

NO. DAKOTA DR. REINSTATED; HHS INQUIRY MOOT

After a doctor blew the whistle on rampant child sexual abuse at the Spirit Lake Indian Reservation in North Dakota, he was punished by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for doing so. We immediately intervened by calling for an investigation. The next day the physician was reinstated.

The whistle-blower, Dr. Michael R. Tilus, director of behavioral health at the Health Care Center on the reservation, tried in vain for five years to get HHS to do something about this issue. After he blew the whistle, he was reprimanded, reassigned, barred from promotion, and threatened with the loss of his professional license.

We contacted three senatorial offices about this matter, noting that there was no outcry from those who have been quick to condemn the Catholic Church. Justice was swiftly delivered. Here is a list of the conditions:

- a 2-month-old baby girl died in July 2012 after tribal officials received warnings of child abuse
- last year a 9-year-old girl and her 6-year-old brother were found dead, raped and sodomized inside their father's home
- foster children have been sent to homes where registered sex offenders live
- the tribe hired a convicted felon as a child case worker
- a teenage girl who was sexually abused was placed in a tribal home where she was then raped
- a one-year-old child covered with 100 wood ticks was discovered by a social worker yet was not taken to a

hospital

- foster children have been illegally removed from homes and then assigned to new ones without conducting a safety check
- mandated background checks are not made by the tribe before placing foster children in new homes
- monthly visits by the tribe to check on children in foster care are not being made
- American Indians are 9 percent of North Dakota's population but Indian children constitute nearly 30 percent of the state's child abuse victims

After the doctor was reinstated, Bill Donohue sought to uncover what disciplinary measures, if any, were taken against the HHS official who called for his punishment. He wrote a letter to Dr. Yvette Roubideaux, director of the Indian Health Service, copying Senator John Barrasso; he is the vice chairman of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

Donohue said he wants to know whether Dr. Candelaria Martin, the official who initially sought to punish Dr. Tilus, has been reprimanded. We are awaiting a response.

MICHELLE'S GIFT

Over the summer, Michelle Obama told members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in Nashville, Tennessee something quite revealing: "And to anyone who says that church is no place to talk about these [political] issues, you tell them there is no better place—no better place. Because ultimately, these are not just political issues—they are moral issues."

Perhaps unwittingly, the First Lady presented us with a gift: she opened the IRS door by beckoning the clergy to talk as freely as they want about politics from the pulpit. The next time the IRS goes after a member of the clergy for mixing politics and religion, they should direct the agent to Michelle's remarks and then say they were only following her advice.

In all honesty, the First Lady was only following in the footsteps of her husband when she called for the politicization of religion. President Obama has explicitly called for "congregation captains" to organize for his reelection. We all know what that means.

Since the Obamas have taken the gloves off—in effect calling for Americans not to be restrained by separation of church and state legalisms—others should follow suit. We hope that the bishops, priests, evangelical ministers, and the orthodox members of all religions are taking note.

We don't have two constitutions: if the Obamas are giving the green light to those in their faith community to merge politics and religion, there are no more red lights left for anyone to obey.

THE GAY EXPRESS

FROM THE PRESIDENT'S DESK

William Donohue

Many years ago, Harvard sociologist Daniel Patrick Moynihan said he was stunned by the swiftness of cultural change that took place in the 1960s. In particular, he cited the overnight conversion to co-ed dorms on college campuses. Lots of changes

took place during this period, but fast as they were, their pace looks comparatively slow when measured against the lightening speed by which the homosexual agenda has proceeded in recent years. Indeed, it seems as though our culture is being driven by the Gay Express.

Estimated at only a few percent of the population, homosexuals project a larger presence partly because so many of them are strategically situated in the cultural command centers of the media, Hollywood, the professoriate, and the publishing world. The clergy do not lack for disproportionate numbers either, and I don't mean merely in Catholic circles: the Episcopalian clergy, especially on the coasts, is heavily gay. But there aren't enough homosexuals in society to score such dramatic gains all by themselves, which is why sympathetic heterosexuals are the real key.

The American people are not the problem, the elites are. In 32 states where voters have been asked to decide whether to expand the definition of marriage to cover homosexuals, none has agreed to do so. Even in California, one of the most liberal states in the nation, the people said no. In the few states where gay marriage is legal, the people were never consulted: either the state legislature, or a judge, granted two men the right to marry. And in places like New York State, lawmakers never even had a public hearing on the issue.

This fall things may change. The issue of gay marriage is on the ballot in four states, all of which have a reputation of being either liberal or decidedly independent: Maine, Maryland, Minnesota and Washington. Helping the pro-gay marriage forces are super-wealthy contributors to President Barack Obama and former Governor Mitt Romney. In fact, they are lavishing millions in the push for gay marriage in these states.

In the case of Obama, many of his most generous donors are big contributors to gay causes. The Human Rights Campaign, the

most powerful gay advocacy group in the nation, is wedded to the Obama campaign. By the middle of August, they had already amassed over \$5 million to spend on the November elections. And, of course, the Democratic Party platform broke new ground this year by endorsing gay marriage. Why not? The president has.

Leading the charge for gay marriage in the Romney camp are Paul Singer, Cliff Asness, Dan Loeb and Ken Mehlman. Singer is the founder of a \$20 billion hedge fund called Elliott Management Corporation, based in New York; his son is a homosexual. Asness is co-founder of AQR Capital Management in Greenwich, Connecticut. Dan Loeb is the founder of the \$8.7 billion Third Point LLC in New York. Both Asness and Loeb supported Obama in 2008, but are not happy with the way he is handling economic issues, so this time they're supporting Romney. Mehlman was President George W. Bush's campaign manager in 2004, and is the former chairman of the Republican National Committee. He announced he was a homosexual in 2010.

Now you know why neither Obama nor Romney said a word about the Chick-fil-A issue that exploded over the summer. All they had to do was to say that it is wrong for mayors to tell businessmen to take a walk just because they disagree with the politics of the owner. Moreover, Dan Cathy, the owner of Chick-fil-A, never uttered an anti-gay remark, yet gay activists and their elite heterosexual friends came thundering down on his head. Recall what happened.

"We are inviting God's judgment on our nation when we shake our fist at Him and say, 'We know better than you as to what constitutes a marriage.'" This unremarkable statement is what set off a culture war. Immediately, Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, whose city is in a state of warfare, had the audacity to speak for all Chicagoans: "Chick-fil-A values are not Chicago values."

The mayors of Pittsburgh, San Francisco, and the District of

Columbia also chimed in, but none sounded more ludicrous than Boston's Tom Menino. After boasting, "we're a city that's at the forefront of inclusion," he summarily decided to exclude Chick-fil-A. Fortunately, former governor and talk-show host Mike Huckabee called for Christians to step up to the plate, and thousands turned out to patronize local stores.

It is a bad sign when people like Rep. Barney Frank, who claims to be married to his boyfriend, as well as liberals like Alan Dershowitz and the folks at the ACLU, can summon the moral courage to denounce these censorial mayors, and yet neither presidential candidate has it in him to do likewise.

No one but a bully wants to punish homosexuals or to stop them from participating in American life free of intimidation. But that is not the issue: at stake is whether those who believe in marriage, traditionally defined, should be the object of punishment and intimidation. That's how far the Gay Express has come. It's time this train was derailed.

CURRENT THREATS TO RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Jeff Field, director of communications for the Catholic League, recently interviewed Bill Donohue on the subject of religious liberty. Below is a transcript of the interview.

Bill, you've been doing this job at the Catholic League for about two decades. How have things changed in the last couple of decades in terms of the threats to religious liberty?

Well, I would say that if you look at the Catholic League's

annual reports we generally have seen the greatest degree of hostility against Catholicism coming from the media. We've certainly seen it from the artistic community, from activist organizations, from some segments of business and the workplace. Education has clearly been a venue of hostility toward the Catholic Church from kindergarten right through graduate school. But what is most striking to me is that government is now the seat of hostility to Catholicism more than any other sector of our society; this is particularly troubling. After all, government in this country was created to ensure rights, not to erode them.

In the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote that our rights do not come from government. Our rights are unalienable. That is to say, our rights come from "the Creator," from God. We have God-given rights. We don't look to government to give us our rights. We look to government to ensure our rights. Now, regrettably, over the last decade, we have seen many examples at the local, state and federal level where government has become the problem.

This is very troubling because, unlike problems coming from the media, which tend to be more in the way of dissing Catholics, these are real threats to our religious liberty.

Bill, could you give us some examples of the threats to religious liberty coming from the local level?

Well, right here in New York City, we have a mayor, Mayor Michael Bloomberg, who is not exactly religion-friendly. Let me give you a particular example.

When we had the 9/11 commemoration in September of 2011—the ten-year anniversary—the clergy wanted to speak. Obviously, the clergy always speak at some commemorative exercise in this country. They are expected to speak. Mayor Bloomberg censored them. He did something unprecedented. He said that everybody can speak who is a person of notoriety, but we don't want the

clergy. So, he literally banned the priests, the ministers and the rabbis, the imams and others from speaking.

This is censorship. Only the government can censor. Private institutions such as newspapers, for example, they don't have to publish people's letters or op-eds. It may show a bias but you can't call it censorship in the strict sense of that word. Here we have the government—the chief executive of New York City, Mayor Michael Bloomberg—making a decision on his own, without consulting the public, saying, “Listen, I don't want the clergy to speak.” That's a hostility I don't think that we can put up with, that kind of censorship.

The same mayor has denied non-white Protestants who belong to the Bronx Household of Faith use of school property and buildings on Sunday mornings—when nobody else is using them—for their religious services. They've been doing this for a very long time, up until Mayor Bloomberg decided that, while you can have LGBT meetings and anything else in the public buildings on a Sunday morning, you cannot have a religious service. This was a mean-spirited attempt to erode the religious liberty of these Protestants.

On the west coast, in San Francisco back in 2006, the Board of Supervisors, who essentially run the city, went after the Vatican. They accused it of meddling in the internal affairs of San Francisco, and engaging in hateful speech. Now, what in the world did the Vatican do to meddle in the internal affairs of San Francisco? I'll tell you what they did: the Catholic Church simply has a position—which is held by many, many other religions—that they are not in favor of gay adoption. Now, people can agree or disagree with this decision, but what they can't do is to assert that somehow you're meddling in somebody's internal affairs. One could just as easily argue that the City of San Francisco is meddling in the internal affairs of the Vatican because they believe in gay adoption. Of course, that would be absurd, and so was what they said absurd.

More recently in California, there was an attempt to ban the crèche in Santa Monica, this time coming from the Freedom From Religion Foundation based out of Madison, Wisconsin. It's an atheist group. It's not just indifferent to religion, they hate religion. But they don't hate all religions equally. They have a particular animus against the Catholic Church. After they tried to get the crèche banned from public property, the local government said it would develop a lottery, allowing Christians, Jews and atheists an equal chance of obtaining the right to display their symbols.

Well, last year Christians got the short end of the stick, and after they complained, the spineless leaders in Santa Monica decided that in 2012, there will be no displays at all. Who was delighted? The Freedom From Religion Foundation. This proves that their real agenda was to deny us the nativity scene. Instead of the government defending religious liberty, it took the cowardly way out by censoring everyone equally.

Bill, are there any examples at the state level that you'd like to discuss where you see a threat to religious liberty these days?

Actually, let's pick up on this whole question of gay adoption. Two states, Massachusetts and Illinois, as well as cities like San Francisco and D.C., have essentially stopped the Catholic Church from practicing its adoptive services. The Catholic Church, like a lot of other religions, does not believe in gay adoption. It believes children belong with a mother and a father, ideally. And what's happened is that, in Massachusetts and Illinois, they've said there will be no state funding for the adoptive and foster care services of the Catholic Church, unless you change your teachings and accept the wisdom of the secular state that homosexuals should be adoptive parents. Because the Catholic Church obviously is not going to prostitute its principles, we're therefore punished. This is another example of the hostility I am talking about.

Outside this realm dealing with sexuality is another element. In Connecticut a few years ago, two gay lawmakers decided that they actually wanted to have a takeover of the Catholic Church in Connecticut. This sounds mind-boggling, but it's actually true. These gay lawmakers went into the legislature with a bill to take over the administrative apparatus of the Catholic Church. Oh, yes, they said that the priest could still say Mass and the like. But, they felt that, no, they, the state lawmakers, were in a better position to make decisions about the administrative affairs of the Catholic Church than the priests and the bishops. Just imagine, for one moment, if the bishops in Connecticut and the priests said, "We want a takeover of the state government in Connecticut in Hartford." Wouldn't people be screaming, "Whatever happened to separation of church and state?" Well that's exactly what we had here, except that the state was going to take over the Church.

Now, thank God for Bishop Lori of Bridgeport, now the Archbishop of Baltimore. He led people into the streets. The Catholic League was very vocal in supporting him at this point because we had to pare back their draconian legislation. But it gives you an example of what we're up against.

We have also had problems in Alabama, Jeff. Here I'm talking about the fact that some Republicans—in their quest to secure the borders, which is a legitimate thing to do—have actually gone so far as to say that priests shouldn't tend to the ministerial needs, the pastoral needs, of undocumented aliens. Well, quite frankly, it's up to the government to decide how best to deal with the immigration problem. But, you can't tell the clergy, you can't tell priests, for example, that you're not allowed to service people who may be in this country and are in need. We're not going to turn people away. We do believe in the Good Samaritan approach.

It is important for Republicans to understand the Catholic Church is neither Republican nor Democrat. We will fight the Republicans as much as we fight the Democrats on the issue of

immigration and these other issues. You can take care of the problem of immigration on your own terms without interfering with the rights of Catholics. Religious liberty matters to Catholics whether we are dealing with gay adoption or the question of immigration.

Bill, are there any examples at the federal level that you could speak to in terms of the current threats to religious liberty?

There are a lot of them, Jeff. Let's begin with what happened in 1996. President Clinton signed a law, a federal law, the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), which said that states which don't recognize same-sex marriage don't have to; they can recognize traditional marriage as being between a man and a woman. Only 14 senators refused to sign on with this. It was basically uncontroversial.

Now we have a situation today where President Obama, who was sworn to uphold congressional legislation, has ordered his Justice Department not to enforce congressional legislation on this issue, on DOMA.

Here is what we have now, to show you how perverse it is. In New York State, a lesbian couple who work at St. Joseph's Medical Center in Westchester are now suing because they want the Medical Center to recognize their quote "wedding," their marriage. It is true that in New York State gay people can marry. I should point out that, unlike the other 32 states which have discussed this issue and allowed the people to vote on it (and in every single case people vote against gay marriage, even in California), they did not allow people to vote on this issue in New York State. Even worse, they had no public hearings. So here we have people intentionally working at a Catholic institution trying to force Catholic institutions now to prostitute their teachings so that they can exercise their so-called rights.

Bill, there's been a lot of talk about the HHS mandate, the Health and Human Services mandate, the "Fortnight for Freedom" that the bishops have been promoting in June and July. This idea that we are threatened by the federal government. Speak to us: what's at stake here?

Well, after the Supreme Court agreed to hear the case dealing with the individual mandate—which we now know is constitutional—HHS, the Department of Health and Human Services, issued a mandate saying that Catholic nonprofits have to pay for abortion-inducing drugs, contraception and sterilization.

This led to an outcry. They issued this on Friday, January 20. Cardinal Dolan felt betrayed by the president who told him that he wouldn't have to worry about these kinds of things when they met in November of 2011. Well, with the outcry, three weeks later on Friday, February 10, there was an accommodation. The accommodation, according to the Obama administration, was that Catholic individuals won't have to pay for services deemed immoral by the Catholic Church, but they'll have to pay for their insurance plans.

Of course, this is a shell game. Where does the insurance company get the money except from the employees? And then you have the situation of self-insured entities such as the Archdiocese of Washington, D.C. How do you resolve that question? For that matter, what if a Catholic owns an Italian restaurant? Does he have to pay for something he deems immoral, as well? So, in other words, we felt we were right back to where we started from.

Bill, what's driving this? It seems to me that there is a real strong interest in promoting abortion rights in this administration?

Jeff, that's exactly the case. Let's recall that when Barack Obama was in the Illinois State Senate, he promoted a bill

which said this: A baby born alive as a result of a botched abortion is not entitled to healthcare. To be specific, they can let the baby die on the doctor's table. That's entirely okay with Barack Obama. Now that goes to show you what we're talking about. This is selective infanticide. The baby is fully outside the woman's body, and, because the baby survives a botched abortion, therefore it is not entitled to the right to life.

Remember what happened in 2007, when Barack Obama, then a candidate or about to become a candidate, said to Planned Parenthood that when he becomes president United States he's going to sign FOCA, the Freedom of Choice Act. Now, he never did get a chance to sign this legislation because the Catholic community, including the Catholic League, rose up against him. What it would have done, according to the attorneys for the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), it would have forced Catholic hospitals to provide for and pay for abortions. Now, obviously, we'll close down the Catholic hospitals before we'll ever perform abortions, but this goes to show you the appetite, the lust for abortion that is coming from this administration. The bill never succeeded, but we know where they wanted to go.

Then we have the case dealing with the Catholic Relief Services. Catholic Relief Services has for a long time received a grant from the federal government to fight human trafficking of women and children, modern-day slaves. And, the Catholic Church has a very good program to combat human trafficking. So they issued their proposal again last year. This time, it was knocked down. Was it insufficiently prepared? No, as a matter of fact, the proposal actually scored higher than did those proposals which won out in the end. So, why did the Catholic Relief Services lose? Because the Church is against abortion.

Then there's the question of conscience rights. President Obama spoke at the University of Notre Dame at the

commencement address in 2009. The Catholic League said he had every right to speak at a Catholic university. He is, in fact, the President of the United States. We objected to his receiving an award. Why would any Catholic institution want to give an award to a man who has such an unbridled passion for abortion rights? Doesn't make any sense. We don't give awards to anti-Semites and we don't give awards to racists, nor should we.

Well, what happened during that speech is that he said, basically, "Listen I know I'm in somewhat hot water with the Catholic community. I want to let you know I believe in conscience rights. I believe that people should not be forced—as a matter of a religious objection—to do something that they find inherently immoral." That was greeted with some degree of relief, including by the Catholic League. Isn't it interesting, now, Jeff, that a few years later the same president, Father Jenkins, who welcomed President Obama there, has now turned around and is suing? Notre Dame is suing the federal government because of the disrespect and contempt that it shows for the religious liberty rights of Catholics. It's a rather amazing turnaround.

Now, Bill, let's ask a different question here. Besides abortion, there's been a lot of questions about the Obama administration redefining what qualifies as a religious institution. Can you speak to that at all?

Why, yes. Quite frankly, the most pernicious thing the Obama administration has done is to redefine what qualifies as a religious institution for the purpose of an exemption.

The Obama administration says that a Catholic institution is not Catholic unless it hires and serves people mostly of its own faith. Now that is to turn on its head the virtue of Catholic institutions. We are proud of the fact that we do not discriminate in our social service agencies, soup kitchens, hospitals, schools, Catholic universities, and colleges. We

don't discriminate against people because they're Protestant or Jewish, or atheist, agnostic, or Muslim or Mormon. We welcome everybody. And this is what I find so perverse. We're saying now that unless you discriminate—what do they want us to do, put up signs saying, "No Jews Need Apply"? Should they say, "No Protestants are welcome in our hospitals"? That we do not serve Muslims? Is that what they really want? They want to punish us for being Catholic with a small c, meaning universal? No, we can't put up with this.

Bill, where'd they get this idea in the first place?

Amazingly, Jeff—this will come as a surprise, or maybe not a major surprise to some people—it came from the ACLU, the American Civil Liberties Union; it has been hostile to freedom of religion for a very long time, going back to 1920. The ACLU, in 2000, helped draft a law in California on contraception which came up with this bizarre, invidious notion that you're a Catholic institution only if you hire and serve people of your own faith.

Now the ACLU—let me digress here for a moment—I've written a Ph.D. dissertation and two books on the ACLU. I interviewed the founder of the ACLU, Roger Baldwin, in June of 1978 in his home on Hudson Street in lower Manhattan. He founded the organization in January of 1920, and I asked him, "Mr. Baldwin, your organization in its first 10 objectives lists freedom of assembly, freedom of the press, freedom to petition and the like, but you never mentioned that other component of the First Amendment called freedom of religion. Why not?" He was very blunt. He said, "That's because I'm an atheist. We don't value freedom of religion." Indeed, he certainly does not value freedom of religion. I remember asking Mr. Baldwin—who was certainly very nice to me, he was an elderly man at the time—I said to him, "Listen, what's wrong with a voluntary prayer, when people have a moment of silence?" I said, "Whose rights are being infringed upon if somebody prays silently to himself?"

His answer was rather chilling. He said, "Well, they've tried to get around it even more than you, they call it meditation." So I said to the founder of the ACLU, "Mr. Baldwin, what's wrong with meditation? A child sits there at his desk and he meditates. What if he meditates about popcorn? What difference would it make to you, the great guardians of the Constitution?"

Well, that kind of stopped him in his tracks, but it does give you an idea of where they're coming from. Just to show you how absurd the ACLU is on this, they're actually against "In God We Trust" on the coins; they want "under God" taken out of the Pledge of Allegiance. Somebody actually found a huge statue of Jesus off the coast of Key Largo, on the ocean floor, and the ACLU said we have to remove it. I mean, who are they protecting now? You see, what you're dealing with here is a maniacal hatred of religion. Unfortunately, there are some people in the Obama administration who accept this kind of thinking.

Bill, let's pick up on that idea of the thinking. Could you explain the mindset of these people? Whether in or out of the Obama administration, who has this kind of ACLU mindset?

I'll give you a perfect example, Jeff, of what happened in 2011. You had a woman for the Obama administration go before the Supreme Court in oral argument, and she maintained that a Lutheran school should not be allowed to make up its own rules and regulations regarding employment decisions; she said the government should do so. Now for a very long time in this country, we've had what's understood as the ministerial exception. Meaning that, when it comes to ministers, or the clergy in general, that they can be excepted from this idea that the government should police hiring decisions. That's because you have to have freedom of religion, you have to have some insularity between church and state. This woman actually said that there isn't any difference between a religious association and any other association.

Now that startled Justice Antonin Scalia, but what was even more dramatic was that Elena Kagan, a liberal appointee of the Obama administration, said she wanted clarification. She said to the woman: I want to get this right, are you saying that there's no difference between a religious organization, which has rights grounded in the First Amendment and that of a secular, voluntary association? That there's really no difference? And she said, that's right, there is no difference. Well, in one sense this zealot did us a favor because the Supreme Court did rule 9 to 0 against the idea that the government has the right to police the hiring and firing decisions of a religious entity.

I'll give you some other examples of where there is this mindset that is very troubling. Remember a couple of years ago when President Barack Obama was to speak at Georgetown University? His advance team went out there just to check out the place, and they told the officials at Georgetown that they have to put a drape or a cover over IHS, over the crucifix, over all religious symbols. When the president speaks from Georgetown, they said we don't want the public to see on TV religious symbols of any sort out.

Only an administration which is fundamentally hateful in its ideas toward religion would go into a religious institution and tell them to cover up, and to neuter and to censor their own religious symbols. It'd be like going into a Jewish facility and saying get rid of that Star of David. This kind of hostility has no place in a society which prizes the First Amendment. That's an example of the mindset.

Unfortunately, on many occasions when President Obama cites the Declaration of Independence, he leaves out the word "Creator." So, when we talk about how the "Creator" has given us our unalienable rights, to understand that our rights come from God and not from the government—the president many times leaves out the word, "Creator." That's not a mistake. That's not some editorial mistake on the part of his people. That's

deliberate. Our national motto is "In God We Trust." How many times has he said it's "E Pluribus Unum"? No, it's not "E Pluribus Unum." It's a great statement, but that's not our national motto.

So, there is an hostility. Indeed, the Obama administration is the first in the history of the United States to welcome an openly public atheist organization, one that is publicly aggressive in its hatefulness against religion. I'm talking about the Secular Coalition of America. That they were granted a White House reception tells us something very troubling about this administration.

Then there's the question of freedom of worship versus freedom of religion. Freedom of worship means that you should practice your religion indoors. It's a very insular idea. It's the idea of privatizing religion. That's what President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton have spoken about: they're all in favor of freedom of worship. That means that the priest can tend to the little old ladies in the pews. You can have your sororities and the like and sodalities. You can have your church Christmas parties and the like, but just don't take it outside. It would be on the order as if somebody said, "You can have music played in concert halls, but no longer in public parks. You can have artistic exhibitions in museums, but not on sidewalks or in public parks." That would express an hostility to art and music.

Well, that's what they're doing here. They're saying that freedom of religion—which of course is the public expression of religion, the core foundation of religion, which Pope Benedict XVI has spoken about so eloquently—they're saying that that should not be exercised. So, if you want religion, take it indoors.

No, we will not, Mr. President. We will take it outdoors and we will indeed evangelize. It's not only part of our freedom of religion in the First Amendment, it's part of our freedom

of speech, which is also in the First Amendment.

Bill, can you talk to us about some of the nominees and appointees of this administration, which could give some trouble to people who believe in religious liberty?

Jeff, I am very proud of the fact that the Catholic League fought Dawn Johnsen, an Indiana University professor of law, from getting a position in the Office of Legal Counsel. Why did we not want her? We exercised our freedom of speech by simply publicizing and giving air to her background. Back in the 1980s, she actually as a young woman worked on an amicus brief with the ACLU to deny the tax-exempt status of the Catholic Church. Imagine this: somebody who wants to strip the Catholic Church, and by extension all religions, of their tax-exempt status. This person is to be granted a high position in the administration?

Well, thank God she's not there to do that kind of damage, but we do have Kathleen Sebelius, don't we, running Health and Human Services? The last three consecutive archbishops of Kansas City, Kansas have called her on the carpet and asked her point blank: can you name a single abortion law that restricts abortion that you've ever supported? She said no. Not only that, but she has actually raised money for the infamous partial-birth abortionist who was taken out, George Tiller—George "The Killer" Tiller. Now, this is why one of the archbishops told her you need not present yourself at the communion rail because you are that far gone.

There's also people there like Chai Feldblum in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. Chai Feldblum, she taught at Georgetown University Law School, is now working for the Obama administration. She said a few years back that whenever sexual rights conflict with religious rights, religious rights need to bow to sexual rights. Now, just think about it. There's nothing in the Constitution about sexual rights. There is something in the Constitution, namely the First Amendment

to the Bill of Rights, about freedom of religion. And, yet, our First Amendment right is to take a backseat to sexual rights so that gays and lesbians can win out on some of these fights? This is absolutely mind-boggling.

There've also been people like Kevin Jennings, and people like Harry Knox and others, who have expressed hateful thoughts against the pope and the Church, and who wind up in this administration.

I must say also, regrettably, that we also have in the Obama administration a situation where, in 2009, the big debate at Christmastime was: Should there be a religious presence at Christmas? In other words, should we have a manger scene at Christmastime? Well, what else would we be celebrating? It'd be like not recognizing Martin Luther King on Martin Luther King Day. What else would you be doing?

They did put up an ornament of a drag queen. They did put up an ornament of Mao Zedong. Maybe this had something to do with why the president and his wife do not believe in exchanging Christmas gifts at Christmastime. I know lots of people who are Jewish and who are atheist and agnostic and they all exchange gifts. Now what the Obamas do in the privacy of their own home is their business, but it's my business when this kind of attitude spills over into public policy.

Bill, let's talk more widely, cast it wider. The culture itself, I mean obviously you've been talking here about the threats coming from government—from the cities, from the states, from the federal government—what about from the element of culture?

Well after 9/11, Jeff, that's when things really got worse. Militant atheism was one of the byproducts of the attack on the World Trade Center and in Pennsylvania and in Washington, D.C. One might think that there would be a kind of hatred against Islam. I don't want people to hate Islam any more than

I want people to hate Judaism or Catholicism or Protestantism or any other religion. But interestingly enough, a new wave of intellectuals who never did like religion started to speak up, and who did they really go after? Christianity. And when you talk about Christianity, you can't help but talk about the bull's-eye, that is to say the Catholic Church. So, we've been the ones who've been the victim of this militant atheism since 9/11.

Can you give me some examples, Bill, of where the Catholic League has been involved in this?

Yes. Two years ago, in 2010, I petitioned the people at the Empire State Building to light up on the night of the 100th anniversary of Mother Teresa's birth, her centenary. I wanted them to light up blue and white, the colors of her order, the Missionaries of Charity. The Empire State Building has a practice of lighting up the colors for various events. When the Yankees win, they'll light up blue and white as well. They light up green for St. Patrick's Day and the like. We were rejected.

Now, it's one thing to be rejected, it's another thing to be lied to. We were lied to because we were told that the Empire State Building does not recognize religious figures. Now admittedly it is a private entity, but they lied to us because that was not part of their stricture, part of the regulations. They made that up after we were denied. And I had the actual proof, which we put online.

The reason we were denied was because Anthony Malkin doesn't like Catholicism, I would suppose. Some people said he doesn't like me—that would make him an even smaller man than what I think he is. But no question about it, we weren't going to put up with it. We had a rally in the streets and we worked all summer of 2010 to bring people together. Republicans and Democrats, this wasn't a political issue. We wanted people who were Catholic and Protestant and Jewish and Hindu and Muslim

and Buddhists and people from all walks of life. Politicians and celebrities and people like Jackie Mason, the comedian. We wanted to make a universal statement that Mother Teresa was loved.

Why in the world would the Empire State Building, which had recognized the Ninja Turtles, which had recognized the Communist Chinese and their revolution after Mao Zedong—he killed 77 million people—but they would not honor Mother Teresa?

Any other examples you'd like to mention, Bill?

Yes, a few years ago, the Smithsonian—it is a government-supported institution which gets most of its money from the public—it gave monies and hosted a venue where they showed a video of large ants running across the body of Jesus Christ on the Cross. Now they wouldn't do that to Mohammed, and they wouldn't do it to Martin Luther King. Our objection was principled: if it is wrong to take public monies to support religion, it should be wrong to take public monies to bash religion.

Bill, what's probably the worst thing about the culture war in terms of the Catholic Church and what can we do?

The worst thing about the culture war from the perspective of the Catholic League is that it has weakened the moral authority of the Catholic Church. Of course, that's the goal, isn't it? An attrition of the prestige of Catholicism. We have to stand up for the voice of the Catholic Church, which is one of reason, one of sanity, one of common sense. We're the ones who actually had the ideas that basically make for the good society. The Catholic League is here not to speak for the Catholic Church but for the right of the Catholic Church to speak out in these days of moral anarchy.

What can we do about it? Get the word out, fight, educate, sign petitions, support those activist organizations that you

strongly believe in. Do what you can to be a participant. We need gladiators in this culture war. What we don't need are spectators.

CATHOLIC VP v. CATHOLIC VP

Following the announcement by Mitt Romney to have Paul Ryan serve as his running mate, we compared the two Catholic vice presidential candidates.

In many respects, Catholics today are divided into pro-life and social justice camps. That is unfortunate, and while this division can be overstated, it remains true that most Catholic activists sit in either one camp or the other.

Paul Ryan represents the pro-life wing, and Joe Biden represents the social justice wing. Indeed, both exemplify the differences, and not just on the issue of abortion. For example, Ryan's idea of freedom of choice commits him to supporting school vouchers; Biden's notion of choice commits him to abortion rights. Ryan is opposed to reinventing the institution of marriage; Biden wants to expand marriage to include two people of the same sex.

The Catholic Church opposes abortion and gay marriage. On both of these issues, Biden disagrees with the Church. Biden's defenders—social justice Catholics—argue that Ryan's budgetary prescriptions make him the dissident Catholic; his ideas are said to hurt the poor. This assumes, however, that there is a clear Catholic teaching on what constitutes the best means to conquer poverty. There isn't. For instance, fidelity to the Church's preferential option for the poor can be realized by making a serious case to raise taxes, or to lower them. In effect, both Biden and Ryan can plausibly claim to be a

champion of the poor. But only Ryan, can be identified as a champion of the unborn.

Not all policy issues are equal. Abortion is regarded by the Church as “intrinsically evil.” Moreover, the bishops’ conference has explicitly endorsed a constitutional amendment on the traditional definition of marriage. This puts Biden at a decisive disadvantage in making the case that he better represents Catholic teachings.

AL SMITH DINNER SPARKS DEBATE

When the Al Smith Foundation announced that both President Barack Obama and Gov. Mitt Romney would attend its annual dinner, a large debate ignited.

It is customary, though not compulsory, for the New York Archbishop to invite the presidential candidates from the two major political parties to the annual Al Smith Dinner in New York City. Some were not happy with these choices, especially the decision to invite President Obama. Cardinal Timothy Dolan has not been shy about his criticisms of the Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate, yet he decided to rise above the politics of the moment and allow the presidential candidates to partake in this charitable event.

On the August 9 edition of “Lou Dobbs Tonight,” Bill Donohue vigorously defended Dolan’s decision. He had talked with him earlier that day and found that the cardinal wasn’t budging in his conviction that the HHS mandate must be fought with every tool we have. Dolan’s unflinching resolve was the bottom line for Donohue. This was not the case for others.

If Catholics want to change the culture, they need to engage

it. This means that we invite political figures to Midnight Mass at Christmas, regardless of their religion or politics; it means we break bread with our adversaries at commemorative events; it means we fraternize with those with whom we disagree with at city, state and federal functions. Doing so does not mean that we are selling out.

Acting diplomatically may at times make for a hard swallow. But following protocol is not analogous to prostituting one's principles. As anyone who read Cardinal Dolan's statement about the dinner knows, he is not caving in; indeed he is incapable of doing so.

Finally, though Donohue was not going to the Al Smith Dinner (he has never been to the event), his defense of the New York Archbishop led to a barrage of vile comments directed at him. "So be it," he said, "But Cardinal Dolan deserves better."

RELIGION POLL PROVES REVEALING

A recent survey released by the Pew Research Center showed fewer Americans today say that President Obama is a Christian than was true four years ago when he was a presidential candidate. Indeed, 55 percent said he was a Christian in October 2008, but only 49 percent say he is today. On the other hand, the more people get to know Mitt Romney, the more they identify him as a Mormon; since November 2011, the percentage who say Romney is a Mormon has gone from 48 to 60.

Among those who know that Romney is a Mormon, the least comfortable with his religion were the atheists/agnostics. Indeed, less than half of them said they are comfortable with

Romney's religion.

The American people do not like to have agendas imposed on them. For example, 65 percent said that "liberals have gone too far trying to keep religion out of schools, government."

What is it about President Obama that the more people get to know him, the less likely they are to believe he's a Christian? What is it about non-believers that make them uncomfortable with Mormonism, or, for that matter, any religion? Why do two-thirds of Americans believe liberals want to censor religious speech?

Obama has a perception problem that only he can change. As for non-believers and liberals, they need to work on nurturing the virtue of tolerance.

UNIV. OF TEXAS CATHOLIC PROF ASSAILED

In the July issue of Social Science Research, a University of Texas at Austin professor, sociologist Mark Regnerus, published his findings on how well children fare in households where gay parents reside; they do not do as well as children raised in homes where both a father and a mother live. Now anyone is free to disagree with Regnerus' methodology or interpretation of the data, but to do so one should be in a position to critique a peer-reviewed journal. What happened instead was outrageous.

Scott Rose (his real name is Scott Rosenweig) is a gay activist, novelist and freelancer. He lodged a complaint against Regnerus with University of Texas president William

Powers, Jr.; an inquiry was immediately made, the purpose of which was to see if an investigation was warranted.

Bill Donohue weighed in on this issue, but not on the content of Regnerus' article: his concern was wholly related to the anti-Catholic animus displayed by Rose. Below is an excerpt of Donohue's July 23 letter to President Powers:

In his letter to you, Rose "summed" up his case by saying, "Regnerus converted from evangelical Protestantism to Catholicism; his Church is very aggressively involved worldwide in fighting against gay rights, including in the United States, where in June-July 2012, while making use of Regnerus's study, NOM [National Organization for Marriage] and the US Conference of Catholic Bishops are joined in running the 'Fortnight for Freedom' event."

Rose's comment is invidious as well as ignorant. If a non-academic ideologue were to register a complaint with you about a faculty member's research, summing up his case by noting the professor's conversion to Islam, would that not alone be cause for concern? Since when did a researcher's religion become grounds for indictment?

For the record, the Catholic Church's defense of traditional marriage is wholly unexceptional: no world religion disagrees with the position that marriage is a union between a man and a woman. More to the point, the "Fortnight for Freedom" events that were organized by the bishops had absolutely nothing to do with same-sex marriage: they were a series of events, uncoordinated with other organizations, that were held to garner Catholic support for religious liberty.

Rose's Catholic-bashing is hardly limited to Regnerus. He notes with alarm that "All of NOM's leaders—in other words—all of Regnerus's funders—are Catholic, and not just Catholic, but strong political enablers of the Catholic Church in the U.S. It is perhaps necessary to remind readers that the Catholic

Church fights dirty in its politics.” [His *italic.*]

Though this was not part of the letter that Rose wrote to you, I must ask the following: How would you respond if someone were to write to you complaining that all of those involved in a research study were Jews? Or that they were strong political enablers of Israel? Or that such persons were known to fight dirty?

Rose’s hatred of Catholicism is well documented. Consider his piece of January 21, 2012, “What’s the Real Reason The Catholic Church Wants to Keep Gays Oppressed?” In it he wrote the following:

- “The Catholic Church is the world’s single largest anti-gay hate group.”
- “By socially stigmatizing gay human beings and driving young gay people to despair about their chances for satisfying adult domestic lives, the Church as good as tortures young gay people into signing up to be priests and nuns. The fall-off in the number of young people signing up for lifetimes slaving for the Church corresponds almost precisely to the gradually increasing social acceptance of gay human beings.”
- “The greedy gay-bashing monsters of the Catholic Church are mounting a war against gay people; gay people and those that support their rights—must fight back against this *evil cult.*” (My emphasis.)

On May 11, 2012, Rose wrote the following in his article, “Cardinal Timothy Dolan, Gay Bashing, And Children”:

- “The Catholic Church’s worldwide economic plan is to keep stigmatizing and discriminating against gays and lesbians, in order to get them to despair of successful adult domestic lives, so they will sign up for lifetimes of near-slave labor of the Church, keeping Dolan and others of his level in the Church hierarchy living off the fat of the land.”

Rose's animus against Cardinal Dolan is particularly sick; he has called the New York Archbishop a "gay basher and child rapist enabler." He has also accused Dolan of writing a "threatening letter to President Obama." To demonstrate just how Rose's pathological hatred of Catholicism has impaired his judgment, I am enclosing a copy of the "threatening letter." As you will see, there is not a single threatening sentence in the entire letter.

Given Rose's mindset, it is hardly surprising to learn that he has contacted the IRS asking them to strip the Catholic Church of its tax-exempt status.

It is not the business of the Catholic League to sit in judgment of the way the University of Texas handles complaints against its faculty. But when it comes to bashing a professor because of his Catholicism, and when the Catholic Church is treated with vitriol in such a public manner, it takes on a dimension that transcends ordinary campus issues. That is why I felt obliged to enter this discussion.

WAR ON CHICK-FIL-A

A controversy was recently sparked when Chick-fil-A president Dan Cathy came out in support of traditional marriage. Cathy said that we are "inviting God's judgment on our nation when we shake our fist at him and say, 'We know better than you as to what constitutes a marriage.'" Cathy never mentioned homosexuals, yet created a firestorm labeling him and his fast-food chain anti-gay.

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel said that "Chick-fil-A's values are not Chicago values. They're not respectful of our residents, our neighbors and our family members." Indeed, Chicago

Alderman Joe Moreno has been attempting to block the construction of a new Chick-fil-A partly due to worry about its "business practices."

A *New York Times* editorial said, "Antigay remarks like these are offensive." Boston Mayor Thomas Menino made it clear he wouldn't welcome the restaurant in his city when he said, "I don't want an individual who will continue to advocate against people's rights. That's who I am and that's what Boston's all about."

To their credit, Harvard Law professor Alan Dershowitz, the ACLU and even Barney Frank were critical of the various comments of these public officials.

Dershowitz told Newsmax.com that the mayors were demonstrating "terrible intolerance" and that a city is not free to discriminate against a company due to the views of its owners; the ACLU of Illinois called Moreno's attempt to block construction an "open and shut" case of discrimination; and the openly-gay congressman Frank said that while he wouldn't eat at Chick-fil-A, he doesn't believe that government officials should punish the company based on the views of its owner.

It was also disturbing that Mitt Romney completely skirted the controversy. In a lengthy interview with Newsmax, Bill Donohue said he was "astonished" and "disheartened" by Romney's agnosticism: "I'm astonished that he couldn't even come to grips with the question—leaving gays out of it—do we want the chief executives, the mayors of large cities trying to intimidate, using the power of government against private enterprises whose politics they disagree with?"

According to the logic of Cathy's critics, almost everyone who has ever lived has been an anti-homosexual bigot. Such hyperbole relegates real gay bashing to the trash bin.

Nature, and Nature's God, has ordained that marriage is the

exclusive province of a man and a woman; they are the only two people capable of naturally creating a family. But now we are expected to believe that such a pedestrian view is wrongheaded. Worse, there is a growing segment of the population, overwhelmingly white and well-educated, who want to punish those who hold to the traditional view. This is madness laced with fascistic elements.

GOV. JINDAL'S VOUCHER PROGRAM

The people of Louisiana love their governor, Bobby Jindal, and no segment of the population loves him more than the poor. That's because Jindal is fighting for educational equality: his school voucher program, the biggest in the nation, gives the poor the same choice of schools that the rich can afford.

Leading the fight against the poor is the Interfaith Alliance, headed by Rev. C. Weldon Gaddy. In an August letter to Jindal, Gaddy said that by giving the poor options, the governor was waging a "ruthless attack on public education." Not above Catholic-baiting, Gaddy raised a red flag when he noted that the governor chose "a Roman Catholic Church as the venue" to sign his legislation.

Gaddy was so angered over the voucher program that he even said that private schools are "not up to the standards" of the public schools. But if that were true, there would be no need to worry: no one would want to go there.

There is another issue involved here: the public expression of religion. The Interfaith Alliance is manifestly opposed to this right. Indeed, it has worked hard to stop "In God We Trust" plaques in Colorado public school classrooms. That the phrase is our national motto means nothing to them; what gets

their goat is the prospect of dropping the dreaded "G" word in school. In short, they are no more a friend of religion than they are a friend of the poor.

We urged our members to contact Jindal's office with support and they did. We received an e-mail from Jindal's communications director thanking us.