

COLORADO'S SICK WAR ON PARENTAL RIGHTS

This is the article that appeared in the May 2025 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 hard to know what is sicker—a Colorado bill that would gut parental rights or the basis upon which it rests.

The bill would punish parents who do not align themselves with the wishes of their transgender children. Indeed, it grants the government the right to take them away from them. All they have to do to trigger this brazen denial of parental rights is to refer to their children in terms that reflect their nature-determined sex.

That's right, the authorities can seize your son, Sam, if he wants to be called Sally and you call him Sam. The bill would make this illegal. It's called "Deadnaming." Your child can also be taken from you if you refer to Sam as "he" or "him," instead of "she" or "her," or "they" or "them." This is called "misgendering."

In other words, the rights of mentally challenged children—who are contemplating, or have completed, a regimen of puberty blockers and genital mutilation—trump the rights of parents who want to help them. Parents who violate these provisions are deemed guilty of "coercive control" under the law. The bill also says that the courts do not have to respect laws in other states that make it illegal for parents to allow their child to "transition" to the other sex.

In an unusual move, the bill passed the mostly Democratic Colorado House of Representatives on Sunday, April 6. In doing so, it clearly stuck it to Christians who opposed it. Indeed,

they were told by the bill's sponsors that parental rights should not even be discussed!

It will now be heard by the mostly Democratic Colorado Senate Judiciary Committee. If it passes, it will go to the mostly Democratic Colorado Senate. The Democratic governor, Jared Polis, is a homosexual fan of radical gay and transgender rights.

No state has anything like this on the books. Even Democratic California Gov. Gavin Newsom vetoed a similar bill.

The Colorado bill that passed, HB 1312, explicitly refers to the legislation as the "Kelly Loving Act."

Kelly Loving was murdered in 2022 at a nightclub in Colorado Springs. Five were killed and 25 injured when a madman opened up on them with an AR-15 rifle. But it wasn't an ordinary club—it was an LGBTQ hot spot. And Kelly was no ordinary person: he falsely claimed to be a woman. It appears Kelly was named Jonathan Ray Loving, and later adopted a female name after becoming confused about his sex.

After the massacre, President Joe Biden denounced it as an attack on LGBTQ people, saying, "We cannot and must not tolerate hate." The mayor in Colorado Springs said the shooting "has all the appearances of being a hate crime."

But is it a "hate crime" when transgender people kill transgender people? People of the same race kill people of the same race all the time, and no one calls such acts a "hate crime." Yet as we have shown before, transgender-on-transgender crime is commonplace.

The person who killed Kelly Loving was Nicholas Franklin Brink. But he later changed his name to Anderson Lee Aldrich because he did not want to be associated with his father. When he went on his killing spree, he was a 22-year-old sexually confused person who falsely claimed to be neither a man nor a

woman. He called himself “non-binary” (there is no such thing) and wanted others to falsely refer to him as “they” or “them.”

The killer’s father was a porn actor, and after his parents divorced—he was one-year-old—he grew up mentally disturbed and was arrested several times (a SWAT team had to be sent to his house when he threatened to blow it up). In 2021, he told his grand-aunt he wanted to kill Christians.

Colorado Democrat Rep. Yara Zokaie, who co-sponsored the bill in the House, credits the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) with justifying excluding parental rights from discussion on the bill.

SPLC is a well-funded hate group that is cited by the media as a specialist in identifying hate groups. Following suit, Zokaie censored those who sought to speak against her bill, saying, “we don’t ask someone passing civil rights legislation to go ask the KKK for their opinion.”

A search of the website of SPLC found that the first eleven posts under the banner “parental rights” are all about race, poverty, neo-Nazis, migrants and LGBTQ rights. In short, they have absolutely nothing to do with parental rights. The twelfth post is on parental rights. However it does not mean what is traditionally understood: it defends the right of parents to keep obscene books in elementary school libraries, not the right of parents who object.

Recent elections and surveys prove that attacks on the rights of women and parents is a losing game. But for some reason many Democrats are not listening, and nowhere is this more evident than in Colorado.

McCARRICK'S DEATH DOESN'T RESOLVE EVERYTHING

This is the article that appeared in the May 2025 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](#).

Theodore McCarrick died April 3 at the age of 94. The defrocked cardinal was known for decades as one of the most influential prelates in America. He was also a masterful fundraiser and a notorious homosexual whose predatory behavior is legendary.

Contrary to what the *Washington Post* editorialized in 2019, it was not the media that revealed McCarrick's offenses—it was New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan.

Dolan's Independent Reconciliation and Compensation Program was responsible for outing McCarrick. Dolan went public after one of McCarrick's victims came forward. As Bill Donohue said in his book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse*, "How many rapists who work in the media—think of CBS and NBC—have had one of their senior officials turn them in? None."

McCarrick was not content to be a good priest. The report on him, known as "The McCarrick Report," found that when he was Archbishop of Newark, he told two bishops of his quest to succeed Cardinal John O'Connor as the Archbishop of New York (he had been an auxiliary bishop there in the late 1970s-early 1980s). He "pounded the table and blurted out 'I deserve New York.'"

In the mid-1990s, McCarrick called to congratulate Bill Donohue for fighting anti-Catholicism. He had been in the job for only a few years. Donohue was struck when McCarrick told him of his desire to come across the Hudson and become the

successor to Cardinal O'Connor. Why, Donohue wondered, would he tell him? It was obvious that he was consumed with this issue.

None of this would have come as a surprise to those who knew him when he was a monsignor in the late 1960s. He was assessed by his superiors as being overly "ambitious."

In the 1980s, McCarrick first served as the Bishop of Metuchen, and then as Archbishop of Newark. This is when he began his predatory behavior. It was at his beach house on the Jersey Shore where he would invite seminarians to stay with him. He would intentionally invite more men than he had beds for. This set the stage: he would invite one of them to sleep with him. He often succeeded. He also had sex with seminarians in the Waldorf Astoria in Manhattan.

McCarrick justified his behavior by telling the seminarians that "priests engaging in sexual activity with each other was normal and accepted in the United States, especially in that diocese." While this was an obvious rationalization, it was not altogether incorrect. The homosexual network at that time was extensive.

His sexual romps were known to many of the New Jersey bishops, but they did nothing about it. Nor did they say a word when McCarrick grabbed the crotch of a priest at the dinner table—they simply looked away.

Were there any good guys? Yes. Cardinal O'Connor was not afraid to act. After fielding several complaints, he reported McCarrick to Vatican officials. But McCarrick had friends everywhere, and those who surrounded Pope John Paul II took his side when he contested O'Connor's account. It took Pope Benedict XVI to get beyond this. In 2006, he accepted McCarrick's resignation, something he had to offer when he turned seventy-five.

Travel restrictions were placed on McCarrick but he ignored

them. He ignored them under Benedict and even more so under Pope Francis. He did exactly what he wanted to and no one stopped him.

Unfortunately, McCarrick's death does not put to rest all concerns.

The person who is currently in charge of the Vatican's administrative duties is also the person who lived with McCarrick in Washington, D.C. for six years (McCarrick consecrated him in 2001), yet he claims that he never heard of any wrongdoing. Indeed, he "never suspected or ever had reason to suspect, any inappropriate conduct in Washington." As Donohue said in his book, "That would make him unique."

His name is Cardinal Kevin Farrell. He is now the Camerlengo, or Chamberlain, responsible for overseeing the daily operations of the Vatican. He was very close to Pope Francis, who elevated him to several high posts. Pope Francis also said he never heard about McCarrick's predatory conduct, though others say they told him.

Farrell admitted in 2019 that he received a \$29,000 gift from Bishop Michael Bransfield to refurbish his Rome apartment. A probe found that he had been using diocesan funds for these gifts and his own personal spending. He then returned the money; Bransfield was removed from office.

A priest was recently quoted saying that Farrell is holding "the fort down until the conclave elects a new pope." Now that McCarrick is dead, it would be helpful if he told us more about his interactions with him. It would also be instructive to know why he thinks he was held in the dark when so many others at least heard of McCarrick's offenses.

HOW GAYS CRASHED THE ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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](#).

Bill Donohue

As we approached the 10th anniversary of homosexuals marching under their own banner in New York City's St. Patrick's Day Parade, it behooved us to understand how this happened.

To begin with, gays were never banned from marching. As I said on radio and TV in New York for two decades, no one ever asked anyone what they did in bed and with whom. Gays were banned from marching under their own banner, and that is because to do so would deflect from what the day is all about—honoring St. Patrick. For the same reason, pro-life groups were banned from marching under their own banner.

The first gay group to march was in 1991. Mayor David Dinkins entered into a discussion with the Ancient Order of Hibernians (AOH), the parade organizers, and a compromise was reached: members of the Irish Lesbian and Gay Organization (ILGO) could march with the mid-town chapter of the AOH, accompanied by the mayor.

When ILGO sought to march in the 1992 parade, they were barred. They were accused of "outrageous behavior" when they marched in 1991, making obscene gestures in front of St. Patrick's Cathedral and in front of the reviewing stand at 5th Avenue and 67th Street.

On January 21, 1992, the Hibernian National and State Boards issued a joint statement asserting that "no organization or organizations are allowed to use New York City's 231st Annual

St. Patrick's Day Parade on March 17, 1992 as a vehicle to publicly insult any person or group watching or reviewing the parade." They repeated the charge that ILGO engaged in "outrageous behavior and conduct."

ILGO did not give up and proceeded to march, illegally, in the 1994 parade. They were arrested for marching without a permit on March 17, but that didn't make any difference to Manhattan Supreme Court Justice Robert Sackett. On November 2, 1994, he threw out the charges, saying the arrest of the ILGO members was a "blatant denial of First Amendment rights."

A week later, here is what I said about that ruling.

"Judge Sackett is an embarrassment of the courts. For him to simply disregard the fact that ILGO (a) had no permit to march (b) never sought one in the first place (c) was never denied the right to protest elsewhere and (d) had already lost in the courts in its bid to march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade, demonstrates that Judge Sackett shows no respect for the law."

In 1995, the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously ruled that banning ILGO from the Boston St. Patrick's Day Parade was constitutional. It was a private parade, the high court said, and the organizers had a First Amendment right to freedom of association, essentially affirming their right to craft their own rules.

Meanwhile in New York, the AOH handed the parade over to a new group, the St. Patrick's Day Parade Committee, headed by John Dunleavy. Even though the Supreme Court upheld the right of parade organizers to ban ILGO, they attempted to march in the late 1990s, and were arrested for doing so. I took pictures of them and was assaulted by one of the lesbians. I did not hit her back knowing the media would capture my retaliatory move, and blame me.

Why was ILGO so determined to march? It had nothing to do with honoring St. Patrick. *This is not an opinion—it is what they*

said.

In 2017, Anne Maguire and Maxine Wolfe published their reminiscences on an array of subjects, one of which was the parade. Maguire, who was co-founder of ILGO, talked about the politics of the group. She explicitly said that the protests at the St. Patrick's Day Parade "sort of dovetailed with ACT UP." She also admitted that "the vast majority" of ILGO members were illegal aliens who sought to mobilize politically.

Maguire said that within their first year in the U.S., "somebody brought up in a meeting, 'Wouldn't it be kind of funny if we marched in the St. Patrick's Day parade?'" To which most of them said, "Are you kidding me?" This is how it all began—as a lark.

They asked for a permit, were denied, and "it just completely blew up." They saw homophobia everywhere, from being denied a permit to "ACT UP and AIDS."

Maguire's admission that there was a nexus between the parade and ACT UP is telling: she was referring to what ACT UP did on December 10, 1989 at St. Patrick's Cathedral. That was the day when gays crashed the Sunday 10:15 a.m. Mass, celebrated by Cardinal John O'Connor. ACT UP activists interrupted the Mass, handcuffed themselves to the pews, blew whistles, shouted obscenities and spat the Host on the floor. One of the most prominent members at the "Stop The Church" protest who was arrested was Ann Northrop.

Northrop blamed Cardinal O'Connor for AIDS, not promiscuous homosexuals. How did the archbishop cause AIDS? By saying that monogamy protects against the sexually transmitted disease! This is like blaming obesity on those who diet.

Further proof that ILGO's interest in marching in the parade was a lark, having everything to do with making a political statement and nothing to do with honoring St. Patrick, was

made plain by Maguire. In 1996, a year after the Supreme Court ruled against ILGO, she wrote the following.

“What is clear about ILGO and the St. Patrick’s Day parade is that most [ILGO] people, particularly those of us who are most actively involved, had no inclination to be associated with, never mind march in, the parade. [The protest], very simply, is where our ‘coming out’ took place.”

This is exactly what the AOH had been saying all along.

In September 2014, as I previously recounted in the *March Catalyst*, Dunleavy was pushed aside by the vice chairman of the St. Patrick’s Day Parade Committee, John Lahey, president of Quinnipiac University. At a press conference held at the New York Athletic Club, welcoming a gay group to march, OUT@NBCUniversal, Lahey and others spoke, but Dunleavy did not. He was treated like dirt by the heavyweights who sucked up to the media. I was never invited, and we all know why.

Lahey paired with elites from other universities, corporations, lawyers and the media to take the reins from Dunleavy. Dunleavy was a former transit dispatcher, a great blue collar guy from Ireland. He was outclassed by these sharks. It did not matter to the elites that the Supreme Court declared that parade officials had a First Amendment right to bar ILGO. What mattered is that they wanted the affirmation of elites unconnected to the parade.

Lahey and company would have us believe that the parade was being threatened with a boycott from its sponsors, and that they could not have it televised on NBC without their advertising support. It is true that Guinness, Heineken and the Ford Motor Company were planning to do just that. It is also true that Manhattan College, Fairfield University and the Irish government were pressuring parade officials.

What Lahey did not say is that they could have looked for other alternatives. What about WPIX? Would they have agreed to

televisе the march? What about EWTN, the Catholic media giant? What about looking for new sponsors? Quite simply, they used this as an excuse to get what they wanted all along—the elites were all on the same side.

I know that their hearts were not in it because in the spring of 2014, right after the St. Patrick's Day Parade, the issue of gays marching in 2015 was coming to a head. I met with seven owners of Irish pubs in New York City; they owned roughly 25 percent of the Irish bars. All but one agreed to my plea to boycott Guinness. Some chose to cut the price of Guinness' competitors, thus enticing drinkers to choose an alternative; others simply took out the Guinness tap. But it was not enough to change things, and that is because parade officials wanted nothing to do with it.

On September 17, 2014, I wrote Dunleavy a letter restating how I was lied to about gays marching in the parade. I mentioned to him that one of the parade officials, John Fitzsimmons, an attorney, had called me at the end of August. I knew him well and would have fielded the call but I was in Montauk, Long Island taking a break. The call was about including a gay group in the parade in 2015. Here is part of what I said.

"I told Bernadette [the vice president] to let John know that it was okay by me [to include a gay group], as long as (a) there was a formal change in the parade rules governing marching units allowing those that have their own cause to march, and (b) a pro-life group would be marching under its own banner as well. John said he believed that a formal revision of the rules had been made, but that he had to 'check his notes.'

"John called back saying that he checked with you about this issue, and that he also checked his notes. He said there was, in fact, a formal change in the rules, and that a pro-life group would be marching. Bernadette then urged him to pick a pro-life group so that it could be announced at the same time

as the NBC gay group [which had already been approved]. He agreed to do this.”

It was plain that I had been lied to by Fitzsimmons, so I closed my letter to Dunleavy saying, “John is the source of the problem.” (Both Fitzsimmons and Dunleavy have since passed away.) I pulled our Catholic League unit the next year and we will never march again.

On the day that gays first marched in the St. Patrick’s Day Parade under their own banner, March 17, 2015, Northrop said she still wasn’t happy. She was angry that a gay group was chosen by NBC, which televised the march, saying “it’s all a corporate deal. It has nothing to do with really opening up the parade and welcoming gay people in and certainly not Irish gay people.”

It’s never enough for narcissistic gays—it’s always about them.

To show how crazed Northrop is, consider that she once celebrated the news that human cloning could make men obsolete. “Essentially, this is sort of the final nail in men’s coffins. Men are now totally irrelevant, if [cloning] is, in fact, true and possible and becomes routine. Men are going to have a very hard time justifying their existence on the planet, I think.” Male hatred is not unusual among radical lesbians, but this comment is hard to beat.

Ten years after the first gay group marched up Fifth Avenue, there is still no pro-life group allowed to march. Each year Irish Pro-Life USA, founded by John Aidan Byrne, requests a permit to march, and every year he is denied. Parade organizer Hilary Beirne never gets back to him.

In other words, the St. Patrick’s Day Parade officials allow homosexual groups to march but not pro-life Catholics. In short, we can thank the Irish elites, in the U.S. and Ireland, for ganging up on John Dunleavy.

LANSING DIOCESE MALIGNED BY MICHIGAN AG

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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](#).

Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel released a report in December on sexual abuse in the Diocese of Lansing. It is seriously flawed, though she received no pushback from the media; they accepted the report at face value. We did not, and with good reason: Nessel's animus against the Catholic Church is indisputable (see our website for the evidence).

This is the fourth diocesan report on this subject: reports on the dioceses of Marquette, Gaylord and Kalamazoo were previously issued. The Lansing report found that there were 56 diocesan officials who were accused of sexual abuse between the 1950s and the 2010s. Unlike most probes on this subject, this one includes alleged adult victims as well as minors.

The alleged offenders include one male teacher, three religious brothers and 52 ordained clergy (four deacons and forty-eight priests). Of the 56, two-thirds are dead. Of the one still in active ministry, the allegation was found to be unsubstantiated by the diocese.

The report found that two-thirds of the alleged victims were males; a quarter were females; the rest targeted males and females. Most of the cases took place during the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s.

Our review of Nessel's report found serious mistakes that inflated the total number of alleged victims and deflated the

number of male victims.

- The report lists alleged male and female victims as John Doe and Jane Doe, respectively. There were 120 John Does and 42 Jane Does listed. However, there were also 40 other alleged victims in the report who were not listed as either John Doe or Jane Doe. Of the unlisted, 37 were male and three were female.
- The report lists several instances where there is no mention of a John Doe, yet they are still included in the tally. For example, there is no record of John Doe 30 nor of Jane Doe 10.
- In some cases, the report lists Jane Doe where the victim was male. Also, in one case Jane Doe was not a victim, but rather the wife of a male who alleged abuse. In another case, a Jane Doe was a sibling of a John Doe but did not claim she was abused.

Why would the report inflate the total number of alleged victims and deflate the number of male victims? It is obvious to any honest scholar who has covered this issue—to protect homosexuals from scrutiny. For decades now there has been a persistent cover-up of the role that homosexual priests have played in the clergy abuse scandal (see Bill Donohue's book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse*). The guilty parties include the media, government officials, educators and activists.

Another serious problem with the report is that it disregards the Diocese of Lansing's records on abuse cases. Of the 56 accused in the report, only 21 are listed in the Diocese of Lansing's credibly accused list (Nessel's report relies heavily on data reported on the website of bishop-accountability.org, which is hardly a reliable source).

Upon investigation, the Lansing diocese found that many of the accusations were not deemed to be credible: It is not easy to substantiate accusations about alleged offenses that took

place decades ago. In several cases, the Diocesan Review Board could not find any evidence of abuse. In four cases, the accused passed a polygraph exam. Yet they were still included in the report!

Attorney General Nessel is not interested in curbing sexual abuse. If she were she would stop stalking the Catholic Church and start probing the public schools. That's where this problem is on-going.

USA Today reporters investigated all 50 states to see how they handle the sexual abuse of students. They gave Michigan an overall grade of "F." They said its background system was "weak" and was "left to local school districts." Also, mandatory reporting laws were determined to be "weak." In terms of transparency, they found "no information online about teacher disciplinary actions and misconduct." To make matters worse, information on teacher misconduct was "not shared with other states."

There is plenty here for Nessel to mine. It's time for her to investigate public school kids who have been abused in the past, as well as those currently being raped by teachers.

Also, since Nessel did not confine her probe to minors who have allegedly been abused by priests and other staffers, an examination of sexual misconduct in the public schools must include an investigation of teachers, administrators and other school personnel who have been accused of molesting or harassing other adults, including the parents of their students.

We contacted every lawmaker in the state to do what should have been done a long time ago: insist on a probe of sexual misconduct in the public schools. It's time to stop religious profiling and treat every segment of society equally.

U.S. ATTORNEY GEN. PAM BONDI CONTACTED

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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 February 19, we contacted U.S. Attorney General Pamela Bondi letting her know that we are delighted that President Trump established a Presidential Commission on Religious Liberty, and that he chose her to head a task force on anti-Christian bias. We pledged to do everything we can to assist her in this effort.

In his letter to Bondi, Bill Donohue said the following.

“The Catholic League has more documentation on this issue than any organization in the nation. We are currently collecting documents for you to make it easier to access our work; we will be sharing this with you when the process is complete. Please see our website, catholicleague.org, for detailed news releases, essays and reports on anti-Christian bigotry.”

KUDOS TO SEN. HAWLEY

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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](#).

No one has done a better job addressing modern-day child abuse than Sen. Josh Hawley. That is why Bill Donohue wrote to him on February 24 asking him to expand his reach.

Donohue commended him for introducing a bill, "The Jamie Reed Protecting Our Kids from Child Abuse Act," that would allow minors who were harmed by sex-transition procedures to bring lawsuits against those who participated in this abuse.

Good as this is, Donohue implored him to address the role played by the medical schools, the American Medical Association and other professional associations. "They provide legitimacy for these acts of child abuse," he said. He offered several examples how this is done.

The medical watchdog, Do No Harm, reports that in a five-year period, 2019-2023, approximately 14,000 children underwent sex-change operations. There is big money in this scam—the hospitals charged nearly \$120 million. They have the support of elite medical schools, the AMA, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Psychological Association and the American Psychiatric Association.

Mass General is the original and largest teaching hospital of Harvard Medical School. It has a specialized gender-affirming care unit. Surgeries include the creation of a vagina and a penis. Boston Children's Hospital is also a teaching hospital at Harvard Medical School; it operates "the first pediatric and adolescent transgender health program in the United States."

Other medical schools that do the same work include Johns Hopkins, Stanford Medicine, the University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine, the Columbia University's Vagelos College of Physicians & Surgeons, the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Yale Medicine and the Duke University School of Medicine.

While all of these institutions matter, the AMA is the most

influential. What it professes is alarming: “Designating sex on birth certificates as male or female, and making that information available on the public portion, perpetuates a view that sex designation is permanent and fails to recognize the medical spectrum of gender identity.”

“Self-identification is no substitute for biological truths,” Donohue said. “There are but two sexes—male and female—and no amount of chatter about ‘the medical spectrum of gender identity’ can change this verity. Quite simply, what the AMA professes is anti-science.”

Donohue explained that given its commitment to subjectivism, “it is not surprising to learn that the AMA supports transgender persons joining the military.” Regarding children, it has a policy that says “Exclusionary Bathroom Policies Harm Transgender Students.” This means that boys who claim to be girls should be free to shower with girls. It also believes that male prisoners who falsely claim to be female should be housed in women’s prisons, no matter how violent the men are.

Donohue concluded, “You have done yeoman work. Please consider expanding your reach to address the damage that the AMA is doing.”

“CONCLAVE” FLOPPED

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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 extremely bizarre movie, “Conclave,” won some awards at the Screen Actors Guild, and other film festivals, but it walked away with only one Oscar, and not a coveted one.

Few go to the movies anymore, so if you missed out on this one, let us explain why it didn't pan out the way those associated with the movie thought it would.

The movie was about the election of a new pope. While there were artistic elements of some merit, the only reason it garnered any attention was because of the ending. That's when we learn that the newly elected pope has a uterus. In fact, the pope is "intersex."

It failed because most audiences did not take the flick seriously. Instead, they snickered.

It appears that the desired outcome—to jar the public, especially Catholics—to change their mind about the Church's teachings on sexuality and welcome a pope with a uterus—did not succeed in getting through. When the audience giggles, it's a sure sign they failed to receive the memo. That's why the movie was a flop.

DEMS WEDDED TO TRANSGENDER AGENDA

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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](#).

Eight-in-ten Americans are against boys and men competing against girls and women in sports and showering with them. Even two-in-three Democrats take this position. But the elected Democrats in Congress are not listening.

On March 3, a bill that would bar males from participating in

women's sports, "The Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act," failed to achieve the 60-vote margin needed to fend off a filibuster. The Democrats killed the bill. The vote split along party lines: 51 Republicans supported the bill and 45 Democrats opposed it. On January 14, the House voted in favor of the bill, splitting again along party lines, 218-206; two Texas Democrats voted with the Republicans.

Why would the Democrats, who got clobbered in the election, want to go against the express will of the people, including members of its own party? Money explains part of it: some very rich individuals and foundations are committed to the radical LGBTQ agenda. Ideology also matters: the Democratic Party has become the party of sexual engineers, supported overwhelmingly by the teachers unions.

Still, why go against the grain? Isn't it political suicide to push an agenda that the public abhors?

After the Democrats lost in November, Rep. Tom Suozzi, a moderate Democrat from Long Island, said, "The Democrats have to stop pandering to the far left. I don't want to discriminate against anybody, but I don't think biological boys should be playing in girls' sports." Another Democrat, Rep. Seth Moulton from Massachusetts, said, "I have two little girls. I don't want them getting run over on a playing field by a male or formerly male athlete, but as a Democrat, I'm supposed to be afraid to say that."

When it came time to vote, both Souzzi and Moulton caved and voted to deny girls and women their right to compete against athletes of their own sex; their right to privacy was also shattered.

Some Democrats do get it. Former Pennsylvania Gov. Ed Rendell noted that during the presidential campaign, Donald Trump made hay out of the Democrats for supporting gender ideology. Ads that were run saying, "Kamala is for they/them; President

Trump is for you,” resonated with the voters. “Week by week when that ad hit and stuck and we didn’t respond, I think that was the beginning of the end.”

It’s not just seasoned Democratic politicians who understand how pivotal this issue is—liberal celebrities get it.

Bill Maher lambasted a former Obama speechwriter for defending the rights of transgender students against their parents. “You want to lose every election? Just keep coming down on the side of parents coming in second in a ‘Who get to decide what goes on with my kid contest.’”

Celebrity fitness trainer Jillian Michaels brought the transgender issue up in a recent TV interview, saying to Democrats, “This is why your entire party got their butts kicked in the election.” Sports commentator Stephen A. Smith told Democrats that Trump is “closer to normal” on this issue. He wondered why they were catering to “the transgender community” when they “pertain to less than 1% of the population.”

Comedian Andrew Schulz said the Democrats can’t even have a conversation and “make jokes about pronouns” or “make a gay joke.” Radio host Charlamagne tha God, noting how the Democrats have sunk their teeth into the transgender issue, opined, “Democrats will never win another election ever again.”

To deny the reality of nature-based differences between men and women is as irrational as it is anti-science. But that is what the Democratic Party has become.

It really is mindboggling. The Democrats, who pride themselves as the champion of women’s rights, are doing more to destroy them than any other segment of the population. They have morphed into the most misogynistic force in American society. As the celebrities observe, good luck with that.

CELEBRATING ABORTIONISTS IS SICK

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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 10 was “Abortion Provider Appreciation Day.” It’s a time when those who love abortion rally to the side of medical personnel who make a living by killing kids in utero.

We looked into the origins of “Abortion Provider Appreciation Day” and found that its original proponents were ideological extremists.

Those who started this day in 1987 belonged to a radical group called Refuse and Resist! (“R&R!”). They opposed a “Christian fascist, fundamentalist morality.” Funded by the Ford Foundation, “R&R!” was pro-abortion and anti-death penalty.

The two most famous members of “R&R!” were William Kunstler and Abbie Hoffman. Kunstler spent a good part of his life defending anyone who hated America. His clients included the Communist Party, the Black Panther Party and the Chicago Seven. Hoffman was a member of the Chicago Seven, the group that was convicted for crossing state lines in 1968 to start a riot at the Democratic National Convention. Others were either members of the Communist Party or supporters of it.

Their real interest was not abortion. What they wanted was a sexual revolution that was tied to a political revolution. In other words, men like Kunstler used women to further their radical agenda.

“EVERY CHILD IS PERFECT”

This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 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](#).

When President Trump addressed a joint session of Congress last month, he took direct aim at the greatest child abuse scandal of our time—allowing minors to undergo sex-reassignment surgery.

Instead of persuading sexually confused young people, who are going through a rough patch, that they should not seek to change their sex (80 percent will decide against doing so if given the time to think it over), some therapists, teachers, administrators, doctors and nurses are encouraging them to do so.

Trump wasted no time signing an Executive Order banning the schools from indoctrinating children with transgender ideology. He also cut off funding institutions that engage in the sexual mutilation of young people. “And now I want Congress to pass a bill permanently banning and criminalizing sex changes on children—and forever ending the lie that any child is trapped in the wrong body.”

His most cogent observation was, “Our message to every child in America is that you are perfect, exactly the way God made you.”

That is a quintessentially Christian response.