

MAHER JUSTIFIES KILLING INNOCENT KIDS

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

On his April 12 HBO show, "Real Time," Bill Maher justified the killing of innocent children. Speaking of pro-life Americans, he said, "They think it's murder, and it kind of is. I'm just okay with that. I am. There [are] 8 billion people in the world, I'm sorry, we won't miss you. That's my position on that." He did not volunteer to make a personal contribution to that end.

Maher's sincerity is appreciated, if not his promotion of violence. He knows, as every honest person who agrees with science knows, that abortion is the taking of innocent human life.

The most famous person to warn of overpopulation, Thomas Malthus, was opposed to abortion as a remedy. Perhaps that's because he was an Anglican minister. Maher is an atheist.

Maher has more in common with Paul Ehrlich, the most famous overpopulation zealot in recent times. He predicted in 1968 that "hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death" in the next decade. It never happened. In fact, obesity spiked in the 1970s. Like Maher, however, he recommended aborting more children to "solve" this alleged problem.

Maher makes abortion rights advocates jittery. On his show, two guests, Gillian Tett and Piers Morgan, admitted they are fans of abortion rights, but when Maher said he was okay with the killing of innocent kids, they branded his position "quite harsh." They did not explain what was harsh about it.

It is dishonest to say that some abortion rights advocates are not happy to be pro-abortion. In fact, there is a book, *Abortion Is A Blessing*, by a famous atheist, and there are several women who have testified before Congress bragging how abortion “is an act of self love.” Sickness abounds.

SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER IS A HATE GROUP

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Part I

There are many radical organizations in the country, but none has achieved a more inflated status than the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC). Its undeserved status is due to its perceived expertise in assessing hate groups. While its tracking of hate groups includes some that are undeniably hateful, its list also includes many that are merely conservative organizations who are anything but hateful. By smearing these entities, SPLC is proving that it is the master of hate.

The following organizations are listed by SPLC as hate groups, and the quotes are cited by it as proof that they are a Klan-like organization. Judge for yourself.

Alliance Defending Freedom

“Allowing males to compete in the female category isn’t fair and destroys athletic opportunities. Males will always have

inherent physical advantages over comparably talented girls – that’s the reason we have girls’ sports in the first place. And a male’s belief about gender doesn’t eliminate those advantages.” *ADF legal counsel Christiana Holcomb*

“Men who self-identify as women are still biological men. Sure, they can take synthetic hormones to make themselves appear more feminine, style their hair, and wear makeup (or not). But being a woman is more than a physical appearance or a feeling – it is a biological reality.” *Marissa Mayer, senior web writer, on the ADF website*

“The only surprise is the rapidity with which this degradation of our human dignity has occurred. It has occurred, with raging effect, and within twelve months, on the heels of government mandated recognition of same-sex ‘marriage’ – an oxymoronic institution if ever there was one.” *ADF-affiliated attorney Charles LiMandri*

American College of Pediatricians

“Transgenderism is a belief system that increasingly looks like a cultish religion – a modern day Gnosticism denying physical reality for deceived perceptions – being forced on the public by the state in violation of the establishment clause of the First Amendment.” *Andre Van Mol, co-chair of ACPeds’ Committee on Adolescent Sexuality*

“Conditioning children into believing a lifetime of chemical and surgical impersonation of the opposite sex is normal and healthful is child abuse.” *Gender Ideology Harms Children, ACPeds article*

“Sex is hard-wired from before birth, and it cannot change.” *Michelle Cretella, former president of ACPeds*

Family Research Council

“People with gender dysphoria or transgender identities are

more likely than the general public to engage in high-risk behaviors, which may result from or contribute to psychological disorders (or both)." *FRC senior fellow Peter Sprigg*

"I know they'll mock at the idea, but look, if you are a male – genetically you are a male, biologically you're a male – and you say, 'Well, I'm not a male. I'm a female.' I mean what's to keep you from saying that you're an animal?" *Tony Perkins, president*

"By ignoring underlying conditions, the demands of transgender supremacy ignore our unique kids, especially those with autism and mental health diagnoses. They deflect much-needed resources away from the pandemic of autism." *Sarah Perry, FRC director of partnerships and coalitions coordinator*

Liberty Counsel

"Homosexual conduct can result in significant damage to those involved who engage in such conduct. There is no evidence that a person is born homosexual. And there is evidence that people can change." *Liberty Counsel website*

"One of the most significant threats to our freedom is in the area of sexual anarchy with the agenda of the homosexual movement, the so-called LGBT movement. [It] undermines family and the very first building block of our society [and] secondly...it's a direct assault on our religious freedom and freedom of speech." *Mat Staver, president*

"Statistically, sexual promiscuity is increased among those who engage in homosexual conduct, the result of which is disease found predominantly, if not exclusively, among homosexuals." *Mat Staver*

Pacific Justice Institute

"It is fundamentally unjust for the government to treat some

crime victims more favorably than others, just because they are homosexual or transsexual.” *PJI president Brad Dacus*

“Most parents do not want their first through fifth graders bombarded with pro-homosexual messages at school. If LGBT advocates really want to stop name-calling and bullying, they should start with themselves.” *Brad Dacus*

“Forcing boys and girls to share bathrooms, locker rooms and sleeping arrangements is not equality; it is insanity.” *Brad Dacus*

Ruth Institute

“Transgender is a political category. Invented for political purposes. It has nothing to do with either psychology or medicine. It is a political category.” *Jennifer Roback Morse*

“Compared to children raised by their own biological parents, married to each other, children whose parents had a same-sex relationship are at elevated risk for the following...emotional problems, pleading guilty to a non-minor offense, learning disabilities....” *Ruth Institute pamphlet*

“It’s really important to be well informed about what the church actually says about homosexual practice...The church is very clear that same-sex sexual action are intrinsically disordered and can never be morally acceptable.” *Jennifer Roback Morse*

SOUTHERN POVERTY LAW CENTER

IS A HATE GROUP

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

PART II

“Designating Antifa as Domestic Terrorist Organization Is Dangerous, Threatens Civil Liberties.”

That is how SPLC views Antifa. The evidence shows that its characterization is seriously inaccurate.

Antifa is a loosely-knit group that espouses, and engages in, violence. In July 2019, police shot and killed Willem van Spronsen after he tried to ignite a 500-gallon propane tank attached to a government building in Tacoma, Washington. He was armed with a rifle and incendiary devices. Shortly before the attack he sent a manifesto to friends, saying, “I am antifa.” After his death, Antifa colleagues called him “a martyr.” Memorials were organized in Washington and Oregon.

A month later, Connor Betts killed nine and injured dozens in a mass shooting in Dayton, Ohio. Though he was not a member of Antifa, he openly supported them on social media.

Mike Isaacson is the founder of an Antifa group in Washington, D.C. He proudly justifies violence. According to Mark Bray, a Dartmouth historian, people like Isaacson justify their use of violence as self-defense against fascists. Their idea of self-defense includes hurling glass bottles and bricks at the police. This has led liberals such as Rep. Nancy Pelosi to condemn Antifa’s violence.

Attorney General William Barr, under President Donald Trump, referred to Antifa as a “new form of urban guerrilla warfare,” similarly to what Mao Zedong promoted.

Antifa members have been arrested many times for carrying guns, knives, hatchets, gasoline, clubs, chemical irritants, pipes, hammers, fireworks, and homemade explosives.

A Baltimore Antifa activist explained that when peaceful protests don't succeed, you "fight them with fists," and if that doesn't work, you "fight them with knives," and if that fails, you "fight them with guns," and if that doesn't get the job done, you "fight them with tanks."

In 2016, the Department of Homeland Security and the FBI warned state and local officials that Antifa was engaging in "domestic terrorist violence."

Yet SPLC says it is *dangerous* to label Antifa a domestic terrorist group.

"Black Lives Matter Is Not a Hate Group."

After George Floyd was killed by a police officer in 2020, Black Lives Matter (BLM) labeled it a hate crime committed by a white cop, Derek Chauvin. That led to over 600 attacks on 220 American cities.

Yet when the left-wing African-American Minnesota attorney general, Keith Ellison, examined this case, he said it was not a hate crime. "I wouldn't call it that because hate crimes are crimes where there's an explicit motive and bias." He added, "We don't have any evidence that Derek Chauvin factored in George Floyd's race as he did what he did."

This led author David Horowitz to comment, "All the outrage against police racism and all the mayhem fueled by that outrage, was based on no evidence whatsoever."

The fact is that during the 103 days of unrest following the death of Floyd, there were 633 violent protests all across the nation, and BLM was involved in 95 percent of those incidents. The riots were responsible for an estimated two billion

dollars in insured property damage and untold more in uninsured property damage. There were twenty-four deaths and countless others who were injured, including many cops.

Yet SPLC says “Black Lives Matter Is Not a Hate Group.”

But guess who is a hate group? White Lives Matter. SPLC calls it a white supremacist group, led by a middle-age homemaker, Rebecca Barnette. If she doesn’t sound like a violent Antifa or BLM analog on the right, that’s because she isn’t.

The only violence associated with White Lives Matters occurred years ago when they clashed with counter-protesters in Anaheim, California. White Lives Matter was responsible for stabbing three of them. As it turned out, the five who were arrested were released by the police after it was determined that they acted in self-defense.

Are there things that White Lives Matter has said that are hateful? Yes, and it stands to reason that they should be included in any list of hate groups. But in comparison to BLM, these racists are at least not a violent threat to the social order. They are more kooky than a menace.

SPLC not only unfairly labels respectable social conservative organizations as hate groups, it shamelessly exculpates left-wing violent organizations, defending them as if they were the Boy Scouts.

Worse, the mainstream media cites SPLC’s list of hate groups as if it were the Gospel truth. It is for these reasons that the Catholic League concludes that SPLC is a bona-fide hate group—it goes to the mat for true hate groups while smearing those that are not.

As with Part I, we sent Part II to Washington lawmakers and many other interested parties. It’s time SPLC was outed as a dangerous fraud.

ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL TARGETED AGAIN

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

A group of protesters invaded St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City during the Saturday night Easter Mass. Standing front and center, they unfurled a banner with a depiction of an olive tree and the inscription, SILENCE = DEATH. They were screaming "Free Palestine"; their allies were heard shouting similar chants from the street. Security quickly escorted them out of the Cathedral.

The big media acted according to script. It was not covered by the *New York Times*, *Washington Post* or the Associated Press, though the latter two found time to cover Trans Visibility Day on Easter Sunday. CBS and NBC ran a story on the protesters, but ABC and PBS said nothing. MSNBC ran one story on St. Patrick's Cathedral and five on Trans Visibility Day. The winner was CNN: it had no coverage of the church-busters but aired ten stories on Trans Visibility Day.

At least some of the protesters claim to be affiliated with Extinction Rebellion. Founded as a climate change organization in the U.K. in 2018, they have now taken up the anti-Israel cause, championing Palestinian rights. They demand that leaders in the western world stop genocide and ecocide.

Extinction Rebellion falsely claims to practice civil disobedience, and they are portrayed that way by their friends in the media. The truth is that they are not unaccustomed to

violence; they are also known for taking over bridges and damaging property.

Extinction Rebellion is funded by rich individuals and organizations, among them being the Children's Investment Fund Foundation. Left-wing professors, such as America's Noam Chomsky, and eco-extremists such as Greta Thunberg, applaud their goals and tactics.

St. Patrick's Cathedral was recently invaded by LGBT radicals, and now it's the pro-Palestinian protesters who have crashed the Cathedral.

These are not activists. They are domestic terrorists. They could have taken over a Broadway play or a concert at Madison Square Garden. But that wouldn't excite them. Disrupting an Easter Mass excites them.

At bottom, they are angry at God, which is why they chose St. Patrick's Cathedral to vent their anger. In doing so they are committing the greatest sin of all—the sin of pride. Their rejection of God and their exalted sense of who they think they are explains their sorry condition.

They also hate Jews and Catholics. Jews were the object of their protest—they want Israel to disarm so Hamas can win—and their venue was the nation's most iconic Catholic church.

Until these domestic terrorists are prosecuted, convicted and sent to prison, these kinds of Satanic acts will continue. They can be stopped, but the authorities in New York City and New York State have no interest in doing so.

VIOLENCE MARKS TRANSGENDER VISIBILITY DAY

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Transgender Day of Visibility is an international event that is held every year on March 31. This year it fell on Easter Sunday.

Left-wing government officials, led by President Biden and his administration, along with left-wing LGBT activists, led by the Human Rights Campaign (HRC), called attention to the heroics of transgender persons. They should instead have called attention to their lifestyle, which too often is marked by drugs and violence.

At the end of 2023, HRC listed 32 incidents of transgender persons who died a violent death. It took the occasion to say that “These victims, like all of us, are loving partners, parents, family members, friends and community members. They worked, went to school and attended houses of worship.”

Well, not so fast. We examined each of the 32 cases and found that, while all are tragic, many of the incidents are still open to investigation; there was a lot of random violence. Importantly, there was not one incident that clearly merited the tag “hate crime” (in one instance, the police said it was a possible hate crime).

The fact is that a large portion of the violence was the result of an altercation between the transgender victim and the assailant. Too often the victim was not the kind of model citizen that HRC portrays.

Why was it necessary to get into a confrontation with someone

who was innocently “misgendered”? Asking a stranger for sex is not a smart thing to do—it often results in violence. Assaulting a security guard can end in death, as happened in one instance. When an ex-con robs a store and is killed by a security guard, we shouldn’t be shocked. When an ex-con shoots at state troopers, that is really stupid. And so on.

Even HRC admits that in more than a third of these cases (36 %), the killer was a “romantic/sexual partner, friend or family member.” We found that in five of these cases, the killer was another transgender person. Which raises the question: Why are these people so violent?

Just looking at the pictures of these transgender persons who were killed is enough to conclude that they are not just like the guy next door. That obviously doesn’t justify violence. Still, the idyllic portrayal that HRC presents is nonsense.

No innocent person deserves to die a violent death. Unfortunately, in too many cases the transgender persons that HRC mourns were not innocent victims. Their lifestyle is very much in need of a corrective.

CAN’T ERASE OUR JUDEO-CHRISTIAN PAST

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Militant secularists would like to erase our religious heritage, but they are clearly in over their heads. Our nation’s Capitol abounds with Judeo-Christian iconography, so

much so that it overwhelms attempts to cancel it.

- The dome of the U.S. Capitol was inspired by the dome of St. Peter's Basilica in Rome, as well as St. Paul's Cathedral in London.
- The Supreme Court building is modeled after a Roman temple.
- St. Joseph's church on Capitol Hill was built in 1868.
- The Jefferson Building of the Library of Congress features *The Court of Neptune Fountain*; it resembles a grotto.
- The west end of the Mall—from the U.S. Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial—has a statue of Lincoln surrounded by comments he made about his respect for God. At the far end of the Mall, the Supreme Court, the Library of Congress, and the Capitol building have inscriptions honoring our Judaic heritage.
- Within the Capitol there are statues of Catholic priests and nuns and medallions of Pope Innocent III and Pope Gregory IX.
- On the first floor of the Main Reading Room in the Library of Congress there is a statue of St. Paul.
- In the Library there is a quote from the Book of Proverbs and a reference to God from Shakespeare.
- There is a chapel in the U.S. Capitol. Moreover, prayer meetings for Senators and Congressmen are commonplace throughout.
- Crucifixes abound in the Capitol.
- On the front doors of the Capitol are pictures of Franciscans with rosaries, symbolizing the history of Columbus.
- In the Rotunda, there is a painting of Hernando De Soto and his armies standing on the banks of the river rejoicing, as well as a depiction of priests planting a cross.
- There is also a painting in the dome of the burial scene of De Soto depicting a Mass being celebrated; a barge is carrying his body for burial in the Mississippi. A priest is shown holding a crucifix during burial prayers.
- In front of the Federal District Court, across from the National Gallery of Art, there is a depiction of pilgrims

praying before a cross—a splendid recognition of religious liberty.

- On the corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and 7th St. N.W. is the Temperance Fountain with the inscription of Temperance, Charity, Hope, and Faith. Nearby is a quote from St. Paul.
- Near the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, engraved on the sidewalk, there is the *56 Signers of the Declaration of Independence Memorial* with an inscription referencing our “firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence.”
- There is a frieze on the Supreme Court Building that depicts Moses.
- The entrance doors to the Supreme Court, made of oak, have the Ten Commandments engraved on each lower portion of each door.
- Inside the Supreme Court, right above where the Justices sit, there is a display of Moses and the Ten Commandments.

These are just some of the tributes to our Judeo-Christian heritage found in Washington, D.C. Noticeably absent are tributes to the contributions made by secularists. Small wonder.

*P.S. To read more about this issue, see *One Nation Under God: Religious Symbols, Quotes, and Images in Our Nation's Capitol*, by Fr. Eugene F. Hemrick.*

FLAWED SURVEY DEMONIZES CHRISTIANS

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

A new poll on LGBT rights was published in March by the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI), a left-wing outfit with a reputation for crafting politically skewed surveys. Its most prominent researcher, sociologist Robert P. Jones, is well known for demonizing so-called Christian nationalists.

PRRI recently released its 2023 American Values Atlas report, "Views On LGBTQ Rights In All 50 States." It offers more proof that the aforementioned flaws are extant. As a sociologist and a Catholic leader, Bill Donohue has great interest in this subject.

First a word about LGBT people (there is no need to add a "Q"—it stands for Queers and is therefore a redundancy).

The typical LGBT person is a young Democrat with no religious affiliation. This makes perfect sense.

Transgenderism, the ideology that falsely holds that the sexes are interchangeable, is a culturally induced phenomenon that is more attractive to young people than older Americans. Democrats are mostly liberals, and as such they have an expansive view of sexuality. Secular-minded persons reject nature, and nature's God, and are therefore easy bait for transgender influencers.

To put it differently, the older a person is, the less likely he is to buy into this mad idea. Republicans tend to be conservatives and are therefore more immune to trendy fashions unhinged from reality. Religious Americans appreciate nature, and nature's God, and are thus inhospitable to militant secular ideas.

There are two aspects of the survey that deserve a riposte.

One of the questions asked respondents was whether they supported or opposed "allowing a small business owner in your state to refuse to provide products or services to gay or lesbian people if doing so would violate their religious

beliefs.”

This is a dishonest question. In fact, it is a red herring designed to make religious persons look intolerable.

It is dishonest because PRRI knows that this issue, which was broached in two similar Colorado cases that wound up in the Supreme Court, had nothing do to with denying homosexuals products or services because of their sexual orientation. It had to do with the religious rights of Christians being violated for having to *affirm conduct* they could not in good conscience do.

Neither Jack Phillips nor Lorie Smith ever denied serving a customer who was gay or lesbian. Phillips sold them cakes and Smith serviced their websites. But when Phillips was asked to personally inscribe a wedding cake for two men, he refused. Smith issued a preemptive strike by publicly stating that she would not provide web services celebrating gay weddings. The high court agreed with them, noting the obvious religious liberty issues involved.

PRRI, following Jones’ obsession with Christian nationalism, claims that those who believe that America was founded as a Christian nation and should return to its moorings are a threat to democracy.

If someone were to say that America was founded as a secular nation and should become even more secular, would it be fair to say that this person is a threat to democracy? Of course not. One may disagree, but to assert that we are on the verge of a despotic secular regime would be as irresponsible as saying that Christian nationalists are about to establish a theocracy.

PRRI is not simply reporting survey results—it is setting the political table for liberals.

For example, Politico, a mostly responsible liberal media

outlet, seems to go off the rails when it comes to Christian nationalism. Last month it maintained that if Trump wins in November, his allies are ready to infuse Christian nationalism in his second administration. It claimed to have the evidence to buttress its position, yet it conceded that “The documents obtained by Politico do not outline specific Christian nationalist policies.” That’s because there are none.

Heidi Przybyla wrote a piece for Politico last month that set off the alarms. The issue was the conviction, shared by millions of Americans, and encoded in the Declaration of Independence, that our rights come from God, not from government (that was what Stalin, Hitler and Mao believed). This simple observation was enough to send her into orbit. Now it would have come as a shocker to Jefferson, who was not exactly a religious guy, that he was a Christian nationalist.

PRRI knows what it is doing. None of what they did was a mistake. Which is why they are not to be trusted.

PUBLIC CONCERNED ABOUT LOSS OF RELIGION

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Is it a good thing, or a bad thing, for a free society to have a vibrant role for religion? The Founders, not all of whom were practicing Christians, were unanimous in their conviction: the public role of religion is indispensable to the crafting of a free society. The American people in 2024

seem to agree.

In a recent survey by Pew Research Center, 80 percent of Americans say that religion's role in American life is shrinking, and most conclude that it is not a good thing. This is significant given that this is the highest percentage ever recorded in a Pew survey on this issue. It was also found that 57 percent of Americans express a positive view of religion's influence in American life.

The survey did not ask why it is not a good thing for religion's role to recede, but it is likely that it has something to do with the fact that the inculcation of religious values has a stabilizing effect on individuals, and hence on society. Also, character building, which is essential to citizenship, is facilitated by religion. Unfortunately, American society has become more unstable and character building has become more difficult.

Another bad sign: the faithful are in a precarious state. Almost half, 48 percent, say there's "a great deal" of or "some" conflict between their religious beliefs and mainstream American culture (up from 42 percent in 2020). In fact, 3-in-10 (29 percent) now think of themselves as religious minorities. This is what we would expect from an increasingly secular society—religious Americans are in an uneasy spot.

The public looks to the president of the United States to defend the faithful. Indeed, 64 percent say it is important for the president to stand up for religious Americans. Interestingly, most don't believe that either Trump or Biden is very religious: the figures are 13 percent and 4 percent, respectively. This is striking given that Biden has gone out of his way to hawk his Catholic credentials.

While Americans are concerned about the declining effect of religion on society, they are wary about extremists, and not just religious extremists. They do not support those who are

too aggressive in pushing either a religious or a secular agenda. This is prudent: extremists are not a good role model.

Regarding this issue, it is interesting to note that secularists—atheists, agnostics and the religiously unaffiliated—are more likely to say that conservative Christians have gone too far with their agenda (72 percent) than Christians are to say that liberals who are not religious have gone too far with their agenda (63 percent). This helps to explain why the faithful believe there is a tension between their beliefs and the mainstream American culture. In short, it seems likely that they are feeling the pinch of militant secularists.

Secularists have made a lot of hay lately over the threat of so-called Christian nationalists. But if these people were really the threat that secularists say they are, the majority of Americans wouldn't say they have never heard or read about Christian nationalism. So much for this bogeyman. It would be more accurate to say that it is not those being charged as extremists who are the problem; it is those making the charge.

The survey also found that while most Americans don't want Christianity to be the official religion, a plurality (44 percent) of those who think this way nonetheless believe the federal government should promote Christian moral values. There is nothing inconsistent with this view. In fact, it is identical to the beliefs of the Founders: they did not want an established church, but they also maintained that the nation would benefit by advancing *Christian-inspired* values.

It would be instructive to learn what Americans consider secular values to be and why they are not supportive of them. The findings would no doubt prove to be enlightening, both for the faithful and for secularists.

BIGOTED PLAYWRIGHT IS DEAD

This is the article that appeared in the May 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Christopher Durang died on April 2nd. In its obituary on the homosexual anti-Catholic playwright, the *New York Times* predictably treated him with admiration, saying he had an “impish wit.”

The most anti-Catholic, and celebrated, play that Durang ever wrote was “Sister Mary Ignatius Explains It All for You.” The *Times* obit branded it “an absurdist lacerating one-act” play. It said not a word about its vicious portrayal of Catholicism.

When the play was first performed in New York City, many prominent non-Catholics labeled it anti-Catholic, including the Anti-Defamation League and the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Here is what we previously said about the play.

“The play features a malicious nun who is confronted by four of her former students. All of them are obviously dysfunctional, a condition directly traceable to their Catholic upbringing. The play not only manages to mock virtually every Catholic teaching, it goes after Jesus with a vengeance—from the Nativity to the Crucifixion; the Virgin Mary is similarly disparaged. In the end, the nun shoots and kills two of her ex-students.”

The *New York Times* knows all about the anti-Catholicism that marks “Sister Mary Ignatius,” but it is not offended.

SUPPORT DETRANSITIONERS

This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

March 12 was Detransition Awareness Day, the most important LGBT day of the year. Those who are responsible for transgenderism, the pernicious ideology that holds that the sexes are not binary and are interchangeable, will never call attention to this day, and that is because it seriously undercuts their crusade. But we at the Catholic League are not afraid to celebrate it.

The tide is turning. The insane idea that biology doesn't matter—we can self-identify our sex—has peaked. It is true that the Biden administration continues to promote transgenderism. It is also true that elite American institutions in the behavioral sciences and the medical community continue to misinform the public. But the good news is that, even there, many are rethinking their position, coming over to our side.

Our side is the side of science. Their side is the side of politics.

Jamie Reed is a middle-age woman who calls herself a queer and says she is politically to the left of Bernie Sanders. She is married to a woman who thinks she is a man, a so-called transman. She took a job in 2018 at a transgender center at St. Louis Children's Hospital and saw how children with gender dysphoria are treated. She left last November because of what she witnessed.

“By the time I departed,” she wrote, “I was certain that the way the American medical system is treating these patients is the opposite of the promise we make to ‘do no harm.’ Instead, we are permanently harming the vulnerable patients in our care.”

To those who think this is just anecdote, they’re wrong.

The American College of Pediatricians recently did a review of more than 60 studies on the issue of adolescents who have transitioned. They concluded that “There are no long-term studies demonstrating benefits nor studies evaluating risks associated with the medical and surgical interventions provided to these adolescents.” Similarly, there is “no long-term evidence that mental health concerns are decreased or alleviated after ‘gender-affirming therapy.’”

The same organization found that “there is strong evidence that children and adolescents who identify as transgender have experienced significant psychological trauma leading to their gender dysphoria.” Therefore, they said, they “cannot condone the social affirmation, medical intervention, or surgical mutilation of children and adolescents identifying as transgender or gender nonconforming.”

By all accounts, the Europeans are way ahead of the Americans. The medical profession there has woken up and begun to realize that transgenderism should not be promoted. Even the Dutch, who were the first to tout its benefits in 2011, have concluded their enthusiasm for transitioning was not based on strong data.

The *Economist*, an influential British liberal weekly, wants desperately to believe in transgenderism, but has to admit that the medical evidence in support of it is “worryingly weak.” It cites a review of this subject conducted by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. “The academic evidence it found was weak, discouraging and

sometimes contradictory....”

Tavistock, the English institute, is the world’s largest pediatric gender clinic. It was closed last year after an independent review. According to the Society for Evidence Based Gender Medicine, the clinic was “not a safe or viable long-term option.” This is because their work was “based on poor evidence and its model of care leaves young people ‘at considerable risk’ of poor mental health.”

The authors of an article published last year in the journal of the Danish Medical Association found their initial well-meaning intentions were based on insufficient evidence—they encouraged transitioning—but came to realize that they were doing more harm than good and sharply reversed course.

Dr. Riittakerttu Kaltiala, a Finnish-born psychiatrist who heads the department of adolescent psychiatry at Finland’s Tampere University Hospital, was among the first physicians in the world to head a gender identity clinic for minors. She, too, has reversed course.

In a statement she wrote that was signed by 20 clinicians from nine countries, she said, “Every systematic review of evidence to date, including one published in the *Journal of the Endocrine Society*, has found the evidence for mental health benefits of hormonal interventions for minors to be of low or very low certainty.” She knows why so many professionals have been snookered. “Medicine, unfortunately, is not immune to dangerous groupthink that results in patient harm.”

Last year, a group of five professionals in Norway examined what the medical community was promoting and took them to task for not following the science. Sex-affirming treatment with hormones and surgery, they said, was “not correct.” They explained why. “Such treatment methods, which have irreversible and significant consequences, have a weak knowledge base.”

In a lengthy piece published in February by the *New York Times*, it found that young people who have detransitioned, and medical professionals who no longer support transgenderism, are often stigmatized for doing so.

Those who have detransitioned, or are contemplating it, deserve our widespread support. They do not need to be marginalized by bullies who are too ideologically corrupt, or greedy, to realize that transgenderism is a monumental fraud.