

DOES BUTTIGIEG REALLY HAVE A HUSBAND?

Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg recently told Fox News host Brett Baier that his travel expenses were not inappropriate, especially given that other public officials have taken their spouses on official business trips. “Why is it any different when it’s me and my husband?” Baier had no answer.

Does Buttigieg really have a husband? Of course not. He may love Chasten but he can never be his husband. Why not? Because he has been disqualified by nature.

It is true that Buttigieg is legally married, but that is a legal fiction. The Britannica Encyclopedia defines a legal fiction as “a rule assuming as true something that is clearly false.” The idea that a man can have a husband is clearly false—he can only have a wife—despite claims to the contrary.

Buttigieg’s “marriage” is recognized by the positive law, or by what lawmakers and judges posit, but it is not recognized by the natural law. The natural law, which was first promulgated by Aristotle and Cicero (and later amended by Aquinas), holds that morality is a function of human nature, and that we can arrive at moral strictures on the basis of observation and reason.

As human beings, Aquinas said, we are given to three natural inclinations, one of which is reproduction (the others being self-preservation and reason). Reproduction has been ordained by nature, and nature’s God, as the province of a man and a woman. Two men cannot reproduce anymore than two women can. It therefore makes no sense to say that people of the same sex can marry.

Marriage exists so that the sex drive of men and women can be

constructively channeled in such a way as to provide for stable families, without which children suffer. But only people of the opposite sex are capable of performing this function (even allowing for the reality that some are sterile).

There is an anatomical goodness-of-fit to a man and a woman that permits them to become one flesh, and it is this union—and only this union—that allows them to reproduce. This is natural. Without a male and a female mating, the world would come to an end. Deviations from this are therefore unnatural.

Think of it this way. It is an axiom of natural law that everything has a law that is built into its nature. For example, it is a law of electricity that if we want to generate it, we must insert the plug into the socket. Having two plugs or two sockets touch each other delivers no juice. Plugs and sockets are related, but they are different, and attempts to conjoin them always render sterile results.

Here are some other analogies.

No man can have a husband anymore than a man can bear a child. He can say he does but that doesn't make it true. A stepfather can tell strangers that he is the father of his wife's children, but that doesn't make it true. If someone introduced his uncle to a stranger, saying, this is my aunt Joe, no one would believe him. Those who have blue eyes can claim they have brown eyes, but that doesn't change reality. A left-handed person can claim to be right-handed, but observation tells us otherwise. Gorillas do not give birth to kangaroos.

Nature can be stubborn. It is not a social construct. It is fixed. The sooner we learn this verity, the better off our society will be.

So what should we call Chasten, if he is not Buttigieg's husband? His partner. The two of them may not like it, but

truth is not determined by what is popular. It is determined by what makes sense according to nature and nature's God.

SUPER BOWL OFF-THE-FIELD CONTROVERSIES

The Super Bowl halftime show and commercials were a good index of the state of our culture. We are split between those who opt for a traditional moral stance and those who prefer a secular approach. Both were on display during the game. More interesting was the reaction to what occurred.

He Gets Us is a Christian organization that has taken to the airwaves promoting the message of Jesus. It featured two Super Bowl ads, which cost \$20 million, and they got right to the point.

One ad depicted migrants seeking refuge from persecution, referencing Jesus, Mary and Joseph. The other portrayed people bickering over racial issues and the pandemic, reminding us that "Jesus loved the people we hate."

Had these ads run on TV decades ago, few would blink. But not today.

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez channeled Jesus, saying he would not "spend millions of dollars on Super Bowl ads to make fascism look benign." AOC did not explain what was fascistic about either of the Christian commercials.

Nick Fish is the president of American Atheists, and he too hated the Jesus commercials. He said those behind the ads "have funded anti-LGBTQ, anti-choice, anti-immigrant, and anti-democracy extremism from the Christian Nationalism

movement.” He offered no evidence to support his hysterical claims.

Both AOC and Fish made it clear, without being explicit, that they are perturbed because one of the organizations supporting the Jesus ads is Hobby Lobby, the evangelical-run store chain that won an important religious liberty victory in the U.S. Supreme Court.

Then we have Rihanna, who took the opportunity to portray herself as a role model for young black girls. During her halftime show, she grabbed her behind and her crotch, smelled her hand, and humped around the stage. She did so while singing, “Come here rude boy, boy, can you get it up? Come here rude boy, boy, is you big enough?” The men got the message.

Why does the NFL invite halftime performers to wallow in the gutter? This seems to be the norm. Can any of these entertainers put on a show without getting vulgar? Are they all that morally debased?

Apparently, Rihanna drew less criticism from public figures than He Gets Us. That is a telling commentary on the direction of our culture.

WAR ON RELIGION SPIKING IN U.S. AND U.K.

People of faith, mostly Christian, in the United States and the United Kingdom, are being harassed and arrested by government agents at an alarming rate. The most common reason why these non-violent persons are being bullied is their

biblical objection to the radical LGBT agenda. Their freedom of speech and freedom of religion are being trounced, and most civil libertarians are cheering it on, so far gone are they from their founding principles.

Here are a few examples of this war on religion.

United States:

- In January, 2023, a dozen Catholic students and their chaperons from a Greenville, South Carolina Catholic high school were ordered out by staff of the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum in Washington D.C. because they wore beanies with pro-life messages. In town for the annual March for Life, they were allegedly mocked and cursed at by the museum staff.
- In January, 2023, Ivan Provorov, a hockey player for the Philadelphia Flyers, skipped the warmups on Pride Night because he was expected to wear a pro-Pride jersey. A member of the Russian Orthodox Church, he was subjected to hate speech by some fans and commentators. "I respect everybody's choices," he said. "My choice is to stay true to myself and my religion."
- In January, 2023, Paul Shoro, a black Christian, walked into the Mall of America in Bloomington, Minnesota, wearing a T-shirt that said, "Jesus Is The Only Way." Security officers, responding to complaints, said to him, "If you want to shop here you need to take off that shirt." He was explicitly told that "Jesus is associated with religion and it is offending people."
- In August, 2022, on the first day of class at George Washington University, a female psychology professor, Lara Sheehi, berated a Jewish female student in class because she said she was born in Israel. The professor continued to harass Jewish students throughout the semester, smearing their reputations and using bigoted and obscene language to describe Israel on Twitter.
- In April, 2022, three students at the University of

Idaho were asked by a fellow student why the Christian Legal Society (to which they belonged) required its members to believe in the Christian understanding of marriage. After they gave a biblical answer, they were reported to school officials, and three days later the university's Office of Civil Rights and Investigation censored their speech, ordering the Christian students to stop all communication between them and the complaining student.

- In January, 2022, a Michigan junior high school student filed suit in U.S. District Court against his high school district because he was suspended for three days the previous fall for stating his Christian beliefs in a private text conversation in a hallway at Plainwell High School.
- In January, 2022, a U.S. Army veteran was arrested for holding a sign that said "God bless the homeless vets." He was standing on the sidewalk in front of Alpharetta City Hall, a town in Georgia. He was handcuffed by police and charged with "panhandling," though all he did was hold the sign. He sued a year later.
- In October, 2021, a scholar-in-residence at Christopher Newport University in Newport News, Virginia, who "proudly and openly identified as a Christian woman of color," was condemned for criticizing DC Comics for making Superman's son bisexual. Students protested and wanted her removed from the campus, despite the fact that she deleted her tweet.

United Kingdom:

- In December, 2022, a Christian Englishwoman, Isabel Vaughan-Spruce, was arrested for silently praying outside an abortion clinic. She faces two years behind bars.
- In December, 2022, a Christian Englishman, Adam Smith-Connor, was accosted by the police for silently praying

outside an abortion clinic. The British army veteran was asked, "Can I ask what is the nature of your prayer today?" He was fined 100-pounds (roughly \$123.65).

- In April, 2022, Pastor John Sherwood was arrested by London police for causing "alarm and distress" to pedestrians. His crime was publicly quoting from Genesis about God's design for mankind.
- In April, 2022, a 76-year-old grandmother in Liverpool was questioned by the police, and then fined, for praying silently on a public street.

Notice that in every one of these cases it was militant secularists who complained about, or bullied, people of faith, most of whom are Christians. It is not the latter who are seeking to deny the rights of secularists; no, it is secularists who are punishing people of faith.

While all of these incidents are horrific, none smacks of totalitarianism more than the English cop who asked the army veteran, "Can I ask what is the nature of your prayer today?" That is right out of Stalin's Russia, Hitler's Germany and Mao's China. If they can find the technology to read your mind, some will demand that Christians caught praying in public be shot. That's where we're headed.

WESTERN WORLD AT WAR WITH CATHOLICS

There hasn't been a wave of virulent anti-Catholicism in the West like what we are currently witnessing in at least a hundred years.

In the 1920s, the Ku Klux Klan in the U.S. was on the march against Catholics, trying to force them to send their children

to public schools. Al Smith ran for president but was roundly condemned because of his Catholicism.

Meanwhile, in Europe, especially in Germany, anti-Catholicism got really nasty. Hitler emerged as a Nazi leader in the 1920s, at a time of moral collapse and anti-Catholicism. When he took over in the next decade, he promised to “crush [the Catholic Church] like a toad.”

Catholics in the West are not facing groups like the Klan or the Nazis today, but they are being monitored and persecuted for their faith by government bodies. That this is going on in what are called democracies is mind-boggling.

Here are some examples that emerged very recently!

In the U.S., the FBI began investigating orthodox Catholics, citing the far-left Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) as its source; it quickly dropped its probe. In an important whistle-blowing article published by Kyle Seraphin, a former FBI special agent, the Richmond Field Office of the FBI released a report on “Radical-Traditionalist Catholics,” or what they call RTCs.

The report says there is a difference between RTCs and “traditionalist Catholics.” The former are labeled extremist anti-Jewish and anti-gay bigots who reject Vatican II and who adhere to white supremacist ideology; the latter prefer the Latin Mass and pre-Vatican II teachings.

The document lists as RTCs a few groups which we are familiar with, and while they are certainly not associations the Catholic League identifies with, they are not violent-prone entities. Some of these people may be kooky, but they are not exactly Antifa, about which the FBI has done little. So why the probe?

The SPLC may call them “hate groups,” but that means nothing: it calls the Family Research Council and the Ruth Institute

hate groups, which is a scurrilous lie. Tony Perkins, who runs the former group, and Jennifer Roback Morse, who runs the latter, are both outstanding social conservatives. They are anything but hateful.

As Seraphin notes, "The FBI is forbidden from opening cases or publishing products based solely on First Amendment-protected activities." Why then the war on RTCs? What's next? A war on Catholics who are orthodox and who summarily reject the morally debased society that militant secularists have created?

Make no mistake, we are not done with this FBI story.

In Canada, a 16-year-old student who attends a Catholic high school was arrested for publicly stating that there are only two sexes and that male students should not use the women's restrooms. The student, Josh Alexander, attends St. Joseph's Catholic High School in Renfrew, Ontario, and his principal took the side of the police in punishing him for mouthing Catholic teachings on sexuality.

"I said there were only two genders and you were born either a male or a female and that got me into trouble," Alexander said. "And then I said that gender doesn't trump biology." The principal of the school suspended him, saying he was not allowed back until he renounced his views, all of which are based on Catholic teachings. It is not the student who should be ousted—it's the principal.

In Wolverhampton, England, Fr. Sean Gough was arrested for praying outside an abortion clinic. He was holding a sign, "Praying For Freedom Of Speech." This was considered "intimidation" and therefore unlawful. "I pray wherever I go, inside my head, for the people around me. How can it be a crime for a priest to pray?"

Fr. Gough correctly identified the problem: Agents of the state want to get "inside" his head. Thought control was never

so vicious in the West, rivaling anything Mao Zedong did in China, if not in the same volume.

The West is decaying, and it is happening at lightning speed. We have no other choice than to expose these fascists and defeat them.

DONOHUE FIRST TO BAT FOR NEWSMAX

DirecTV, owned by AT&T, decided on January 25 to discontinue carrying Newsmax, the fourth highest-ranking cable TV news channel. The reasons it offered—a conflict over fees—did not strike us as persuasive.

Bill Donohue has known Chris Ruddy, the Newsmax owner, for decades, and he was not about to disbelieve his account. Chris insisted that the decision to cut Newsmax was politically motivated.

The number of prominent persons who have rallied to Chris' side, asking people to drop DirecTV, is considerable. Politicians, corporate leaders, TV personalities, sports figures, actors, lawyers, religious leaders—it's a Who's Who of American public figures.

The first person to come to bat for Chris was Bill Donohue. He was closely followed by Sen. Lindsey Graham, Sen. Tom Cotton, and President Donald Trump. "Bill Donohue: Catholics Should Drop DirecTV" was how Newsmax flagged his news release. Newsmax then issued its own statement, "Catholic League's Donohue Calls on Faithful to Cancel DirecTV."

We are happy to help all good causes.

ALTERNATIVES TO DISNEY

Universal Parks and Resorts: Poor Alternative

Universal Parks and Resorts is the theme park unit of NBCUniversal, a subsidiary of Comcast. Universal Parks and Resorts is best known for attractions and lands based on famous classic and modern pop culture properties (movies, television, literature, cartoons, comics, video games, music, etc.).

It operates Universal Studios Hollywood, Universal Orlando Resort, Universal Studios Japan, Universal Studios Singapore, and Universal Beijing Resort. In 2017, approximately 49,458,000 guests visited Universal Studios theme parks, making it the third-largest amusement park operator in the world.

While its parent company is not as vocal in their embrace of “woke” causes, Comcast-NBCUniversal tacitly supports initiatives that run counter to traditional values. For instance, Comcast is a corporate sponsor of the Equality Act, one of the biggest threats to religious liberty ever considered by the United States Congress. Comcast also supports the Respect for Marriage Act, which would redefine marriage as something other than a union between one man and one woman on the national level. Comcast also announced they would pay for their employees to travel for abortions.

Both Universal Studios Hollywood and Universal Orlando host Pride Month events. Universal Studios Hollywood hosted a drag show in June of 2022.

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment: Better Alternative

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment is a subsidiary of SeaWorld Entertainment Inc. and owns and operates thirteen recreational destinations in the United States. In May 2018, Themed Entertainment Association and the global management firm AECOM reported that SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment ranked ninth in the world for attendance among theme park companies.

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment's parks include: SeaWorld Orlando, Discovery Cove Orlando, Aquatica Orlando, Busch Gardens Tampa Bay, Adventure Island Tampa Bay, SeaWorld San Diego, Sesame Place San Diego, SeaWorld San Antonio, Aquatica San Antonio, Discovery Point, Busch Gardens Williamsburg, Water Country USA, and Sesame Place near Philadelphia.

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment, along with its parent company, are not vocal on social issues. For instance, they are not corporate sponsors of the Equality Act, and we could not find a public pledge to pay for their employees to travel to undergo abortions.

While Orlando has become a popular destination for LGBT tourists, SeaWorld does not appear to have any events specifically designed for that audience. Numerous LGBT oriented travel magazines note that Orlando is a popular place and recommend a visit to SeaWorld, but we could not find specific events sponsored by the park.

Six Flags Entertainment Corporation: Better Alternative

Six Flags Entertainment Corporation owns the most theme parks and water parks combined of any amusement-park company and has the seventh highest attendance in the world. The company operates 27 properties throughout North America, including theme parks, amusement parks, water parks, and a family entertainment center. In 2019, Six Flags properties hosted 32.8 million guests.

Six Flags has largely remained silent on social issues. It is not a corporate sponsor of the Equality Act, and we could not find any public statements on paying for employees to travel to undergo an abortion. Several people on the left condemned Six Flags for making political contributions to Texas officials that were pro-life or opposed to the transgender agenda. While this is not dispositive that the corporation is for these issues, we could not find any statements of trying to spin these contributions as just the cost of doing business. Rather, Six Flags appears to have ignored the controversy.

In 2022, Six Flags Mexico rescinded its bans on homosexual couples showing public displays of affection. Additionally, several Six Flags parks in the United States offer private LGBT/Gay Nights; however, we could not find evidence that minors are allowed to attend.

PHYSICIAN POLITICS NEEDS TO BE CHECKED

There has always been an element in the medical profession that has been given over to politics, but in recent years it has become more common and more aggressive.

It would be harder to find better proof of physician politics than the letter signed by over 1,200 health officials in the spring of 2020. With Covid-19 raging, and lockdowns everywhere, these doctors reacted more like left-wing activists than professionals.

The good doctors threw caution to the wind, suspending their support for social distancing, all because they vigorously

endorsed the cause of “social justice.” To be specific, many protests were launched following a few controversial incidents of police interactions with black men. That some of the protests turned into a riot—killing and injuring innocent persons, many of whom were cops—did not seem to matter.

The signatories were outraged by the “emerging narratives that seemed to malign demonstrations as risky for the public health because of Covid-19.” That was their number-one concern—bad mouthing the protesters—not the spread of Covid. They added that their goal was “to present a narrative that prioritizes opposition to racism as vital to public health, including the epidemic response.” Not only that, these protests—not all protests—were deemed “vital to the national public health and to the threatened health specifically of Black people in the United States.”

This backdrop helps us to understand why so many in the medical profession have said very little about the legalization of marijuana. It comes down to politics. Some issues galvanize them; others do not. To cite another example, consider their strong support for sex-reassignment surgery. Physician politics has never been more apparent.

In early January, the Health and Human Services’ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration released the findings of its annual survey and found that over 16 percent of the population, more than 46 million people, suffer from substance abuse disorder. Almost all of them did not receive any treatment.

In December, CFAH, a health advisory organization, issued a report on the legal status of marijuana in the states. The drug is fully legal in 21 states and the District of Columbia; it is legal in another 23 states, but with restrictions; it is illegal in 6 states.

The American Medical Association (AMA) is opposed to marijuana

legalization, but not in a vigorous way. In fact, the last statement it issued on this subject was to call for expunging prior marijuana arrest records, a decision that smacks of politics, not science.

On the issue of state restrictions on sex-reassignment surgery, the AMA is quite vocal, making it clear that such legislation “represents a dangerous governmental intrusion into the practice of medicine,” insisting that “trans and non-binary identities are normal variations of human identity and expression” (our emphasis).

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) lists several health concerns with marijuana use, but stays away from commenting on the wisdom of legalizing the drug.

When it comes to gender identity, the CDC offers a full-throated endorsement, imploring health providers to “create welcoming environments that facilitates disclosure of gender identity and sexual orientation.” Furthermore, clinics should work to “improve sexual health for transgender and gender nonbinary persons.”

Our leading medical guru, Dr. Fauci, has not commented on the legalization of marijuana, even though he has spent the past three years warning us about respiratory illnesses.

Interestingly, Anthony “Double Mask” Fauci, in his role as Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, has come under considerable criticism for spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to finance attempts to turn monkeys transgender.

To be specific, he has used public monies to inject male monkeys with feminizing hormone therapy. His interest in sex is longstanding, beginning with AIDS in the 1980s. Moreover, at the height of the pandemic, “Double Mask” could not bring himself to tell gay men not to have sex with anonymous men, saying only that it is risky. Apparently, this was not as

risky as going to church during the Covid outbreak, which is why church doors were shut.

Most doctors and those who work in the medical profession are good men and women who have served the public well. But there are more than a few—especially in elite positions—who have shown themselves to be charlatans, or worse. Politics has no more legitimate role to play in medicine than it does in sports.

Those who are looking for reliable medical sources should go to the websites of the Catholic Medical Association (they cover a wide range of subjects—see their journal, *The Linacre Quarterly*), the Charlotte Lozier Institute (a pro-life institute) and the National Catholic Bioethics Center.

CARDINAL PELL, R.I.P.

Cardinal George Pell died on January 10th at age 81.

We mourned his death at the Catholic League. No priest of his stature was victimized in recent times more than him. He suffered mightily, spending over 400 days in an Australian prison for crimes he was later acquitted. The anti-Catholicism that drove his conviction was obvious to all with eyes to see.

His conviction on five counts of sexual abuse was unanimously overturned by Australia's High Court in 2020. He was never guilty of these charges in the first place.

Pell was the victim of outrageous lies. He had been smeared, spat upon, and forced to endure solitary confinement for crimes he never committed.

This was a sham from the get-go and should never have made its

way through the Australian courts.

Pell was charged with abusing two boys in 1996. One of the boys overdosed on drugs but not before telling his mother—on two occasions—that Pell never abused him. The other boy’s accusation was undercut by the dead boy’s account: they were allegedly abused at the same time and place. There were no witnesses to an offense that supposedly took place after Mass in the sacristy of a church.

The High Court concluded that the charges against Cardinal Pell strained credulity. It was based on assumptions that simply didn’t add up.

We defended Cardinal Pell for many years. Indeed, we issued approximately two dozen news releases defending him from his critics. He was sustained by his faith, and his courage was exemplary. May he rest in peace.

MEET THE CATHOLICS IN THE NEW CONGRESS

Catholics comprise 28% of the seats in the 118th Congress, the largest of any religious affiliation. But just how Catholic are these Catholics?

We reviewed the scorecard of incumbent representatives and senators as tallied by National Right to Life and NARAL, the two most authoritative sources measuring congressional support for the right to life and the right to abortion, respectively, in the nation. For newly elected members, we consulted their stated record on this subject when they were candidates. Here is what we found.

There are 65 Democrats who claim a Catholic identity in the House of Representatives, 54 of whom have a perfect pro-abortion record; and all 10 of the newly elected members are in the pro-abortion camp. Of the 56 Republicans who claim a Catholic identity, 48 have a perfect pro-life voting record; one has a mostly pro-life record; and the seven newly elected members espouse a pro-life position.

This means that 98% of the Catholic House Democrats are pro-abortion and 100% of the Catholic House Republicans are mostly pro-life.

In the Senate, there are 15 Catholic Democrats, 12 of whom have a perfect pro-abortion record. Of the 11 Catholic Republicans, 7 have a perfect pro-life record.

This means that 80% of Catholic Senate Democrats are pro-abortion and 100% of Catholic Senate Republicans are pro-life.

In the last two years, both parties have become more entrenched in their positions. Even people known to be more moderate on this issue ventured closer to their party's extreme. For instance, Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Susan Collins of Maine moved more to the pro-life camp. However, moving in the opposite direction was Joe Manchin of West Virginia: he had a perfect pro-life rating in the 116th Congress but dropped down to a 67% score in the last congress.

Similarly in the House, Jeff Van Drew (R-NJ) became more pro-life after leaving the Democratic party. Henry Cuellar (D-TX), who was widely seen as the last pro-life Democrat in the House, earned a higher score from NARAL and a lower score from National Right to Life.

Does this mean that Catholic Republicans are better Catholics than Catholic Democrats? On the issue that the bishops regard as the "preeminent" issue of our time, namely, abortion, it certainly does. It must be said, however, that as a true measure of one's Catholic status, one's voting record on one

issue is not necessarily dispositive.

Some argue that a congressman's record on social justice issues is a more accurate gauge of his Catholicity. The problem with that contention is that it is much more difficult to make comparisons on such matters. To wit: Catholics who favor more government welfare programs contend that their position is better aligned with Church teachings, yet Catholics who oppose more government dependency maintain that they are more faithful to the Church's teachings on the poor. Climate change is another issue that is difficult to score.

Ultimately, whether one is a "good Catholic" depends on factors of a more intimate nature. But it is not wrong to suggest that elected Catholic officials who maintain a decidedly pro-abortion voting record are an embarrassment to Catholics. They most certainly are. After all, the right to life is the most foundational of our natural rights. This is not an observation—it is a fact of life.

PRO-LIFE MEASURES SHOT DOWN

On January 11, all but two congressional Democrats voted against a bill that would mandate medical care for infants born alive following a botched abortion (one voted with the Republicans and one voted present).

The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act says that an infant born alive following an abortion is a "legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States," and as such must be attended to by medical staff or transported to a nearby hospital for care.

Democrats offered two arguments against the bill: (a) they

said it is already illegal for doctors and nurses not to care for any individual, therefore no new legislation is necessary, and (b) it may actually be dangerous to transport an infant to a hospital.

When it comes to combating racial discrimination, or discrimination against LGBT persons, Democrats can never get enough legislation on the books, but for some reason when it comes to infants born alive following a botched abortion, no new laws are necessary.

On the same day Democrats voted against the bill to provide health care for babies who survive an abortion, they voted against a resolution condemning violence against crisis pregnancy centers and churches following the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. Yet these sites have been firebombed and vandalized by Jane's Revenge and others.

Not a good sign. Votes like this should not be along party lines.