

# Were We Fair, or Unfair, to Jane Pauley? You Decide

*Dear Dr. Donohue,*

*I think the thing that makes me saddest about the complaint registered in Ray Kerrison's column is your perverse desire to turn a friend into an enemy. I may be a member of a sometimes snide and cynical industry, but I think I have a reputation that should have earned for me, at the least, the benefit of a doubt.*

*I hope you will also read my letter on your radio appearances and print it along with your denunciation. I ask that your listeners and readers contemplate an alternate explanation, that my words were written in a spirit of admiration for a man whose religious faith was exemplary, a beacon in a world where cynicism too often prevails. Let us all pray for a more generous spirit and an understanding soul.*

*I am not a member of the Catholic Church, but I know in my heart that I remain a friend in good standing.*

Sincerely,

In the July/August *Catalyst* we ran a critical piece about a comment that Jane Pauley made when interviewing Scott O'Grady, the U.S. pilot who was rescued in Bosnia last spring. In the course of the interview, Ms. Pauley said the following about Mr. O'Grady: "God has long been Captain O'Grady's co-pilot. A devout Roman Catholic, O'Grady made his confirmation at age thirteen, and unlike many of his peers never left the Church." [Emphasis added.] Catholic League president William Donohue chided Pauley for the remark, calling it "snide" and "gratuitous."

Ms. Pauley and several of her supporters complained that Donohue was unfair to her, arguing that he gave the wrong interpretation to her comment. Printed below is the letter that Ms. Pauley wrote, along with Dr. Donohue's response. We'll let you be the judge as to who has the better of the argument.

*Dear Ms. Pauley:*

*Thank you for your letter of June 27. I am taking the liberty of responding to many of the parties that have contacted this office regarding the Catholic League's criticism of a remark you made while interviewing Scott O'Grady.*

*Your reply, the letter from Father Smith of Providence College, and the communication between Bob Wright and Father Eichner, have convinced me that no ill will was intended toward Catholics when you made the comment in question. For that reason, I am prepared to drop this matter altogether. But in fairness to you-and to the Catholic League-I will print your letter, and this one, in the September edition of Catalyst, the journal of the Catholic League (the July/August edition will carry the original story; I will send both copies to you). Having said that, I would like to defend the criticism that was made.*

*You state that your "words were written in a spirit of admiration for a man whose religious faith was exemplary..." But the problem I have with your remark has nothing to do with your admiration for Mr. O'Grady, rather it has to do with your comment that "unlike many of his peers [he] never left the Church." I do not see how this demonstrates admiration for anyone, including Mr. O'Grady. Indeed it strikes me as an unnecessary statement, one that appears to say something less than flattering about the allegiances of young Catholic men and women to their religion. As I said in the news release, if it were said about blacks or gays-that unlike many of his peers he's never been arrested or never contracted AIDS-the*

*remark would be seen as baiting.*

*I am enclosing a copy of the May Catalyst. Please read the cover story on the AP as I believe it bears resemblance to the matter with you and Mr. O'Grady.*

*Again, I want to thank you, and your supporters, for convincing me that no ill will was intended. I will let our readers judge whether the effect of your remark was to bait or to enlighten.*

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue  
President

---

## **San Diego Union-Tribune Cartoon Draws League Response**

*To the Editor:*

*It is truly regrettable that S. Kelly, your cartoonist and the Union-Tribune continue to engage in Catholic-bashing (Editorial Page cartoon, July 12, 1995).*

*While the Holy Father makes a sincere effort to reach out to disaffected women within the Church with a pastoral letter which extends good will and conciliation the Union-Tribune responds in a mean-spirited manner ridiculing the Catholic Church.*

*The Catholic Church's refusal to extend ordination to women is based on careful consideration of Scripture and Tradition in its determination that "official priesthood for women is*

*contradictory to binding Church doctrine and to the nature of women.” (Hauke, M., WOMEN IN THE PRIESTHOOD: A SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS IN THE LIGHT OF THE ORDER OF CREATION AND REDEMPTION [Ignatius Press, San Francisco? 1986], p. 481.)*

*Criticism of this analysis may well be fair comment, but it would be a great deal more useful if the Union-Tribune attempted to do so in a competent, scholastic manner. As a general circulation newspaper, it is appallingly hypocritical for the Union-Tribune to call for tolerance for diversity in so many other areas when it displays such a strident intolerance for the Catholic Church’s determination of who is eligible to receive its sacraments.*

*Sincerely,  
Carl H. Horst,  
[San Diego] Chapter President*

---

## **High Court Backs Gay Ban in St. Patrick’s Day Parade**

Ending a bitter three-year controversy the United States Supreme Court ruled on June 19, that the South Boston Allied War Veterans Council, organizers of Boston’s St. Patrick’s Day Parade, can bar homosexual groups from marching in the parade. Justice David Souter, writing for a unanimous Court in *Hurley v. Irish-American Gays*, framed the issue as “whether Massachusetts may require private citizens who organize a parade to include among the marchers a group imparting a message the organizers do not wish to convey.” “We hold,” said Justice Souter, “that such a mandate violates the First Amendment.”

The newly formed Irish-American Gay Lesbian and Bisexual Group of Boston (GLIB) sought an application in 1992 to march in South Boston's St. Patrick's Day Parade. Although the group's application was turned down by the veterans council that year, the gays marched in the parade by virtue of a court order. The parade's organizers then cancelled the parade rather than admit the gay group while pursuing justice in the courts.

In his opinion Souter repudiated an earlier decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court which had ruled in favor of the gay group on the basis of the state's anti discrimination laws. The Court pointed out that forcing the parade sponsors to allow GLIB to march in the parade was a violation of the veterans' free speech rights.

The justices in *Hurley* made clear that the parade sponsors were not seeking to bar homosexuals from marching in the parade as individuals or with an approved group, but only as a group attempting to convey a message that was offensive to the veterans. The parade sponsors have the authority, wrote Souter, to "exclude groups whose views clash with the message the council wants to convey in the parade."

Commenting on the decision, the Catholic League issued the following statement:

"This Supreme Court decision is a victory not only for Irish Catholics, it is a victory for all those who believe in free speech and freedom of association. Every racial ethnic and religious group that wants to maintain the integrity of its heritage has a right to insulate its parades from those who would insult and degrade its culture. This decision will also do much to provide for public order by limiting the rights of those who would use their rights to abuse the rights of others."

---

# Religious Freedom Advances in Rosenberger Case

The United States Supreme Court has ruled that the University of Virginia must allow student activities fees to be used to help defray publication costs of a religiously oriented student magazine. Rejecting the university's argument that funding a Christian publication would violate the First Amendment's Establishment Clause, five justices concluded the university's refusal to fund the magazine was a denial of free speech and "would risk fostering a pervasive bias or hostility to religion, which would undermine the very neutrality the establishment clause requires."

The Court's opinion in *Rosenberger v. Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia* was written by Justice Anthony Kennedy, and was joined by Chief Justice Rehnquist and justices Scalia, Thomas and O'Connor.

It upheld the claim of Ronald Rosenberger, a student at the university and editor of "Wide Awake: A Christian Perspective at the University of Virginia," who sought a share of the school's Student Activities Fund to assist in publication costs for his magazine. The money in the fund is derived from mandatory fees paid by students and provides financial support to a wide range of extracurricular student clubs and activities.

The university refused Mr. Rosenberger's request to fund the Christian magazine because of a regulation that prohibits support for "religious activities." After exhausting the available appeal procedures within the university without success, Rosenberger and other editors of the magazine filed

suit in federal district court. They alleged the university's refusal to provide funding on the basis of the magazine's editorial viewpoint violated their rights to freedom of speech and press and to the free exercise of religion.

Although a federal district court and the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit ruled in favor of the university, a majority of the Supreme Court agreed with Rosenberger's free speech argument, noting that "[v]ital First Amendment speech principles are at stake here. The first danger to liberty lies in granting the State the power to examine publications to determine whether or not they are based on some ultimate idea and if so for the State to classify them. The second, and corollary, danger is to speech from the chilling of individual thought and expression."

The Catholic League filed a friend of the court brief in support of Mr. Rosenberger. Authoring the League's brief was Professor Edward Gaffney, Dean of Valparaiso University Law School. The brief argued that the publication of religious viewpoints deserves the highest level of First Amendment protection and was in fact a central concern motivating both the First and Fourteenth Amendments. Furthermore, the brief argued that the lower court's attempt to artificially isolate religious speech from campus debate will impoverish discourse at public universities.

---

## Coming and Going

The Catholic League is in transition. Having recently acquired Bernadette Brady as Vice President, the League has now hired Susan Fani and Adrienne Chevrestt as Executive Assistants. Susan, a recent graduate of Holy Cross, will replace Karen

Lynn Krugh. Karen is leaving to pursue a Master's degree in Theology at the Franciscan University of Steubenville. Adrienne, who was active in the New York school board battles a few years ago, is replacing Cynthia Jessup; Cynthia is pursuing new educational and occupational opportunities in Brooklyn. We will miss Karen and Cynthia but feel quite fortunate to have Susan and Adrienne on board.

---

## **Short Vote Short Circuits Educational Choice**

*by Arthur J. Delaney President, Greater Philadelphia/ South Jersey Chapter*

With Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge pushing hard to pass his educational choice bill, the centerpiece of his educational reform plan, and with 95 affirmative votes out of the needed 102 already on the vote tally board, House Speaker Matthew Ryan ordered the June 16 vote stricken citing electronic malfunctioning of the voting machine. The outcome was obvious: the school choice proponents were between 5 and 7 votes short.

Governor Ridge admitted the loss, telling reporters, "We lost fair and square." But, he added, "Let me make one thing perfectly clear, I am not done asking. This is not the end, it's merely the end of the beginning."

The Philadelphia Chapter of the Catholic League, advancing essentially the same position that the founder of the Catholic League, Fr. Virgil C. Blum, S.J., enunciated more than twenty years ago, was in the thick of the fight. Local League officers and advisors responded to numerous letters, editorials, and op-ed pieces in addition to producing many of



their own. From the outset, two officers served on the Archdiocesan School Choice Committee.

So why the short vote, and what happens now?

In the first place, the school choice proponents have a large job to do in *motivating* and *energizing* their *own* constituents. Too many of those whose rights would be most redressed by choice legislation are too laid back and apparently fail to realize the gravity of the matter.

Most of the arguments offered by the anti-choice coalition are contrived emotional appeals created to make the public feel threatened and therefore panicked into negative voting.

The real enemy in this matter is the monopoly in educational funding which our political policies have allowed to develop over the years. Eventually such policies will wreck both the present established public school system and the great private school system, endangering the common good of the nation.

Things are beginning to change, however. The educational monopoly that has been thwarting Educational Choice is beginning to crumble. George Voinovich in Ohio has already signed a bill creating a pilot voucher program in Cleveland and Tommy Thompson signed into law a dramatic *expansion* for the Milwaukee voucher program. We in Pennsylvania shall revisit and continue to present this legislation until justice is done and our rights are not only recognized but honored! As Cardinal Bevilacqua put it, "We are certainly closer than ever before."

Second, school choice proponents in Pennsylvania face an enormously powerful coalition of anti-choice special interest groups. Such groups as the AFL/CIO, ACLU, PAC's, AFT, PaFT, PFT, NEA, PSEA, NAACP, Pa. Jewish Coalition, Pa. Black Caucus, Pa. Council of Churches, Public School Administrators, League of Women Voters, coupled with a large number of those representing good, old-fashioned bias, are among the

opponents.

---

## **Note on “GOSPA”**

We received several letters criticizing the Catholic League’s promotion of the movie “GOSPA.” Readers maintained that the Holy See has never confirmed the veracity of the alleged apparitions at Medjugorje. The readers are right. Our point was simply that, in the wake of the movie “Priest,” this is one movie which treats Catholicism in a most respectful way. But we understand why some might think we were trying to undercut official Church ruling on the subject. We apologize for not clarifying the nature of our intent.