

LGBT MANIA ABUSING KIDS AND PARENTS

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](#).

What started as switching the genitals of minors behind the backs of parents has now evolved to the stage where children are being abducted from their parents if they object. This is the kind of nightmare that few would believe could happen in the United States as recently as 9/11. It is also the kind of condition we would normally associate with totalitarian regimes.

In 2015, Oregon became the first state in the nation to allow 15-year-olds to get sex-reassignment surgery without parental consent. Now the state of Indiana is taking children away from their parents if they object.

The U.S. Supreme Court has declined to hear the Indiana case. When a Catholic couple learned that their son identified as a girl, they provided mental health services for him, but they did not agree to affirm his new status. Government officials learned of this and moved with dispatch to remove the teenage boy from his parents and place him in a home. There was no evidence of parental abuse of any kind, just a disagreement about the kind of treatment the boy should have.

This is child abuse and the abuser is the government. The sincerely held religious convictions of a responsible Catholic couple have been eviscerated by ideological zealots who work for the state. Even if the couple were atheists, the government has no right to do this. Instead of putting the confused child in a home, the government officials who abducted him should be sent to prison.

This madness never ends. There is a bill in Illinois that would allow the government to charge the parents of a minor with child abuse if they do not accede to their child's desire to transition to the other sex, or have an abortion.

All over Europe, nations which once heralded sex transition surgeries for minors are pulling back, and this includes the Netherlands, home to studies from 2011 which concluded they are beneficial. They later found the data were weak and reversed themselves.

Britain, Finland, Norway and Sweden were once strong advocates, but no more. They now regret doing so. The evidence is clear: so-called gender-affirming care for minors is dangerous to their mental and physical health. Regrettably, the U.S. has yet to figure this out. It is still harming innocent children, and this crusade is being led by the Biden administration.

Minors are not allowed to get a tattoo and teachers are not allowed to give them an aspirin. Yet these same children are allowed to have their hormones altered and their genitals mutilated while keeping their parents in the dark. But it is okay for school officials to know. Indeed, they are often the officiators.

Parents are the only ones who can stop this insanity—the medical profession, educators and government agents have become the enemy. The monetary and ideological profit being made by legally exploiting children is what fires them. There can't be enough lawsuits.

SUPPORT WANING FOR LGBT MOVEMENT

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](#).

There are now more Americans who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender than at any time in history. A new Gallup poll shows that the LGBT population stands at 7.6 percent. But look for it to peak soon.

More than half of that population identifies as bisexual, a tribute, no doubt, to the encouragement they receive from those who tell young people that in order to find their true self, they need to “experiment.”

Then there are activists like Andrea Long Chu, a man who falsely claims to be a woman—he is featured in *New York Magazine*—who argues that transitioning to the opposite sex (a biological impossibility) is a fundamental human right, even for kids. He realizes, however, that he is having a hard time trying to convince liberals to get on board. Many have elected to sit this one out.

Chu is not wrong in his assessment: many liberals are reluctant to embrace transgenderism, and that is because they know in their heart of hearts that this sick ideology is a fraud. But God forbid they get tagged as a conservative, so it is best to sit this one out. How brave.

The good news is that support for transgenderism is waning. By a margin of 3-1, a new Rasmussen poll found that the public is opposed to giving minors puberty blockers and submitting them to sex-reassignment surgery. As for males who claim to be a female and want to compete in girl and women’s sports, the

survey found that by a margin on 7-1, Americans are opposed to it.

More good news. In England, the National Health Service has ruled that doctors can no longer prescribe puberty blockers to children seeking to transition. The statement said that “there is not enough evidence of safety and clinical effectiveness.”

There will come a day when the public will look back at this period in Western history (the rest of the world has never bought into this mad idea) and declare it to be an era when child abuse was celebrated by the medical profession, as well as by elites in all walks of life.

This is the most critical civil rights issue of our day—protecting children from those activists, philanthropists, educators, journalists, social media influencers, therapists and doctors who prey on them for ideological or financial profit. The tide is turning against them, but it is not fast enough.

Had we followed the teachings of the Catholic Church on this subject—as well as on matters of sexuality in general—we would not have gone down this road in the first place. However, it is never too late to wake up.

COVERING UP FOR A MASS SHOOTER

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](#).

The shooter who was killed after crashing Joel Osteen's Lakewood Church in Houston on February 11 has been identified as Genesse Ivonne Moreno. She was a biological woman, but was she also a transman? It matters, because the media have been quick to cover-up such stories.

We have prepared a timeline of media reports that unfolded. (It is available on our website.)

On Monday, February 12, the Houston CBS affiliate reported that "Moreno had used multiple aliases, including Jeffrey Escalante...." Jeffrey?

According to the Texas Department of Public Safety, Moreno primarily identified as "Jeffrey Escalantemoreno." Why would a person who was not trans do that? It makes no sense. Do people called Jeffrey go around calling themselves Janice?

As a side note, we found that in mug shots taken years ago, as compared to recent ones, Moreno appears to look more feminine than she was at the time of her death.

The Houston NBC affiliate described her as "transgender" in its online reporting on February 12. During its noon broadcast that day, the Houston NBC affiliate once again describes Moreno as "transgender."

The Daily Wire also reported that according to arrest records, "Moreno identified as a man named 'Jeffrey' in recent years." This is telling.

Back to the Houston NBC affiliate. We found that it stopped describing Moreno as transgender on February 12 in its evening report. But it did mention that the Houston Police Commander said there were some "discrepancies," including the alias Jeffrey Escalante.

It matters greatly if Moreno identified as a man named Jeffrey. Unfortunately, as we have detailed, trans persons

have a violent history.

Last year, we provided evidence of this on March 31, October 11 and October 12. Moreover, on March 30 last year we called attention to the games the media were playing trying to downplay the violent streak in trans persons. We noted that NBC News was the most egregious offender.

When the media were covering the clergy sexual abuse scandal, they made sure every miniscule piece of information was made public. But when it comes to trans violence, they do just the opposite.

It has been well established that trans persons have serious mental issues. They need help, not compassionate cover-ups. The sooner they are treated for their psychological disorders, the better they will be and the safer the public will be.

Bill Donohue sent a letter to Houston Mayor John Whitmire to ask him make public all records that pertain to this issue. A copy of his letter was also sent to Troy Finner, Chief of Police.

NY WOMAN GOV. SIDES WITH MISOGYNISTS

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](#).

Why does the woman governor of New York, Kathy Hochul, want to destroy women's sports?

Bruce Blakeman is the Nassau County executive. He recently

signed an executive order mandating that any sports entity that wants to hold athletic events in county parks or facilities must “expressly designate” that its teams are male, female or coed, based on the biological sex of the athlete. In other words, males who falsely identify as female must compete against other males; the obverse holds as well.

It is to be expected that the ACLU would object—any organization that falsely believes that men can become pregnant is bound to get it wrong. But Hochul is a woman who says she champions women’s rights. Not when it comes to women’s sports.

Hochul went ballistic when Blakeman held his ground. She accused the women’s rights advocate of “bullying trans kids.”

This is a lie. He did nothing of the sort. Trans kids are not barred from competing in athletics nor has Blakeman bullied them.

“There is nothing lower than trying to score cheap political points by putting a target on the backs of some of our state’s most vulnerable children,” Hochul said.

“Putting a target” on the backs of young people? Accusing someone of violence is a serious matter, and if Blakeman were not a public figure, he could sue her for libel and win. Hochul is out of control.

Hochul is not only discriminating against women, she is endangering them. To cite a recent example, in February three female basketball players in Massachusetts were injured by a male who falsely claimed to be a woman. The coach of the girl’s team forfeited the game after the remaining players on his team were afraid to compete.

Surveys show that 7-in-10 Americans are opposed to allowing biological men to compete in women’s sports. But Hochul still doesn’t get it.

Hochul can shout from the rooftop about being a supporter of women's rights, but the fact is that it is Blakeman, not her, who is the real deal. She has laid anchor with misogynists, doing the dirty work of sabotaging women's rights.

MARYLAND AG ASKED TO END CHURCH PROBE

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](#).

Catholic League president Bill Donohue asked Maryland Attorney General Anthony G. Brown to end the investigation of clergy sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. It has yielded not a single indictment and the alleged offenders are either dead or missing.

February 27, 2024

Hon. Anthony G. Brown
Maryland Attorney General
200 St. Paul Place
Baltimore, MD 21202

Dear Attorney General Brown:

It is exasperating, to say the least, to learn that your office wants to continue its investigating of clergy sexual abuse of minors in the Catholic Church. After all, the results of the 463-page interim report on the Archdiocese of Baltimore released last April on this subject turned out to be a total waste of money. It did not result in a single indictment.

There is a good reason why nothing came of the probe: of the 156 individuals who were accused of molestation dating back to the 1930s, 104 of them—two-thirds—are dead. Another third are alive, but none is in ministry; it is unknown whether they are alive or dead.

Of the 156 individuals, the archdiocese had already published the names of 152 of them. Two were nuns, four were male teachers, five were deacons, one was briefly in the seminary in Maryland before being kicked out, and 144 were priests.

Most of the abuse took place in the 1960s and 1970s. Between the mid-1930s and the mid-1940s, there were zero instances of alleged abuse. Between 1990 and 2019, there were virtually no instances of alleged abuse. Which begs the question: Why is the investigation being extended?

What makes this particularly disturbing is the fact that a *USA Today* study of the sexual abuse of minors in the public schools, in every state, found that Maryland public schools had such a horrific record that the researchers gave it an “F.”

Yet there is no probe of the public schools. Why is this?

Why is it that the law in Maryland says that those who successfully sue a private institution can be awarded as much as \$1.5 million, but if the exact same offense were to take place in a public institution, the award is capped at \$890,000? This smacks of discrimination—we all know which private institution stands to be investigated and which private ones will be given a pass.

This is madness. The scandal in the Catholic Church is long over, not only in Maryland but across the nation (see my book [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#)).

At this point, given all that we know of the 2023 report, it

makes no sense to pursue this matter any further. That is why I am requesting that you finally end the investigation.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

cc: Maryland Gov. Wes Moore

Maryland lawmakers

Baltimore Archbishop William E. Lori

DISNEY'S EXCLUSIONARY IDEA OF INCLUSION

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](#).

The diversity industry functions more like a religious cult than a group of professional associations. It has a rigid core set of beliefs, and deviations from them are not welcome. Worse, the application of those beliefs often results in discrimination. It may strive for some degree of demographic diversity, but the most important expression of diversity of them all, namely diversity of thought, is not countenanced. Indeed, it is subject to punitive measures.

Disney is one of the nation's premier exponents of diversity. As such, it is not a coincidence that it has been hit with a federal civil rights complaint alleging discrimination.

America First Legal, ably led by former Trump administration

official Stephen Miller, contends that Disney “knowingly and intentionally” discriminates in its diversity, equity and inclusion policy.

“Disney maintains multiple programs that facilitate the limiting, segregating, or classifying of employees or applicants for employment and new business in ways that would deprive or tend to deprive, white, male, or heterosexual individuals of employment, training, or promotions because of their race, color, sex, or national origin.”

Disney says it bases its policy on norms adopted by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences and the British Film Institute. These organizations focus on what they call “underrepresented groups.” Who are they?

- African American/Black/African and/or Caribbean descent
- East Asian (including Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Mongolian)
- Hispanic or Latina/e/o/x
- Indigenous Peoples (including Native American/Alaskan Native)
- Middle Easterner/North African
- Pacific Islander
- South Asian (including Bangladeshi, Bhutanese, Indian, Nepali, Pakistani, and Sri Lankan)
- Southeast Asian (including Burmese, Cambodian, Filipino, Hmong, Indonesian, Laotian, Malaysian, Mien, Singaporean, Thai, and Vietnamese)
- LGBTQ+
- People with cognitive or physical disabilities, or who are deaf or hard of hearing

There was no mention of the blind or dwarfs.

Nor was there any mention of Catholics or Protestants, yet everyone knows that, beginning in the late 1960s, Hollywood has produced a slew of Christian bashing movies, many of which

have been chronicled by the Catholic League (prior to the late 1960s, Hollywood showed no signs of bigotry against Christians).

Why, then, in the name of diversity, does Hollywood—and Disney, in particular—not mention Christians?

Disney has a post on its website called “Belong.” Under the banner of “Our Diversity & Inclusion Journey,” it says, “Our focus and intent encourages people from every nation, race/ethnicity, *belief*, gender, sexual identity, disability and *culture* to feel respected and valued for their unique contributions to our businesses (our italics).”

Why was the term “belief” used and not “religion”? By saying people from every “culture” are to be respected, wouldn’t that mean religious people—religion is the heart of any culture—and wouldn’t that include Christians? Why the reticence?

In its “Community—Disney Social Responsibility” Statement, it lauds the Muslim Public Affairs Council Hollywood Bureau and the ADL, a Jewish anti-defamation organization. Why are no Catholic or Protestant civil rights groups mentioned?

Disney also aligns itself with Tanenbaum; it is a consulting group that deals with religious discrimination. Tanenbaum says its mission, in part, is to tackle “religious bullying of students [and] harassment” in the workplace. What about religious students who are bullied? There is no shortage of examples. Why are they treated as if they are only the victimizers?

In the name of inclusion, Disney practices some of the most exclusionary policies imaginable. There seems to be a place at the table for just about everyone, save for Christians. Not until it breaks out of its cult-like cocoon, will Disney mature and stop excluding Catholics and Protestants (especially evangelicals).

MEET THE TIKTOK NUN

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](#).

She's advertised quite a bit on Fox News, posing as an advocate for TikTok. In full habit, she is introduced as Sister Monica Clare. Most people would just assume she is a Catholic nun—there aren't too many Protestant ones—but they would be wrong. She's an Episcopalian.

Sister Monica Clare may look like a traditionalist, but she is very much a radical activist. She champions gender equality, "inclusion," women's rights (presumably abortion) and Black Lives Matter (she's even marched with them).

Born Claudette Monica Powell, she grew up in an unhappy household. Her father was a drug addict and mentally ill. She attended a Baptist church with her family, recalling that the Southern Baptists "were very anti-Roman Catholic." She now claims expertise in dealing with "religious trauma."

The good sister belongs to a small group of nuns in Mendham, New Jersey. In fact, it's a dying order: at 58, she is the youngest of them all. Before becoming a nun she was married for two years to a "fanatical atheist," which ended in divorce.

She then considered joining a Catholic order of nuns, confessing that her life was unfulfilled. But she did not like the Church's teachings on homosexuality and was put off by the male clergy. Lucky for her, she is now about to become an Episcopal priest.

Her future is uncertain. While she is sure to continue posting animal videos, will her quest to climb the hierarchy and assume a privileged position in the Episcopal Church leave her TikTok fans feeling disabused? Or will she use her new mantle to become an even more rabid advocate of left-wing causes?

One thing is for certain. TikTok needs her. Under fire by Republicans and Democrats alike, it has been accused of violating data privacy and national security. John F. Plumb, assistant secretary of defense for space policy, has called it a “potential threat vector” to the United States. “Chinese cyber intrusions are the most prolific in the world,” he says.

Congresswoman Cathy McMorris Rodgers has accused TikTok of conspiring with the Communists, saying, “The Chinese Communist Party poses the greatest national security threat to the United States of our time.” Congressman Mike Gallagher is even more pointed. “This is my message to Tiktok: break up with the Chinese Communist Party or lose access to American users.” On March 13, the House voted 352-65 to ban TikTok.

When Sister Monica Clare climbs the social ladder to Rev. (it makes no sense for a woman to call herself “Father,” unless, of course, she wants to self-identity as such), she may be asked to save TikTok from Washington. The pivotal question is whether she is more likely to side with the Communists than the Congress.

OSCAR FOR RELIGIOPHOBIA WARRANTED

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](#).

It is time for the Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences to award an Oscar for Best Performance of Religiophobia. It would prove to be a very competitive field, and would have the benefit of raising awareness about Hollywood's long suffering malady.

From all accounts, the movie with the most overtly religious theme that was nominated for an Oscar this year is "Poor Things"; it was in the running for Best Picture. It tells the story of a woman who was "created" by a scientist—its Frankenstein appeal is palpable—who raises her as his child. She refers to him as her father and as "my God." Eventually, she turns on him, ultimately rejecting authority of any kind.

Movieguide, published by the Christian Film & Television Commission (Bill Donohue serves on its board of advisors), called "Poor Things" a "Marxist, humanist, socialist, feminist brand of hedonism and one of the most obscene, blasphemous, abhorrent, and disgusting movies ever released by a major Hollywood studio."

This explains why the Academy nominated it for Best Picture.

Rob Reiner, more commonly known as "Meathead," released a movie last month that demonstrates the pervasiveness of religiophobia in Hollywood.

"God and Country" is about an alleged threat to American democracy posed by so-called Christian nationalists. The Meathead would have the audience believe that we are on the verge of a theocratic takeover, though few outside of Hollywood and other secular subcultures pay any attention to this fable. The Hollywood Reporter went so far as to liken the current American situation to Nazi Germany.

As for the Meathead, he says Christian nationalism is out to

make us a Christian nation, something the Founders rejected. It is true that the Founders did not want the establishment of a Christian nation, but it is also true that they recognized, and indeed applauded, the founding of a *Christian-inspired* nation. That is why there are four references to God in the Declaration of Independence.

Here's the good news. "God and Country" is a bomb. It took in a whopping \$38,415 in its first weekend—over four-days—playing in 85 theaters. As one movie critic put it, this means it averaged \$451 per theater, a stunning achievement, even for the Meathead.

Time for Hollywood to award an Oscar for Best Performance for Religiophobia. Call it reparations to the faithful, especially Christians.

OUR SCHIZOPHRENIC DRUG POLICIES

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](#).

The more states legalize drugs, the more crowded hospital ER's become. But the liberal elites in charge of dealing with this issue are unable to connect the dots. Their policies are downright incoherent. Indeed, they are schizophrenic.

Connecticut lawmakers have sounded the alarms over drinking and driving and will soon decide whether to lower the state's blood alcohol level from .08 to .05. The national norm is .08; only Utah pins it at .05.

Yet when it comes to marijuana, Connecticut goes easy. It fully legalized marijuana on January 10, 2023. Adults age 21 and over can legally buy seven grams for recreational use.

The government is so proud of its new policy that it hypes it on its "Visit Connecticut" webpage. It not only tells stoners where to buy weed, it advises them to buy "Munchies," featuring chocolate. This is not an accident: brownies are a popular pot edible.

Are Connecticut officials aware that it takes a much longer time for edible users to experience a high, resulting in greater intake and greater risks? Those who take edibles are more likely to wind up in the ER than smokers.

Ever responsible, the webpage closes with a promo for gambling, exclaiming, "it's worth letting loose in a casino." Assuming the stoner is capable of standing up.

Ask any cop who pulls drivers over for reckless driving and he will tell you that driving under the influence of alcohol and marijuana is increasingly common. The problem is there is no reliable test for marijuana. Breathalyzers can be used to nail beer drinkers but are useless for nailing pot smokers.

There is a blood test for alcohol, as well as for marijuana, but the problem with the latter is that even if a driver smoked weed two days earlier (even weeks earlier in some cases), the test will come back positive, thus undercutting successful prosecution.

Many states, not just Connecticut, are treating marijuana as a relatively safe drug.

At the federal level, the Biden administration is pushing hard to deemphasize its negative effects. The Department of Health and Human Services wants marijuana use to be treated as a Schedule III drug, which would put it in the same class as Tylenol with codeine; currently weed is classified as Schedule

I, meaning it is treated as a serious drug.

If the Biden administration is right to say that marijuana poses no major risk, then why did psychologists recently conclude that a California woman who stabbed to death her boyfriend 108 times—after taking *one* hit of marijuana—was suffering from “cannabis-induced psychosis”? Consequently, the judge set her free on probation.

Some people learn the hard way. In 2020, 58 percent of Oregon voters decided the time had come to decriminalize all drugs, including fentanyl, heroin, oxycodone and meth. They treated them like chewing gum. The result? One in five quickly became addicted and death due to opioid overdose skyrocketed. So did homelessness and crime. Now a majority of Oregonians (56%) want to repeal this insane policy.

No matter, the sages who run the editorial page at the *Boston Globe* still believe that banning drugs is not the answer. Yet they readily admit that because of decriminalization in some states, and relaxed enforcement in most of the other states, marijuana use has increased dramatically. More important, the medical professionals they interviewed admit that matters are out of control.

Dr. A. Eden Evins is the founding director of the Mass General Hospital Center for Addiction Medicine. Here is how he describes the changes. “Cannabis use is now the number one reason why young people present for addiction, *which wasn’t the case before.*”

Sharon Levy is chief of the Division of Addiction Medicine at Boston Children’s Hospital. When she started practicing addiction medicine around 2000, the editors note, “she hadn’t heard of hyperemesis—severe vomiting caused by repeated cannabis use. Now she hears cases where adolescents are hospitalized repeatedly because they cannot keep food down (our emphasis).”

“Levy said she is *also seeing* more teens with psychotic symptoms like hallucinations, delusions, disordered thinking, and paranoia. This is particularly troubling, she said, because a teenager with cannabis-induced psychosis is more likely to develop mental illness as an adult (*our italics*).”

In other words, what these doctors are saying is that relaxed sanctions for marijuana use have resulted in a crisis condition. But the editors at the *Boston Globe* still don't get it. What do they recommend? Education. We need more “consistent and accurate labeling.” Yeah, that'll do it.

Liberals are a tortured people. They hate the effects of drug use yet they don't want to do anything about it. They hate homelessness yet their only answer is to build more tents. They hate migrants overburdening towns across the country yet they love sanctuary cities and don't want to prosecute illegals.

But it is not as though liberals are against using the law to punish all lawbreakers. They are very much in favor of locking up non-violent protesters who pray outside abortion clinics—they are an existential threat to the social order.

BIDENS HONOR WOMAN WHO ABORTED HER BABY

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](#).

Most Americans are conflicted about abortion, and most are reluctant to condemn a woman who has had one. But they are

also reluctant to honor those who have. Not the Bidens.

At the State of the Union on March 7, the Bidens showcased Kate Cox, a woman who left Texas in December to have her baby aborted. The First Lady and the president spoke to her in January after the abortion.

Cox's child was diagnosed as having Trisomy 18, more popularly known as Edwards syndrome. It is a severe genetic disorder that typically results in a miscarriage during the first three months of pregnancy; 95 percent of these babies do not make it to term. Cox was 20 weeks pregnant when she had her abortion.

According to White House Secretary, Karine Jean-Pierre, Cox was "forced to go to court to seek permission for the care she needed for a non-viable pregnancy that threatened the life—that threatened her life." But the justices in Texas who ruled on this case did not all see eye to eye on this issue.

It is true that the District Court of Travis County said that Cox's doctor, Damla Karsan, concluded that her patient's life was threatened and merited a D&E abortion. But the Texas Supreme Court noted that "Dr. Karsan did not assert that Ms. Cox has a 'life-threatening physical condition' or that, in Dr. Karsan's reasonable medical judgment, an abortion is necessary because Ms. Cox has the type of condition the exception requires."

Turning to the medical community, a study published in the *American Journal of Perinatology* in 2017 concluded there was no increased maternal risk involved in Trisomy 18 pregnancies.

Cheering Cox on is the Center for Reproductive Rights who, with Cox, sued Texas. It is one of the most well-funded pro-abortion institutions in the world. It is disturbed that so many disabilities organizations are decidedly pro-life. "At times," it says, "the disability rights movement has in fact alienated feminists by forging strategic alliances with anti-abortion groups to advance shared priorities, or by remaining

silent on the abortion issue in order to avoid controversy within their own movement.”

In a poll taken last month, 58 percent of Americans believe that babies born with Down syndrome should not be aborted.

It is bad enough that the Bidens are flagging Kate Cox’s decision to abort her baby. It is worse that they deliberately chose a woman to be honored who was carrying a baby with disabilities. Quite frankly, Jill Biden is exploiting this woman to enhance the political capital of her husband.