

WEINSTEIN'S BIGOTED LEGACY; DUPLICITY MARKED HIS LIFE

Bill Donohue and Harvey Weinstein have been locking horns for over two decades. So when the *New York Times* broke the story about his sexual escapades—using his power position to abuse women in his employ—it triggered a strong response from us.

We now know that Weinstein abused women even as he championed the cause of women's rights. This appears to be consistent with his duplicitous personality: He condemned some expressions of bigotry (anti-Semitism) while contributing to other expressions (anti-Catholicism).

On March 24, 2015, Weinstein gave an impassioned statement condemning anti-Semitism at a Simon Wiesenthal Center awards dinner.

"We're gonna have to get as organized as the Mafia," Weinstein said. "We just can't take it anymore. We just can't take these things. There's gotta be a way to fight back." He was given the Humanitarian Award by Christoph Waltz, who praised him for making movies that made Jews proud of their heritage.

At the time, Donohue said, "I join Weinstein in condemning anti-Semitism. But before I am prepared to issue a joint statement with him, he needs to first condemn anti-Catholicism and pledge not to contribute to it again." Donohue was referring to Weinstein's long history of Catholic-bashing movies.

In 1995, Weinstein and his brother, Bob, offered us "Priest," a film featuring nothing but miscreant priests. In 1998, they gave us "The Butcher Boy," which starred Sinead O'Connor as a foul-mouthed Virgin Mary. In 1999, we were treated to "Dogma," where the audience learned of a descendant of Mary and Joseph who works in an abortion clinic.

In 2002, they released “40 Days and 40 Nights,” a film that ridiculed a Catholic for giving up sex for Lent. Also opening in 2002 was “The Magdalene Sisters,” a movie that smeared nuns. In 2003, “Bad Santa” opened for the holidays; Santa was cast as a chain-smoking, drunken, foul-mouthed, suicidal, sexual predator. In 2006, “Black Christmas” made a predictably dark statement about the holiday.

“Philomena” was released in 2013. It is a tale of malicious lies about Irish nuns and the Church (Harvey lobbied hard for an Oscar, but came up empty). In real life, Philomena Lee was a teenager who abandoned her out-of-wedlock son, and who, because of the good efforts of the nuns, was adopted by an American couple. They are currently working on another movie, “Mary Magdalene.”

Weinstein’s womanizing did him in. If Hollywood weren’t a hotbed of anti-Catholicism, he would have been history years ago.

HHS MANDATE VICTORY

President Trump did not let Catholics down: His administration granted a religious exemption to the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate on October 6th. Those employers whose “sincerely held religious beliefs” are compromised by providing for abortion-inducing drugs, sterilization, and contraceptives in their healthcare plans do not have to abide by the mandate.

By providing for the religious exemption, the Trump administration affirmed conscience rights, a liberty trashed by the Obama administration. This means that organizations such as the Little Sisters of the Poor will not have to abide by healthcare provisions deemed morally offensive.

The Catholic League expressed its concerns on several occasions that the Trump administration was slow to reverse the Obama policy. But we never doubted that President Trump would eventually render the right decision. This ruling effectively overturns one of the most anti-Catholic policies crafted by the Obama administration.

It is for everyone to note, especially Catholics, that the Obama HHS mandate was an opening for demanding Catholic entities to pay for abortion. That was the purpose of including abortion-inducing drugs in the policy.

What still needs correction, not simply clarification, is the Obama administration's pernicious attempt to redefine what constitutes a Catholic organization. Catholic entities that hire and serve non-Catholics do not lose their Catholic status simply because the government defines them as functionally secular.

NUDGING THE NEW YORK TIMES

William A. Donohue

When the Catholic League objects to anti-Catholic art, we are routinely labeled censors by the artistic community, but when some of their liberal colleagues object to art that offends them—such as treating lizards “inhumanely”—there is little outrage, and no name calling.

Where was the outrage by the media, the artistic community, and free speech activists over the Guggenheim's decision to nix three works from an exhibition that opened on October 6? Animal rights zealots took aim at the Guggenheim for showcasing three works as part of its exhibition, “Art and

China After 1989: Theater of the World."

The first artwork banned by the Guggenheim was a video showing four pairs of pit bulls on nonmotorized treadmills; they were portrayed as charging at each other, though they never touched. There was a second video that showed two pigs copulating in front of a live audience. The third work was an installation—considered the real gem by the *New York Times*—that featured hundreds of live lizards, crickets, and other reptiles and insects racing around eating each other under a warming lamp.

When news of these three exhibits initially broke—before the Guggenheim decided to ban them—the ASPCA and PETA were furious with the Guggenheim, as was entertainer Ricky Gervais. They had no business being so self-righteous.

From 1894 to 1994, the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) in New York City killed virtually all the unadopted pets in its care. More recently, its passion for animal rights led it to smear Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus, accusing it of animal cruelty. The charges were false: In 2012 the ASPCA was forced to pay Ringling Bros. \$9.3 million in a settlement.

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) kills almost all the cats and dogs in its possession. In fact, it kills 95 percent of adoptable pets in its care. Yet its leader, Ingrid Newkirk, maintains it is unethical to swat mosquitoes. She is also known for cheapening the Holocaust: "Six million Jews died in concentration camps," she told the *Washington Post*, "but six billion broiler chickens will die this year in slaughter houses."

Gervais will go to the mat to protect the life of animals, just so long as they are not human. There is not an animal rights cause he will not champion, nor is there a pro-abortion cause he will not support. For example, when Texas state

senator Wendy Davis conducted a filibuster protesting abortion restrictions, Gervais said it secured her place in “the pantheon of American heroes.”

Though these big name activists were quite vocal in expressing their displeasure with the Guggenheim, what made the famous museum buckle was not advocacy, it was the threat of violence. “Explicit and repeated threats of violence made our decision necessary,” the Guggenheim said.

Worse than all of these people was the editorial board of the *New York Times*; its reaction to the art that was banned by the Guggenheim was non-existent, until we blasted its silence.

When the Catholic League protested a vile video exhibit at the Smithsonian in 2010 that featured large ants crawling over Jesus on a crucifix, an editorial in the *New York Times* said, “The Catholic League is entitled to protest.” But it strongly criticized the decision of the museum to pull the video, saying that it was giving into the “bullying” of Rep. John Boehner. It cited its support for “culturally challenging images.”

When the Catholic League protested a filthy exhibit at the Brooklyn Museum of Art in 1999 that featured a huge portrait of Our Blessed Mother adorned with elephant dung and pictures of vaginas and anuses, an editorial in the *New York Times* applauded the decision of the museum to “defend artistic freedom.”

When the Catholic League protested an obscene play at the Manhattan Theatre in 1998 that featured Jesus having sex with the twelve apostles, an editorial in the *New York Times* cheered the performance, saying, “This is not only a land of freedom; it is a land where freedom is always contested.”

But when the Guggenheim decided to ban three exhibits that upset animal rights activists, the *New York Times*, which ran several articles about it, dragged its feet issuing an

editorial. So the day the exhibition opened, we slammed the paper for its hypocrisy and asked our email list to contact the editorial page editor (whose email address we supplied).

Exactly one week later, the *Times* finally came through criticizing the museum. Thanks to our troops! As I said in a news release, we may be the leaders, but we cannot do this job without your input.

Why was the Catholic League alone in wondering why the editorial board initially said nothing? Where was the outcry from artists over the decision by the newspaper to ignore the Guggenheim's censorial approach? Are they so dependent on the *Times* for good reviews that they dare not utter a word of condemnation?

We are proud of our role nudging the *Times* to finally do the right thing.

HARVEY WEINSTEIN vs. BILL DONOHUE

Bill Donohue

For over two decades, Harvey Weinstein and I have been at war with each other. It started in 1995 when Miramax released the anti-Catholic movie, "Priest." Miramax was the creation of the two Weinstein brothers, Bob and Harvey; the parent company was Disney.

I was president of the Catholic League for only two years at the time. I realized right from the get-go that if I let this movie slide, Disney would see it as a sign of weakness, so I

pulled out all the stops.

The movie portrayed five priests, all of whom were dysfunctional. Worse, their dysfunctionality was a function of the priesthood. In other words, the teachings of the Catholic Church were responsible for their depraved condition. The cause and effect was plain, and it made all the difference.

Two of the priests in the movie were having an affair: one with the female housekeeper, and the other with his newly acquired male friend. Another priest was a drunk, the country pastor was a madman, and the bishop was simply wicked.

At the end of the movie, the straight priest who was sleeping with the housekeeper defends the gay priest in front of the congregation. Using vulgar language, he asks the faithful at Mass whether God cares what men do with their sex organ, beckoning them to focus their attention on such real outrages as war, famine, and disaster.

I made the decision to confront Disney/Miramax, or what Cardinal John O'Connor called Disneymax, so I held a press conference at the Catholic Center of the Archdiocese of New York. Surrounding the podium were huge toy animals featuring the Lion King, Mickey Mouse, Pluto, and the like. I wanted to make this all about Disney.

I had been tipped off that several executives from Disney/Miramax were in the audience. So I began by telling them to get out. I told them they could hold their own press conference in the street, where they belonged. They quickly grabbed their coats and pocketbooks and made a beeline to the door. The TV cameramen loved it.

The movie was scheduled to open on Good Friday, but after our protest caught fire, they quickly backed down, releasing it on a later date. It turned out to be a dud anyway, though some Jesuit priests loved it.

The next confrontation was even wilder. In 1999, the movie "Dogma" was released, but not before I obtained a copy of the script. The film featured Jesus and Mary having sex. A descendant of theirs was a lapsed Catholic who works in an abortion clinic. God was played by Alanis Morissette, a vulgar actress. The 13th apostle resembled Jerry Springer.

After reading the script, which I obtained the year before it hit the big screen, I wrote to Disney CEO Michael Eisner. "It looks as though Catholic sensibilities will be offended once again. Perhaps it is not too late for something to be done about this," I said.

On April 5, 1999, I issued a news release, "Disney/Miramax Poised to Anger Catholics Again." What prompted the release were news stories citing entertainment sources saying the Catholic League is going to go nuts when this movie is released. Two days later, Miramax faxed me its news release saying that Eisner told the Weinsteins that the movie could not use the Disney/Miramax label. This meant that the Weinstein brothers had to invest \$14 million of their own dollars to finance the film.

This was an important victory—Eisner bowed to our pressure. We didn't give up: we set our sights on having Disney sever all ties with Miramax. That eventually happened.

The drama was only beginning. Bully lawyers for the Weinsteins tried to intimidate me. They failed miserably. Here's what happened.

After "Dogma" star Ben Affleck remarked that "This movie is definitely meant to push buttons," I responded by saying, "The Catholic League has a few buttons to push, and we will not hold back." I thought nothing of it—it was just a tit-for-tat. Then I received a threatening letter from the Los Angeles firm of Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp, representing the Weinsteins.

The firm chose Dan Petrocelli to go after me. He was a real

heavyweight. Alan Dershowitz once said he was the best attorney in the nation. Among his victories was his successful prosecution of O.J. Simpson in a civil suit. But he ran into a brick wall when he tangled with me.

Here is what Petrocelli said:

“Statements like these may be interpreted to announce or imply an intention by the League to go beyond the bounds of legitimate and peaceful dissent or protest, and to stimulate, motivate, or incite danger or violence. Please be advised any such impermissible activity authorized, committed, or encouraged by the League that harms or threatens harm to any person will not be tolerated. We intend to hold the League fully accountable for any wrongdoing, injury, or damage it causes.”

The letter was sent Overnight Priority Federal Express to the Catholic League at our office; we rented space at the time from the Archdiocese of New York. I immediately faxed Petrocelli the following missive: “You erroneously sent your threatening letter to 101 First Avenue. Our address is 1011 First Avenue. Please make a note of it.”

After toying with the Weinstein firm, I then went public with their letter, and with my response:

“The letter by the Weinstein attorneys is wonderful. It proves who the true enemies of free speech really are. Now I don’t even have to argue this issue anymore—all I need do is present their letter. It settles everything.

“I don’t know how many years it has been since the lawyers of Mitchell, Silberberg & Knupp last took a course in constitutional law. But even if they are slip and fall hacks, they should know better.

“The Catholic League protest of ‘Dogma’ will now proceed with even more vigor than ever before. Fascistic attempts to silence us will never win.”

I wasn't finished. Not only did I hold a press conference and write a critical booklet on "Dogma," which was widely distributed, I took out an op-ed page ad in the *New York Times* going after Disney for not dumping Miramax altogether. We were on the offense; Eisner and the Weinsteins knew it.

In 2002, Eisner was back in the fold with the Weinsteins. "40 Days and 40 Nights" was another Catholic-bashing film, though not as vulgar as the others. Just as it was about to open Disney held its annual shareholders' meeting in Hartford, Connecticut. On the day of the meeting, I took out an ad in the *Hartford Courant* asking Disney shareholders to dump Miramax.

The pressure we exerted was paying off. Disney's stock was plummeting: it dropped 32 percent between 2001 and 2002. Eisner was worried. In 2005, Disney officially split from Miramax.

The split didn't stop the Weinsteins from assaulting Catholicism. We waged war on Miramax in 2003 when it released "The Magdalene Sisters." It was the creation of Peter Mullan, who at the time compared the Catholic Church to the Taliban.

The movie portrayed all nuns as wicked persons who exploited unwed mothers. Mullan admitted that the movie "encapsulated everything that is bad about the Catholic Church." Two honest board members of the Venice Film Festival rightfully called it "anti-Catholic propaganda."

Catholics received a Christmas gift from the Weinsteins in 2003, and again in 2006. In 2003, they offered "Bad Santa," and three years later they delivered "Black Christmas." The former was the worst. Santa was presented as a chain-smoking, drunken, foul-mouthed, suicidal, sexual predator. He was depicted having sex with a bartender in a car and performing anal sex on a huge woman in a dressing room.

Next up was "Philomena." The Weinsteins really thought they

would earn an Oscar for it, and indeed Harvey lobbied hard for it. His efforts were in vain. The 2014 film was based on a series of lies, many of which I detailed in a booklet.

The movie featured Judi Dench playing Philomena Lee, a young girl who got pregnant out-of-wedlock in Ireland in 1952 when she was 18-years-old. That part was true. But it was a malicious lie to say the nuns stole her baby and then sold him "to the highest bidder." It was also a lie to say Philomena went to the U.S. to find him.

We went after this propaganda film big time, so much so that those associated with it began to walk back their story. All of a sudden it became a movie that was "inspired" by true events. Harvey tried to manipulate Pope Benedict XVI into seeing it, but he failed.

Now the Weinsteins are working on "Mary Magdalene." Perhaps it would be more accurate to say Bob is working on it. Harvey is in therapy. He should be in jail.

Hollywood has long been home to anti-Catholics, and no one sits higher on this throne of bigotry than Harvey Weinstein. He tried to silence me, but failed. Now his own people have turned on him.

There remains an issue that is bigger than Harvey Weinstein: the insatiable appetite for Catholic bashing that marks Tinseltown.

Late-night talk show hosts never stop ripping priests, making generalizations about them that they would never say about any of the many protected demographic groups. So why do they hate us so much?

There are many reasons why, but none is more important than sex. It is Hollywood that is obsessed with sex, not the Catholic Church (I can't remember the last time I heard a homily about sex). Hollywood is the land of free love, sexual

exploitation, pederasty, and womanizing. It preaches a sexual ethic that knows no boundaries.

Then there is the Catholic Church. It respects boundaries and is opposed to the kind of sexual recklessness that Hollywood basks in. That's why it is hated. Yes, there have been priests who have acted badly, but every one of them violated the teachings of the Church. By contrast, Hollywood celebrities and executives who prey on others are acting in compliance with their "ethic" of libertinism.

The revelations about Harvey Weinstein are one thing. What about all the other big shots in Hollywood? What about all the journalists, lawyers, and politicians in the pockets of these men? Most of all, what about all the children who have been raped, groped, and exploited by these power brokers? While some of their stories have leaked out, there is so much more we don't know.

It takes no courage to condemn Hollywood titans who abuse women and children. But it takes plenty of guts to condemn the kinds of morally debased fare that Hollywood delivers. Let's face it, Hollywood is the most important cultural player in the nation (at least in the secular segment of society), and what it has done to our culture can no longer be tolerated.

To some extent, we are all a product of our environment. Now ask yourself: What kind of environment has Hollywood crafted since the days when "Sound of Music" was released?

"What goes around, comes around." That may be trite, but it is often true. Just ask Harvey Weinstein.

HOUSE PASSES BILL TO SHIELD UNBORN FROM PAIN

The House recently passed the “Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.” The bill would make it illegal for anyone to perform, or attempt to perform, an abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy; it allows exceptions for rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother. The bill now goes to the Senate. A similar measure won House approval in 2015 but failed in the Senate. President Trump has pledged to sign it if it reaches his desk.

Cardinal Timothy Dolan, chairman of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Committee on Pro-Life Activities, sent a letter to House members saying, “All decent and humane people are repulsed by the callous and barbarous treatment of women and children in clinics...that abort children after 20 weeks.” He labeled the 20-week ban a “common-sense reform.”

The Catholic League commends Cardinal Dolan for his leadership on this matter; we strongly support the legislation. The question is why any rational person would oppose it. Curiously, those who do oppose it offer almost nothing in support of their position.

The Feminist Majority Foundation put out a statement against the bill, but never once took up the central question of fetal pain. The best the National Organization for Women could do was to quote one doctor who said fetal pain was “not likely.” Which means he is conceding that unborn babies at 20 weeks may feel pain.

When in doubt, why would any rational person not play it safe and support the bill *in the event the baby can feel pain?*

NARAL Pro-Choice America and Planned Parenthood also fail to come to grips with the issue of fetal pain. In both cases,

they fall back on the argument that abortions after the first trimester are “relatively small.” That resolves nothing. Indeed, it dodges the issue: What about the likelihood that an unborn baby can *feel* the sting of a projectile, one that is designed, of course, to kill him or her.

Cardinal Dolan’s appeal to common sense finds support in the medical practices that accompany fetal surgery: the unborn child is administered anesthesia. Every honest person knows why. That alone should convince those who are on the fence to cast their vote in favor of this bill.

FEMINISTS JEOPARDIZE WOMEN’S HEALTH

Why are feminists working overtime to keep information from women about their bodies? And why are they trying desperately to prevent them from receiving first-class medical care? To be blunt, they are jeopardizing women’s health.

Feminists at Planned Parenthood oppose laws that require women seeking an abortion to see pictures of the baby they are planning to abort. This is the one exception to the “education empowers women” mantra.

Planned Parenthood, along with the ACLU, is now suing Maine seeking to undo a law—which three-fourths of the states have—requiring all abortions to be performed by a physician. This is the one exception to a woman’s right to “competent service by well-trained physicians” mantra.

Planned Parenthood and the ACLU are so zealous about abortion rights that they would sacrifice the lives of pregnant

women—to say nothing about their babies—in exchange for *increasing* the number of abortions. To be exact, they want nurse practitioners and nurse midwives to perform first trimester abortions, thus increasing the pool of abortionists.

According to the ACLU statement on its joint lawsuit, the current law means that “some rural women are being forced to travel hundreds of miles to get an abortion.” That problem would be eliminated if nurses could do the job.

Forgetting about the psychological consequences that many women endure following an abortion, what about the health risks that often accompany abortion?

In a 2013 article published by Denise M. Burke, Vice President of Legal Affairs for Americans United for Life, she recounted how first-trimester abortions can lead to serious medical problems.

“Potential complications for first-trimester abortions include, among others, bleeding, hemorrhage, infection, uterine perforation, blood clots, cervical tears, incomplete abortion (retained tissue), failure to actually terminate the pregnancy, free fluid in the abdomen, acute abdomen, missed ectopic pregnancies, cardiac arrest, sepsis, respiratory arrest, reactions to anesthesia, fertility problems, emotional problems, and even death.”

So what exactly is Nurse Suzie to do when her patient is hemorrhaging on the table? Call 911?

Consider a case cited by Burke that occurred in Arizona. A woman bled to death following a two-inch laceration in her uterus. She was crying for help but the medical assistants didn't know what to do. She died after bleeding for two to three hours. Was there a doctor there? Yes, but he was eating lunch, refused to check on her condition, and left to see his tailor.

Blaming the delinquent doctor misses the point: The point is that the non-physicians were not trained to help the woman. So she died. Now imagine how much more likely this would be if we allow mid-wives to perform abortions when there is no doctor within “hundreds of miles” to treat her?

The lack of hospitals in many rural areas is indeed a problem, but the cause of women’s rights is not advanced by allowing non-doctors to play doctor. It is made worse. That those promoting this policy claim to have the best interests of women in mind makes it all the more sickening.

BARRETT SUBJECTED TO MORE CATHOLIC BAITING

On October 5, the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate voted 11-9 to approve the nomination of Notre Dame law professor Amy Coney Barrett for a seat on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. The committee sent her nomination on to the full Senate for a final vote.

The whole process was tainted by yet another round of Catholic-baiting directed against the nominee. After first being questioned about her religious convictions—coming close to invoking a religious test—by Senator Dick Durbin and Senator Dianne Feinstein (Bill Donohue wrote to both of them registering his outrage), Barrett’s religious affiliations then came under attack.

The *New York Times* had an interesting story on Barrett’s membership in a Catholic group called People of Praise. The paper called it “a small, tightly knit Christian group,” one whose members enter into a covenant with each other.

What seems to bother the *Times*, as well as others opposed to President Trump, are two issues: the extent to which membership in this group might compromise Barrett's independence, and whether her association with a group that accepts a traditional role for married women is acceptable for a federal judge.

"These groups can become so absorbing that it's difficult for a person to retain individual judgment," said Sarah Barringer Gordon, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania.

"These groups?" If Gordon has proof that People of Praise is a cult—that is the clear implication of her remark—she should share it. But she has none. Which leaves us to conclude that she is engaged in the same Catholic-baiting tactics used by Durbin and Feinstein.

People of Praise was founded in 1971 in South Bend, Indiana. Today it has branches throughout North America and the Caribbean. It sees itself as "part of a global movement that has brought powerful new experiences of the Holy Spirit to more than 500 million people since the beginning of the 20th century." It aligns itself with "the Pentecostal movement or the charismatic renewal."

Among other things, it operates interracial schools and camps, and provides for many family outings; members often travel together. Is it a Catholic fringe group? No, for if it were, Pope Francis would not have welcomed it in June: he celebrated with them, and others, the 50th anniversary of the Catholic charismatic renewal; the event drew over 30,000 people from 128 countries.

People of Praise publishes a magazine, V&B (Vine and Branches), that offers concrete proof that it is anything but a cult. The cover story of the Winter 2014 edition was called, "Looking at Marriage." It featured the experiences of five community couples. They were illustrative of the theme,

“Marriage & Community: Two Covenants, One Life Together.”

The first couple, Clem and Julie, do not sound like biblical robots who live an ascetic existence. The interview begins with Julie putting Clem in his place for going out for beers after work on Friday nights, leaving her to tend to their babies. “I’d like to go out for beer on Friday nights, and here I am with these two kids all day, and you go out for a beer?” This isn’t exactly the voice of submission.

Then there is Tom, married to Nancy, who says, “I’m aware of people who left the community because they felt the People of Praise was too much encroaching on their family time...” Cults don’t allow their members to bolt, and if some do manage to leave, there is no lament—just condemnation.

Perhaps the most disturbing aspect of this latest attempt to smear Barrett is the hypocrisy: while there are some people of faith who are guilty of Groupthink, it is not a phenomenon unique to them. “Open-minded” liberals, it could easily be argued, are the most likely to lack independence of thought. Enter Hillary and Michelle.

Why do liberals resent it when women do not engage in Groupthink? Hillary Clinton is fuming over women who did not vote for her: women have an obligation to vote for the woman candidate, she says, regardless of their convictions. She explicitly excoriated women who exercised their independence of mind by not voting for her.

Michelle Obama also resents women who think for themselves. She slammed women who voted for Trump, saying that they “voted against their own voices.” Tell that to the majority of white women who voted against Hillary, Michelle: it’s important to inform them that you know what their interests are better than they do.

GOV. BROWN VETO WELCOMED

California Governor Jerry Brown recently vetoed AB 569, a bill that the Catholic League opposed as “a blatant assault on religious freedom.”

In August, Bill Donohue wrote to every member of the California State Senate. “Under the guise of ‘anti-discrimination,’” he explained, this bill would have barred religious organizations from establishing faith-based codes of conduct for their employees. “So, for example, a Catholic school could not require that its teachers adhere to public and workplace rules of conduct that would model the principles of the Catholic faith to Catholic schoolchildren.”

The bill, which was backed by NARAL Pro-Choice California, specifically targeted codes of conduct involving employees’ “reproductive health care decisions.” It was, Donohue pointed out, “a thinly disguised attempt to impose radical pro-abortion policies on religious organizations.”

Gov. Brown’s veto is a welcome victory for religious liberty.

HARVEY WEINSTEIN—WOMEN’S RIGHTS CHAMPION

Harvey Weinstein and Bill Donohue have been doing battle for decades—he is the supreme Catholic basher in Hollywood. Now we know that he is a serial abuser of women. He never paid a

price for his anti-Catholic bigotry, but this is different: liberals are supposed to object to womanizers.

What makes this case so interesting is that Weinstein is known as a great champion of women's rights. Just recently, he marched in a women's rights parade in Utah; it was during the Sundance Film Festival. He also helped endow a chair at Rutgers in Gloria Steinem's name. Now he is pledging, as part of his Mea Culpa Campaign, to raise \$5 million to support scholarships for women directors at the University of Southern California.

If Rutgers and USC have any integrity, they will follow the lead of Spelman College: the black college terminated a professorship endowed by Bill Cosby, another great champion of women's rights.

Several Democrats in Washington are donating money given to them by Weinstein to charity. Good for them. Which raises the question: Has Harvey contributed to the Clinton Foundation? We know he is best friends with Hillary, and, of course, Bill, a real champion of women's rights.

On the Republican side of the aisle, we learned that Rep. Tim Murphy, a pro-life lawmaker, is planning to resign. This follows revelations of his adulterous affair which included a bid by him to have his lover have an abortion.

Imagine Murphy trying to cover his behind by pledging to give money to crisis pregnancy centers! It's unfathomable. But when women-abusing champions of women's rights give big bucks to universities on behalf of women's rights, the liberal community doesn't blink. It's all so typical.

Good luck, Harvey, you will need it. And by the way, are you still going to bring out your latest Catholic-bashing flick, "Mary Magdalene"? In February you took some cheap shots at Donohue when the movie was under production.

In the event you decide to grease the Catholic League, please know that we would shamelessly take your money. And then we would buy boxes of chastity belts, sending you a ton of them.

DRAIN HOLLYWOOD'S CESSPOOL

Revelations about Harvey Weinstein's predatory behavior should inspire others in Hollywood to come forward. We have known for decades that Hollywood is infested with sexually abusing men in senior positions, but there has been a reluctance to come forward. Weinstein has provided an opening that must be seized.

Hollywood has had a jolly good time ridiculing the Catholic Church for its sexual abuse scandal. Now the tables have turned. The task of draining Hollywood's cesspool should begin by addressing the sexual abuse of minors. Those who work in the entertainment industry have a moral responsibility to go public with their stories.

The situation in Hollywood is so bad that an organization has been established to tackle this issue. BizParentz Foundation is a non-profit entity dedicated to working with parents and children engaged in the entertainment industry. It has conducted workshops such as "Predators and Pedophiles" that expose the nature of the problem.

Anne Henry is a co-founder of BizParentz Foundation. She said a year ago that "Hollywood is currently shielding about 100 active abusers." She estimates that about 75 percent of child actors "went off the rails" later in life. "The problem has been endemic in Hollywood for a long time and it's finally coming to light."

Alison Arngrim, who played Nellie Oleson on *Little House On the Prairie*, said she “literally heard that they [children] were ‘passed around.’ The word was that they were given drugs and being used for sex. It was awful—these were kids, they weren’t 18 yet.”

Lord of the Rings star Elijah Wood said of Hollywood that there are “a lot of vipers in this industry. There is darkness in the underbelly.” He added that it is “all organized.” Which means that many must know what has been going on.

Corey Haim suffered more than most Hollywood victims. He was raped on a movie set when he was just 11; he died of drug addiction at the age of 38.

Corey Feldman said that when he was 14 he was “surrounded” by child molesters who acted like “vultures.” He does not mince words. “I can tell you that the No. 1 problem in Hollywood was, and is, and always will be, pedophilia.”

Feldman says Hollywood is famous for throwing parties for kids. But they are not your typical children’s party: they are “grooming” events, opportunities to lure kids into the world of sexual conquest. “The range [of ages] was usually 10 to 16.”

Feldman says he would “love to name names,” but is afraid of being sued. That is understandable, but there is too much at stake to keep silent any more. He needs to buck up. Feldman can begin by naming the “Hollywood mogul” whom he says is responsible for the death of his friend, Corey Haim.

Who is this monster responsible for Haim’s death? If Feldman knows who he is, others surely know as well. They need to come forward without delay.

The time has come to drain Hollywood’s cesspool.