

# HOLLYWOOD BLASTED ON L.A. RADIO



Bill Donohue explains how the Catholic League is responding to the bigotry and censorship of Hollywood elites:

On October 17, FX will air the first episode of the series, "American Horror Story: Asylum." It depicts an evil Catholic home for the criminally insane where a promiscuous nun—in habit, of course—beats inmates; a Catholic doctor tortures them.

When I submitted a full-page ad [click [here](#)] to be run that is critical of the show, I was turned down by *The Hollywood Reporter's* publisher, Lynne Segall: she said the ad "was not appropriate." She did not say the show "was not appropriate." I then submitted the ad to *Variety* where it met the same fate, this time because of the alleged "mudslinging" title, "FX Trashes Nuns." No one at *Variety* said the show was guilty of "mudslinging."

Today, two Los Angeles radio stations are carrying several 30-second taped statements by me condemning Hollywood's latest assault on Catholicism: KFI is one of the biggest stations in California, and KTLK has a loyal liberal audience. To read the statement, click [here](#).

The two radio stations stand in stark relief to the bigots at FX and the censors at *The Hollywood Reporter* and *Variety*.

---

# HOLLYWOOD'S BIGOTS AND CENSORS



Bill Donohue comments as follows:

When we learned about a TV show this fall that offers an incredibly vicious portrayal of nuns and employees at a Catholic home for the criminally insane, I decided to write a full-page ad for placement in *The Hollywood Reporter*; the first episode is Oct. 17. The FX show, “American Horror Story: Asylum,” was the subject of my ad. We were all set to go—our credit card info had been accepted—when we received an e-mail on Oct. 1 saying that the publisher, Lynne Segall, “has a concern with the artwork and the ad message and we were unable to run the ad.” Forget the fact that there was no artwork, the next sentence reads, “She felt that the message was not appropriate and has chosen to reserve the right not to print it.” The ad was to run in the Oct. 19 edition, hitting the studios on Oct. 10.

The next day, Oct. 2, we contacted *Variety*, and they said they would run the ad in both the daily (Oct. 10) and weekly (Oct. 8-14) editions; our credit card info was accepted. Then we received a phone call saying that the legal department had a problem with the title of the ad and that it would be rejected unless it was changed. The title reads, “FX Trashes Nuns.” We asked what legal problem there could possibly be and we were told in an e-mail that “we don’t allow *Variety* to be used as a

forum for mud-slinging, and we feel that is the only part of the letter that crosses the line.” “Mudslinging”? Consider this: on Jan. 10, *Variety* ran an article about the film, “Alvin and the Chipmunks: Chipwrecked,” titled, “David Cross Continues to Trash ‘Chipwrecked.’” I obviously refused to change the title, hence there will be no ad.

I have long argued that Hollywood hates Catholics. Need any further proof? A Hollywood-produced TV *series* portrays Catholics as sadists, and when a paid ad criticizing the show is offered to *two* prominent Hollywood publications, it is rejected for its “inappropriate” and “mudslinging” properties.

To read the e-mails, click [here](#). To read the ad, click [here](#).

Contact: [thrnewsroom@thr.com](mailto:thrnewsroom@thr.com); [news@variety.com](mailto:news@variety.com)

---

## L.A. TIMES LACKS MORAL STANDING

✖ Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today’s *Los Angeles Times*:

The latest liberal voice worried stiff over the Catholic Church’s resistance to the Obama administration’s war on Catholicism is the *Los Angeles Times*. Today they accuse Donald Cardinal Wuerl of the Washington Archdiocese of “censorship” for speaking out against Georgetown’s embrace of abortion champion Kathleen Sebelius; the paper says the students should be exposed to “a variety of viewpoints.”

Ironically, the last thing the *Los Angeles Times* is known for is exposing its readers to “a variety of viewpoints.” In 2003,

its editor, John Carroll, sent a memo to his editors complaining about the one-sided liberal stories the paper runs. In 2005, a UCLA study of media bias listed the paper as one of the most biased in the nation. In 2009, veteran *Washington Post* reporter Tom Edsall said the paper was composed in large part of the “liberal elite.”

Nor does the paper have any moral standing to lecture anyone about “censorship.” Two years ago, it pulled a patently *inoffensive* cartoon, “Where’s Muhammad?” Were they being respectful of Muslims? Or were they fearful? Either way, they engaged in censorship (as they define it). Ten years earlier they showed their respect—or was it fear?—of Muslims when they dropped a promotional ad that featured images of Muslim women in chadors mixed in with bikini-clad women. To show how deeply respectful—or fearful—the boys and girls at the paper were, over 200 editors and reporters signed a petition calling for the ad to be censored.

In other words, the *Los Angeles Times* shuns diversity of opinion, loathes equal treatment of religion, and likes censorship. Which is why it is such a beacon of liberal thought.

Contact editorial board chief Nicholas Goldberg:  
[nicholas.goldberg@latimes.com](mailto:nicholas.goldberg@latimes.com)

---

## KELLOGG’S DEFENDS HATE SPEECH



Catholic League president Bill Donohue  
comments as follows:

Over the past two weeks, we sent our complaint about Jon Stewart's "vagina manger" stunt of April 16 to the major sponsors of "The Daily Show"; we made sure they received a copy of the picture flashed on the screen of a naked woman with her legs spread with a nativity scene ornament in between. We are pleased with Delta's response, and are awaiting a reply from others, many of which were contacted only this week. But we were taken aback by this response from Kellogg's:

"We understand that our customers come from a variety of backgrounds, experiences, lifestyles, and cultures and we respect their individual decisions to choose the television programs that they deem acceptable for themselves and their families. Consumers speak most loudly when they vote with their remote control and change the channel or turn off the TV if a program does not fit their personal criteria."

In other words, Kellogg's is telling Christians to shove it. But they made a mistake. We will now send the indefensible picture to their senior management and board, as well as to community leaders, religious and secular, throughout Battle Creek, Michigan. We are also calling for a national boycott of all Kellogg's cereals. Moreover, I will notify the public via TV, radio and our website about their collapse of decency. This is just for starters. We have the time, money, and the determination to give Kellogg's some free advertisement.

Kellogg's "Global Code of Ethics" boasts, "our heritage is based on a commitment to treat everyone fairly and with consideration." Excluding the 80 percent of Americans who are Christian.

*Call their Corporate & Media Affairs office: (269) 961-3799. Write to the President and CEO, John Bryant, One Kellogg Square, Battle Creek, MI 49012. E-mail Kris Charles: [kris.charles@kellogg.com](mailto:kris.charles@kellogg.com)*

Click [here](#) to see the offensive picture

---

# “THE PERFECT FAMILY” SMACKS CATHOLICISM



Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on “The Perfect Family,” which opens tomorrow:

It’s Hollywood’s idea of a Catholic family: a neurotic devout Catholic wife married to a boozier who struggles with his alcoholism; her pregnant lesbian daughter who wants to “marry” her girlfriend; her adulterous lout of a son. The wife, played by Kathleen Turner, is up for “Catholic Woman of the Year.”

In real life, Turner is a left-wing atheist who serves on the board of directors of the Christian-bashing People for the American Way. This is her “Perfect Family.” She says her character tries to show the conflict between being a practicing Catholic and seeking to “live in the real world.” *Movieline.com* agrees, saying she plays “a religious dinosaur roaming a modern world.” Though the movie is riddled with intolerance toward Catholicism, Turner says, “I would hope tolerance” is the message that comes through. *Variety* concurs, adding that the film preaches “tolerance toward gays” (but not toward Catholics).

It is a staple of anti-Catholicism to say that Catholics are not independent thinkers. Predictably, Turner’s character admits, “I’m Catholic. I don’t need to think.” However, not all family members are stupid. *Shockya.com* notes that the

pregnant lesbian daughter embodies “independent thinking and modern beliefs.” Why of course.

When asked about the portrayal of Catholicism, Turner says, “I thought we were pretty nice.” Sadly, she means it. The executive producer, Connie Cummings, agrees: “We didn’t want to take cheap shots or villainise anyone.” Rex Reed takes a different approach, saying, “The movie is almost guaranteed to offend the humorless.” Yeah, Rex, it’s too bad those Catholics can’t take a joke (quite unlike those homosexuals).

This blockbuster, which took 19 days to make, will open in a grand total of 13 theaters *nationwide*, eight of which are in California. One would have to be positively humorless not to get a chuckle out of that.

Contact: [gerilyn@brigademarketing.com](mailto:gerilyn@brigademarketing.com)

---

## NEW YORK TIMES TRIES TO TAG POPE—AGAIN!

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on today’s front-page article on Pope Benedict XVI:

The purpose of this story is to do what the *Times* failed to do in March: blame the pope for the sexual abuse scandal. It failed again.

We are told that when Joseph Ratzinger (now the pope) was in charge of the Office of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, he had authority over sex abuse cases, but never exercised it. It cites as evidence some old instructions dating back to 1922 that Australian Archbishop Philip Edward

Wilson “stumbled across” when he was a student in the early 1990s. When he mentioned this 10 years ago at a Vatican meeting, “few people in the room had any idea what [he] was talking about.” In other words, there is no proof that even Ratzinger knew of this alleged authority.

“Bishops had a variety of disciplinary tools at their disposal” when Ratzinger headed the Doctrine of the Faith Office. This is not only true; it undercuts attempts to blame him. We also learn that there were at least a half-dozen offices (besides the one run by Ratzinger) that bishops reported abuse cases to. This is also true, and while it does suggest a bureaucratic problem, this is not the same as moral irresponsibility. We also learn that Ratzinger was preoccupied with all kinds of issues at the time, which is also true, but it is malicious to say he went after Latin American priests for preaching on behalf of the poor: the few liberation theology priests who were questioned were Marxist sympathizers.

The most accurate summation comes from Irish bishop Eamonn Walsh. At the meeting a decade ago, he said of Ratzinger, “this guy gets it, he’s understanding the situation we’re facing.” Yet he also acknowledges that those in Rome never had firsthand experience with some devious priests, and therefore took the position that the accused was “innocent until proven guilty.” Not only is this understandable, from a civil libertarian perspective, it is highly commendable.

---



# PENN & TELLER MUST GO

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an ad he wrote for today's edition of *Variety*:

Today's ad in *Variety* (click [here](#)) is a direct response to the latest hate speech by Penn & Teller against Catholics. Both Penn Jillette, and Showtime (owned by CBS), are flagging the attack on the Vatican that is featured in its season finale, August 27. Given the history of Penn & Teller's vicious record of Catholic bashing, we have no reason to doubt that this episode will be particularly vile. In the ad, we cited previous examples of their malicious assaults, especially on Mother Teresa.

CBS management has spoken to the Catholic-bashing duo before, but to no effect. Though we are not calling for CBS/Showtime to cancel the upcoming episode, we are saying that the time has come to pull the plug on their show; their contract should not be renewed. Those who agree should contact Matthew Blank, the Chairman and CEO of Showtime.

Contact: [Matthew.Blank@Showtime.net](mailto:Matthew.Blank@Showtime.net)

---

# ABORTION AS HEALTH CARE: OBAMA WANTS US TO PAY FOR IT

White House budget director Peter Orszag was asked yesterday whether "no taxpayer money will go to pay for abortions" under proposed health care legislation. "I'm not prepared to say explicitly that right now," he said.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue picked up on that remark:

There was no reason for Orszag to sound tentative—everyone who has been following this issue knows that President Barack Obama has been very explicit about his support for abortion, as well as his desire to make the public foot the bill. Yes, he says he wants “common ground,” but there is absolutely no evidence of his budging on this issue when it gets to the policy stage. And that is the only stage that matters in the end.

Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius, another champion of abortion-on-demand through term, commented yesterday about health care reform saying, “There are basically five different plans in Congress right now and there are a variety of ways.” Is there even one plan that explicitly says abortion will not be subsidized? We know that the Democrats, following the party line adopted by the White House, have killed every amendment that would bar public funding of abortion. So who is kidding whom?

If the Bush administration had said that it wants to seek “common ground” on gun control, and then decided to subsidize handguns in high crime areas, it would have been condemned from high heaven. The Obama administration’s game of playing footsy with the abortion industry should similarly be condemned. Indeed, it represents the audacity of duplicity to dialogue about abortion and then send the public an invoice for killing kids in utero.

---

# CATHOLIC BASHERS OPPOSE PROPOSITION 4

On election day, Californians will vote on Proposition 4, a measure that requires minors to obtain parental notification before an abortion is performed; there is a provision for judicial override in unusual circumstances. Some of those opposed have engaged in Catholic bashing.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue addresses this issue today:

“Some of the Catholic bashing that has accompanied the crusade against Proposition 4 is subtle, and some of it is overt. The subtle variety is on display in news releases that continue to cite the Knights of Columbus as a donor in favor of the resolution: The Knights’ contribution is actually quite small, but by flagging the Catholic lay group, opponents are throwing a red flag to anti-Catholic bigots. This is exactly what we would expect of such groups as the ACLU, NOW, the Feminist Majority, Planned Parenthood and NARAL; their record of bigotry is quite long.

“Besides some anti-Catholic bloggers, opponents of parental rights conducted a demonstration on October 26 outside a Catholic church in Coronado; those coming and going to Mass were specifically singled out.

“A video on the subject, dubbed ‘Therapy’ by the Vote No on Proposition 4 activists, has two young men sitting on a couch discussing the issue. The pro-parental consent fellow, of course, is depicted as making his case based on emotion, not evidence. Worse, he confesses that he is trying to ‘impose [his] moral view on others’; he cites his reliance on the Bible.

“In actual fact, when Planned Parenthood recently appeared in

court it couldn't produce one factual case of a young girl who committed suicide because of a lack of parental consent. And it is not the pro-parental consent crowd which is imposing its moral views—it is those against the resolution.

“Now the Sierra Club is getting involved in stripping parents of their rights; it will hold a press conference today. So is this its message—less kids, less pollution? It admits that it is pro-abortion. What we didn't know is that it is comfortable consorting with anti-Catholics.”

---

## ROSIE O'DONNELL TO HOST NBC SHOW

On November 26, Thanksgiving eve, Rosie O'Donnell will host a special on NBC, “Rosie's Variety Show.” Reportedly, it has a strong chance of becoming a weekly show on Sunday nights at 8:00 p.m. next year.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue is giving NBC a heads-up:

“NBC wouldn't dare hire one of its icons, Michael Richards, to do a special, never mind give him serious consideration for a weekly show on Sunday nights. That's because the “Seinfeld” actor made bigoted remarks *one night* in 2006 while performing. By contrast, O'Donnell has made a slew of the most viciously bigoted remarks, year after year. But she's okay.

“Moreover, Richards made his comments in a private comedy club; O'Donnell made her numerous comments on national television. Oh, yes, I forgot to mention that African Americans were the target of Richards' bigoted statements;

O'Donnell's repertoire is mostly limited to attacking Catholics and the Catholic Church. She once ripped Asians, but then quickly issued an apology. She has never apologized to Catholics for her non-stop bigotry.

"If Michael Richards were to be given the opportunity that O'Donnell is being given, the NAACP, Al Sharpton and others would be scheduling a protest. And by comparison, Richards is positively angelic next to O'Donnell.

"Sponsors had better beware. If O'Donnell resorts to her Catholic-bashing antics, one of them will pay. Bet on it. Ironically, it was on Thanksgiving eve of 2006 that NBC aired Madonna's 'Confessions Tour.' Deleted from the show was the 'Mock Crucifixion' scene we objected to. That's because NBC got the message about the boycott we planned with the Media Research Center (we said we would boycott one sponsor, to be identified after the show). NBC would be wise not to pick this show up in 2009."

Contact NBC CEO Jeff Zucker at [jeff.zucker@nbcuni.com](mailto:jeff.zucker@nbcuni.com)