their discourse, so thoroughly politicized have they become.

Such has been the reaction to the Podesta-Wikileaks scandal coming from many on the Catholic left. A popular refrain to the anti-Catholic comments by Hillary Clinton's communications director, Jennifer Palmieri, and the deeds of her anti-Catholic campaign chairman, John Podesta, is that they cannot be bigots because they are both Catholic.

This is the position of Father Edward Beck, Peter Weber, Michael Sean Winters, E.J. Dionne, and Sen. Tim Kaine. So exercised are they about this issue that some have resorted to attacking those bishops who have criticized this scandal.

Bigotry is determined by what is said and done, and does not turn on biographical data. For example, putting a swastika on a synagogue is no less anti-Semitic if done by a Jew. Similarly, making anti-Catholic statements, or engaging in anti-Catholic conduct, is no less anti-Catholic if done by a Catholic.

Father Beck discusses the Podesta-Wikileaks scandal, noting that those associated with it are "all Catholics themselves." Wrong. Sandy Newman, the left-winger who wants Podesta's advice on how to "plant the seeds of the revolution" within the Catholic Church, is Jewish. He told Podesta he needed some coaching in this area—it was a little out of his league—and Hillary's top aide said he was happy to oblige.

Weber, writing for *The Week*, talks about this issue using quotation marks to assess charges of "anti-Catholicism." Winters at the *National Catholic Reporter* speaks about the

“supposed ‘bigotry’” of Hillary’s top staff and their associates. Dionne, writing in the *Washington Post*, says he can vouch for his good buddy John Podesta.

Podesta told Dionne that he takes “very seriously the social and moral teachings of the church.” Which ones? Abortion? Euthanasia? Marriage? Conscience rights? Stem cell research? Gender ideology? Perhaps Dionne can explain in another column.

The apologists also try to divert attention from the bigotry by saying that the guilty were “just talking.” Sen. Kaine wrote it off by saying the email exchanges amounted to nothing more than “opinions and mouthing off a little bit here and there.” Weber said it was just “grousing in public.” For Winters, it was “talking about the intersection of religion and politics.”

They make it sound as if the Podesta-Wikileaks discussions were about Saturday Night Bingo. Instead, the conversations centered on sabotage. That’s what it means when political agents discuss how to “plant the seeds of a revolution” within an institution. Podesta’s reply to Newman—he had already set up Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United to do just that—was sincere bravado. Mission accomplished.

Both of these organizations, along with Faith in Public Life and Catholics for Choice, are front groups: they were founded to manipulate public opinion into thinking that one can be a Catholic in good standing and still publicly oppose the core teachings of the Catholic Church. All four of these entities are funded by George Soros, the atheist billionaire known for his self-hating Jewish status.

These are not “concerned Catholics attempting to align [their] faith with [their] political ideals and principles,” as Father Beck would have it. No, these are skilled operatives, not all of whom are even nominally Catholic.

Their objective, which is right out of the playbook of Saul Alinsky (Hillary's hero), is to sow the seeds of division within the Catholic Church. There is nothing noble about their campaign, and there is nothing meritorious about defending them. Anti-Catholicism needs to be condemned, not excused, whether the bigots are on the right or the left.

LIES ABOUT RAPIST MEXICAN PRIEST GO VIRAL

Recently, the blogosphere lit up with headlines blaring that the Catholic Church in Mexico has exonerated an HIV-infected priest who *admitted* to raping 30 young girls between the ages of 5 and 10.

There was just one problem: According to the Archdiocese of Mexico, this priest doesn't even exist! "There is no record of such a minister," the Archdiocese attests. Even militant atheist blogger Hemant Mehta acknowledges that with no police reports, no victims going public, not even a photo of this priest, "there's no reason to think this is true."

So what we have here is a blatant attempt to smear the Catholic Church with the most vicious of lies. Why? The Archdiocese of Mexico suggests that supporters of same-sex marriage in Mexico are behind it, as they had recently threatened to plant damaging stories about the Church in retaliation for its opposition to a gay marriage initiative.

That seems like a pretty big story in itself. Yet the mainstream media have completely buried it.

Imagine if the opposite had happened—if the Catholic Church

had published malicious lies about supporters of same-sex marriage. There would hardly be a newspaper, broadcast outlet or online media site in America that would not have led with the story. But when the Catholic Church is the *target* of such vicious lies, they summarily ignore it. Their silence tells us all we need to know about media bias against the Church.

AMAZON AND WALMART INSULT CATHOLICS

Amazon and Walmart have one standard for transgender persons and one for Catholics: they will not tolerate the slightest insults to the former, but they have no problem offending the latter.

Recently, Amazon, Target, and Walmart pulled a “Tranny Granny” Halloween costume, saying it was offensive. It is not certain how many cross-dressers complained, but at least one activist said that it was “humiliating, dehumanizing, and degrading.” Walmart was particularly contrite, telling LGBTQ-Nation that “it clearly violates our policy.”

We have no problem with Target: it does not carry costumes that clearly insult Catholics. But Amazon and Walmart do.

Amazon recently carried an outfit called, “Keep Up the Faith Priest Men’s Costume.” The priest was wearing a black cassock that featured him sporting an erection; the nun, dressed in full habit, was depicted as pregnant. It was also selling, “Foreplay Women’s Sinful Sister Catsuit and Headpiece,” a black scantily-clad costume with black stockings.

Walmart had a “Pregnant Nun Costume” that lives up to its

name. “Heavenly Hottie Costume Foreplay” was also available in black: the nun outfit was a one-piece body suit that featured white high boots; it was adorned with a large cross in the chest area.

There are no excuses for what Amazon did, but Walmart is worse. It likes to tout itself as a “Christian-friendly” store, yet when it comes to Catholics, it drops its guard.

It is not a good cultural sign when corporate elites are more sensitive to cross-dressers than they are to Catholics.

ARE CATHOLICS CONFLICTED ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY?

A new Pew Research Center survey on religious liberty found that the public is split on the question of whether businesses that provide wedding services should be able to refuse same-sex couples if the owner has religious objections: 48% are in agreement and 49% are not. Catholics believe, by a margin of 54% to 43%, that businesses should be required to provide services to gay couples.

Other surveys provide a different outcome. Does this mean the Pew survey is flawed? No. It means that the wording of the question strongly influences the respondent’s answer. What also matters is whether self-identification is an accurate measure of reality.

For example, last December an AP and NORC Center for Public Affairs Research survey found that 82% of Americans said religious liberty protections were important to Christians. Similarly, 8 in 10 Americans said that it was very or

extremely important for people like themselves to be allowed to practice their religion freely.

So when Americans are asked about their support for religious liberty in general—when there is no competing value they are asked to weigh—their commitment shines through. But in the real world, there is usually a conflict between rights.

Last fall, the Catholic League commissioned Kellyanne Conway of The Polling Company to survey Catholics on a range of issues, one of them being religious liberty. Catholics were asked, “Do you agree or disagree that private businesses with religious objections should be forced to provide services that violate their beliefs?” By a margin of 63% to 30%, they opposed compelling private businesses to provide services that violate their religious beliefs.

What about when the question is narrowed to wedding-related businesses? It makes no difference: 62% say it is mostly unfair and 29% say it is fair.

How can these differences be explained? Americans prize religious liberty but they also support equal treatment. When these values conflict, much depends on whether the respondent is being asked to defend government coercion or support equal treatment: the former is not popular, but the latter is.

In the Catholic League survey, we disaggregated on the basis of several criteria, among them being ideology. For example, when respondents were asked about whether businesses should be required to provide health coverage that violates their religious beliefs, Catholics in general took the side of the owner. There was one segment that favored coercion: they were identified as being the most liberal Catholics in the sample.

We know from other surveys that the most liberal Catholics are also the most likely to be non-practicing. Yet the Pew survey treated them as equals—no attempt was made to distinguish them from others. Therefore, it is likely that if non-practicing

Catholics were factored out of the Pew survey, Catholics would appear less liberal on this issue.

Should non-practicing Catholics be included in samples of the Catholic population? Should Americans who identify themselves as vegetarian be included in a survey of vegetarians even if they occasionally eat steaks or hot dogs? It depends on whether self-identification is seen as a satisfactory measure of reality. To put it another way, if a man has male genitals, is he a woman because he says he is?

Postmodern sages who think truth is a myth are entitled to live in their world of make believe, but they are not entitled to our respect. Reality may be interpreted differently, but not all interpretations are equally valid.

POLITICS EXPLAINS “O’NEALS” 2nd SEASON

Anyone who thinks that money alone drives Hollywood doesn't understand the role that ideology plays. For instance, we've known for years that “G” and “PG” movies fare better at the box office than “R” rated films, yet the sages in Tinseltown continue to offer the trash that often marks the latter. That's because they can: they make enough cash from family-oriented films to subsidize their underperforming “R” rated flicks.

Similarly, when it comes to TV programs, the Hollywood crowd will go the extra mile for shows that advance its ideological agenda, even if it means taking a hit in revenue. Bringing back “The Real O’Neals” for a second season, which started on October 11, is a case in point.

Nielson ratings for the 2015-2016 season reveal that ABC chose to cancel four shows that drew a larger audience than “The Real O’Neals.” Here is the proof (TV shows were ranked from 1-196):

Show	Ranking
“Castle”	44
“Blood & Oil”	78
“The Muppets”	90
“The Family”	104
“The Real O’Neals”	ranked 106.

Of the four shows that had better ratings than “The Real O’Neals,” three of them were cancelled after one season; “Castle” lasted eight seasons. So why was “The Real O’Neals,” with its offensive anti-Catholic fare, renewed but the others were not?

It is hard to resist the conclusion that Disney/ABC made a calculated ideological decision not to give in to pressure from the Catholic League, the Media Research Center, and others. These organizations objected to the show largely because it was loosely based on the life of co-producer, Dan Savage: He is a raging anti-Catholic bigot.

It does not speak well for Disney/ABC to allow its politics—the politics of bigotry—to color its decision making. Let’s see how its predilections affect the upcoming scripts.

DISNEY IS NOT OPPOSED TO

BIGOTRY

Recently, Disney, responding to complaints, pulled a Halloween costume that was branded offensive. The boy's costume, which depicted Maui, a well respected figure in Polynesian oral tradition, was seen by some Pacific Islanders as akin to blackface; Maui is a character in the upcoming Disney film, Moana. The costume featured brown pants and a long-sleeved shirt covered in tattoos (there was also a skirt made of leaves).

Disney quickly apologized and withdrew the items. "The team behind Moana has taken great care to respect the culture of the Pacific Islanders that inspired the film, and we regret that the Maui costume has offended some. We sincerely apologize and are pulling the costume from our website and stores."

Disney's decision to "respect the culture of the Pacific Islanders" stands in stark contrast to its decision to disrespect the culture of Roman Catholics. Specifically, its promotion of "The Real O'Neals," via its ABC-TV subsidiary, shows how duplicitous the corporation is. Why is Disney showing sensitivity to Pacific Islanders but not Catholics?

How ironic that Disney credits Pacific Islanders for inspiring Moana. And who does it credit with inspiring "The Real O'Neals"? Dan Savage (he is a co-producer of the show). Its second season started October 11.

As Bill Donohue said in a *New York Times* op-ed page ad last February, Savage's "maniacal hatred of Catholicism is so strong that it would be as though David Duke were hired to produce a show about African Americans." Indeed, his filthy language—aimed at Catholicism—was deemed so bad by the newspaper that it wouldn't permit me to even use an asterisk in place of letters; his obscene words are a staple in his

work.

Disney is obviously not opposed to bigotry, per se. Its selective interest depends on the creed, culture, and color of its characters.

ACLU “NAZIS” PURSUED HENRY HYDE

On September 30, the day that the pro-life community honored the late Rep. Henry Hyde—the Hyde Amendment was passed 40 years ago on that day—it is worth recalling how the ACLU adopted Nazi-like tactics trying to destroy this great Catholic statesman.

[The following account is found in the first of Bill Donohue’s two books on the ACLU, *The Politics of the ACLU*; both this book, and *Twilight of Liberty: The Legacy of the ACLU*, were published by Transaction Press.]

In the 1970s, after it became clear that Rep. Hyde was the champion of unborn children, the ACLU stated publicly that his amendment amounted to the enactment of Roman Catholic “dogma and doctrine.”

To gather evidence, it dispatched a lawyer to spy on him. The agent found that Hyde went to Mass on Sundays, where, as the report said, “pregnant women and children” bore “gifts of life.” It also noted that Hyde actually prayed and went to Communion! This was part of a 301-page brief (it was thrown out by a judge).

When Hyde was asked about the ACLU’s strategy, he said, “I

suppose the Nazis did that—observed Jews going to the synagogues in Hitler’s Germany—but I had hoped that we had gotten past that kind of fascist tactic.”

The signature goal of the fascist Left is power, and its preferred means include lying, manipulation, libel, and violence. Rep. Henry Hyde got a taste of some of it, courtesy of the ACLU.

No one, including the ACLU, could stop Hyde. It is up to us to see to it that the Hyde Amendment remains law. Both Clinton and Kaine have pledged to repeal it, so deeply committed are they to killing the unborn.

WHY COSMO AND GLAMOUR LOVE ABORTION

September 30 marked the 40th anniversary of the Hyde Amendment, the law that bans federal funding of abortion. Anyone who values life should toast Rep. Henry Hyde: he was one of the most brilliant and courageous pro-life leaders in American history. Predictably, the pro-abortion industry—Planned Parenthood, NARAL, Feminist Majority, NOW—all condemned him on September 30. Less predictable, perhaps, was the condemnation stemming from *Cosmopolitan* and *Glamour*.

Bill Donohue said “perhaps” because he never reads these supermarket magazines. But when he read about their support for the repeal of the Hyde Amendment, he decided the time had come to do so.

Cosmopolitan said the Hyde Amendment has been “hurting women for 40 years.” Similarly, *Glamour* said it has “obstructed

women's healthcare for 40 years."

According to these magazines, not making others pay for a woman's abortion "hurts" all women, obstructing their "healthcare." That prompted Donohue to wonder about the mindset of those who write for these glossy publications, as well as the readers. By perusing the latest editions, he found the answer.

Both magazines appeal to the most narcissistic segments of the female population: those who hate babies and men.

Cosmopolitan had a piece online, "Inside the Growing Movement of Women Who Wish They'd Never Had Kids," that was a real eye-opener. Forget the fact that there is no such "movement"—*Cosmo* has a long history of lying about women (see Sue Ellen Browder's book, *Subverted: How I Helped the Sexual Revolution Hijack the Women's Movement*)—what matters are the startling admissions of the author, Sarah Treleaven.

Treleaven writes about a 37-year-old journalist, Laura, who hates her child. After her baby was born, she knew she had made a mistake.

"The regret hit me when the grandmas went home and my husband went back to the office and I was on my own with him. I realized that this was my life now—and it was unbelievable. I hated, hated, hated the situation I found myself in. I think the word for what I felt is 'trapped.' After I had a kid, I realized I hated being the mother to an infant, but by then it was too late. I couldn't walk away and still live with myself, but I also couldn't stand it. I felt like my life was basically a middle-class prison."

Annie Davies had a piece in the October edition of *Glamour* that was just as amazing. It was titled, "I Hated Men Until I Had a Baby." She doesn't hate men now: she finally concluded that not all of them are lousy. More revealing is the way she decided not to allow the father of her baby the right to raise

their child together.

Annie likes to sleep around, so when she became pregnant while visiting Ireland, she had to figure out who the father was. She decided it was Steve. She first met him in Dublin when she was “bored.” This explains why she “brought home the man sitting next to me at a bar. In the heat of the moment, condoms were discussed but never used, and although I took a morning-after pill, it didn’t work.”

When she told Steve she was pregnant, he asked if the baby was his. “Because,” he said, “if the baby were mine, I’d come back to America with you.” She then lied to him. He persisted, asking, “You’re sure I’m not the father?” “Yes,” she said.

Fast forward to the next stage. “Even though the pregnancy had been an accident, I knew from the moment I saw the swimmy ultrasound that I wanted to have the child. I was equally sure that I was going to do it by *myself* (italics in the original), no father involved. I smiled at Steve. ‘I don’t need anyone, thanks.’”

Those who buy magazines about women who hate their own babies, and lie to the father of their own child about his paternity, can be expected to love abortion. Their raging narcissism also allows them to demand that the public pay for it. These are the kinds of themes that *Cosmopolitan* and *Glamour* feature. Not sure who is sicker—the authors or the readers.

SOROS FUNDS PRO-ABORTION MARCH

Recently, there was a March for Choice in Dublin and in 16 other cities; events were held in 11 nations, including Ireland. Its proximate goal is to force the repeal of Ireland's Eighth Amendment that bans abortion; its long-term goal is to secure abortion-on-demand in other Catholic European countries.

The money behind this effort is coming largely from George Soros, the atheist Jewish billionaire who hates Israel—he labels it a “racist” nation—and loves to fund pro-abortion campaigns. That he likes to interfere in the internal affairs of Catholic nations is indisputable.

His Open Society Foundation funds Amnesty International Ireland, the Abortion Rights Campaign and the Irish Family Planning Association. They promoted the protest. He also funds Catholics for Choice in the United States, an anti-Catholic letterhead with no members.

Reportedly, Soros has donated more than \$25 million to help Hillary Clinton and other Democrats win in November; one report says he has given \$9 million to her alone.

The lavish amounts Soros spends on Clinton is something Catholics should know about. After all, she is on record stating that pro-life “religious beliefs” must change. Last year, in reference to abortion, she explicitly said that “deep-seated cultural codes, religious beliefs and structural biases have to be changed.” In other words, it is the duty of elites, such as Soros, to foster the pro-abortion agenda.

An honest media would tell the public what we have just said—it's all true. But don't hold your breath.