

WHY ARE EDUCATED WHITE PEOPLE SO STUPID?

All over the world, the best educated white people are also the most likely to be stupid. There are exceptions, of course, but the generalization remains true nonetheless.

By educated, Bill Donohue means the number of years spent in school, and nothing more. By stupidity, he means a lack of common sense, as in a denial of human nature. By this measure, a large swath of the well-educated white people who live in North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand are plainly stupid people.

The latest evidence to support this observation can be found in the results of a Pew Research Center survey, published July 27. Donohue hastens to add that the researchers at Pew did not come to his conclusion, but that has no bearing on Donohue's interpretation of their data.

Pew found that 56% of adults surveyed believe that "gender is determined by sex assigned at birth," and 41% believe it can be different. Who believes the latter? "Liberal Democrats are particularly likely to say gender can be different from sex assigned at birth." In fact, 81% believe this to be true.

Also, "those with a bachelor's degree or more education are more likely than those who do not have a college degree to say a person's gender can be different from sex assigned at birth." Regarding race, white people are the most likely to accept this position; blacks are the least likely.

Let's begin with Sociology 101. Then we can proceed to Biology 101.

The term "gender" is constantly misused these days: it means socially learned roles that are deemed appropriate for men and

women. Thus, asking someone on an employment or medical form what “gender” he is makes no sense: the proper question is what “sex” the person is.

It is also inaccurate to say that someone’s sex was “assigned at birth.” No one is ever “assigned” his sex—it is a given. To be exact, every person who ever walked the face of the earth had his sex determined by his father. Period. In other words, the only person “assigning” the sex of the baby is the one keeping hospital records. Similarly, “gender-reveal” parties, which are really “sex-reveal” parties, are actually celebrations of what has been learned in utero about what the father has bequeathed.

Contrary to what so many educated white people believe, there is no such thing as a “non-binary” person. A human being is either a male or a female. He or she may deny this, but that is of no consequence. A person could, conceivably, think of himself as a giraffe, but self-identity is not dispositive. Reality matters more than subjective interpretations of it.

Here are some more basic biological facts that are resisted by educated white people.

A male carries the XY chromosomes; a female carries XX. Sorry, folks, there is no third combination—no XYZ exists. It’s a binary fact of life.

Another fact of life is that only females produce eggs. Males are incapable of doing so, and this would certainly include those biological men who identify as a woman. Here’s another reality check: a man can think of himself as a woman until the cows come home, but he will never be able to menstruate.

Donohue has more bad news for those who have stayed in school too long.

Males have a penis, scrotum, and testicles. Females have a vagina, uterus, and ovaries. Yes, one can pay a doctor to

mutilate his genitals and construct a Lego-type replacement—though many trans persons refuse to finish the job—but this is still not a game changer.

For example, males are continuously fertile from puberty—their sperms never stop being produced. Females are fertile for 12 hours a month, until menopause. Men have more testosterone and less estrogen than women; the obverse is also true. Males have a larger brain, thinner face, and larger veins than females. And so on.

The biological differences are evident everywhere. To take one example, the Olympics are the greatest demonstration of nature-based differences in the world. Men are stronger and faster than women, and it is this fact of life that drives sex segregation in sports. Even the most ardent feminists know this to be true. Otherwise, they would scream about discrimination and demand that all events be “inclusive” of both sexes.

The fundamental question remains. Why are educated white people the most likely to swallow the moonshine that a man who thinks he is a woman is, therefore, a woman (and vice versa)? The only plausible answer is that they have been the most indoctrinated by radical egalitarian ideologies.

To rebel against one’s own nature is sick; for others to affirm it is even sicker.

Fortunately, the notion that human nature does not exist is rejected by most of those who have less schooling, and who are non-white. More good news: It has had even less effect on those who live in Latin America, Africa, Russia, or Asia.

Educated white people who deny what nature, and nature’s God, has ordained, need to be deprogrammed. Either that or they will continue to prove just how stupid they really are.

DO WHITE CHRISTIANS DESERVE REPARATIONS?

The idea that the descendents of slaves are owed reparations is based on the notion that white people owe black people money today because dead white people mistreated dead black people long ago. On this score alone, this is a racist proposal, the victims of whom are white.

Why should those who did not suffer the indignity of slavery be awarded financial compensation? And why should those who had nothing to do with it be forced to pony up? But if this crazed idea is to be taken seriously, then white Christians are also deserving of reparations. Who should pay? Muslims.

Economist Thomas Sowell recalls that it was Adam Smith, author of *The Wealth of Nations*, who observed in 1776 that Western Europe was the only place in the world where slavery did not exist. Sowell further notes that nowhere in the world was slavery a controversial issue prior to the 18th century. It wasn't controversial in Africa or Asia or the Middle East—they were accustomed to slavery. No, it was in Western Europe and the newly created United States where objections were first registered.

It seems odd, then, that the nations which ended slavery are the ones being tapped for reparations. Yet that is exactly what the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Michelle Bachelet, wants. She recently said that those nations that “engaged in or profited from enslavement, the transatlantic trade in enslaved Africans, and colonialism—as well as those who continue to profit from this legacy,” should pay reparations.

Bachelet, like so many other elites around the world, never addresses the need for reparations to white Christians. They need to do so.

Charles Sumner was an 18th century American politician, and one of America's most famous abolitionists. He not only condemned black slavery, he condemned white slavery. Indeed, he wrote a book about it, "White Slavery in the Barbary States," published in 1853.

Sumner detailed how Muslim pirates from North Africa, called corsairs, "became the scourge of Christendom, while their much-dreaded system of slavery assumed a front of new terrors. Their ravages were not confined to the Mediterranean." In fact, they extended to "the chalky cliffs of England, and even from the distant western coasts of Ireland," forcing the inhabitants into "cruel captivity."

The most authoritative work on this subject can be found in Robert Davis' book, *Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800*. The Ohio State University professor of history estimates that "between 1530 and 1780 there was almost certainly 1 million and quite possibly as many as 1.25 million white, European Christians enslaved by the Muslims of the Barbary Coast."

How did the Muslim slavemasters manage to capture these white Christians? The Barbary pirates trolled the Mediterranean looking for ships to raid, taking their cargo and enslaving those on board. They also showed up at coastal towns of Italy, Spain, France, England, Ireland, and the Netherlands.

"While the Barbary corsairs looted the cargo of ships they captured," writes Davis, "their primary goal was to capture non-Muslim people for sale as slaves or for ransom." Meaning that the Muslim pirates were out to enslave white Christians. It should be noted that they treated their slaves just as

harshly as white slavemasters in America treated their slaves. "As far as daily living conditions," he says, "the Mediterranean slaves certainly didn't have it any better."

According to political scientist Abraham H. Miller, "For over two hundred years, during the mid-1600s to the 1830s, Barbary Muslims trafficked in white European Christians. The Ottoman Muslims trafficked in White Christian slavery started even earlier, in the 15th century. All in all, Muslims enslaved more than two million white European Christians."

Similarly, Sowell contends that the number of whites who were enslaved in North Africa by the Barbary pirates "exceeded the number of Africans enslaved in the United States and in the American colonies put together." In fact, he adds, "white slaves were being bought and sold in the Ottoman Empire decades after blacks were freed in the United States."

This raises an interesting question: Are white Christians today owed reparations?

Sowell knows the answer. "Nobody is going to North Africa for reparations, because nobody is going to be fool enough to give it to them." "So," Miller asks, "should white European Christians condemn all Muslims for their role in the enslavement of white European Christians? Should the Europeans of the Southern Mediterranean demand reparations from Muslims for the enslavement of their ancestors?"

We would go further: Should present-day Muslims living in America be forced to pay reparations to white Christians living here today?

According to the logic of those who work in the reparations industry—you don't have to be personally guilty or personally victimized to qualify—the answer is clearly yes (though we would not support it).

Perhaps the U.N.'s chief Human Rights official can offer some

advice. But to do so she would first have to admit that her selective interest in this subject makes her unsuitable to continue. She should resign.

MEET THE NEW RACISTS

Many conservatives deny that systemic racism exists. They are wrong. Racism runs deep into our institutions, and it explains why African Americans are being held back.

Does this mean that the Left has the right analysis? No, it only means they have correctly identified a serious problem. Where the Left errs is in its diagnosis. Systemic racism today is largely the result of “progressive” initiatives, policies and laws. In other words, the Left is responsible for the malady it purports to abhor. They are the new racists.

Dictionary.com defines racism as “a form of prejudice in which a person believes in the superiority of what they consider to be their own ‘race’ over others.” That is what the Klan has long believed, and it is what the Left believes today, with one important difference: most of those who espouse this view are white, and it is their contention that while they are not racists, white America is.

The Left is twice wrong: a) white America, like every segment of the country, is extraordinarily tolerant and fair-minded and b) this is not true of the new racists, namely, those who are indicting America. Here is the evidence.

To combat racism, Idaho passed a law in April that bans schools from teaching that “any sex, race, ethnicity, religion, color, or national origin is inherently superior or inferior.” Other states have since passed similar laws.

Not too long ago, if someone were to object to what this Idaho law says, that person would be branded a racist. Today those who object include the National Education Association (the NEA), the nation's largest teachers' union, and virtually every politician, activist, and media outlet on the Left. It is they who have embraced the deeply racist agenda that marks critical race theory.

Critical race theory, which will be taught in the schools this fall, thanks to the NEA, holds that white people today are inherently racist and are responsible for past racial injustices even if there is zero evidence that most white people have never discriminated against a single African American. Being white is all that counts.

According to this perspective, there are no individuals in white America—just clusters of white people. In other words, it is the immutable characteristic of race that determines who we are, not the biographical data that makes us all unique individuals. If this isn't racist, the term has no meaning. Critical race theory, however, is only one weapon in the arsenal of the new racists. Others simply resort to hate speech. Their hatred of America is palpable.

Over the Fourth of July weekend, one left-wing pundit and politician after another declared how racist America is. None was more forceful than Rep. Cori Bush, the newly elected black Democrat from Missouri; she quickly joined the Squad this year, the anti-American contingent of House Democrats. "Black people still aren't free," she exclaimed.

To the extent that blacks are not free, is due almost exclusively to people like her. For example, blacks are the biggest victims of abortion and crime: she champions the former and wants to defund the police. She apparently does not care that innocent blacks pay the biggest price in both instances.

Blacks are overrepresented in the armed forces and have served our nation with distinction; they have also used their service as a lever to achieve a middle-class status. She wants to defund the armed forces. Blacks strongly favor school choice, but Bush, who attended a Catholic high school, wants to deny poor blacks the right to go to a charter, private or parochial school.

What Bush is promoting is systemic racism—it is baked into her policy preferences. Moreover, if she really believed that black lives matter, she would seek to curb the killing of innocent black lives in the womb, and would go into East St. Louis on a Saturday night demanding that blacks stop killing each other. Instead, she wants more funds for abortion and none for the police. Thus has she systematized racism.

Nothing epitomizes systemic racism more than denying poor black people the right to compete equally with whites, Hispanics and Asians in school. Bush, however, wants to make sure that her own people are locked into failed public schools, the kinds of schools her parents rejected when they enrolled her in a Catholic school.

The reality is that it is not white supremacists whom African Americans need to fear today—it is those who champion their cause. The new racists need to be outed, confronted and defeated. They are a threat to the wellbeing of African Americans, and to the nation as a whole.

MAINLINING RACISM IN THE

SCHOOLS

Never before has the education establishment in the United States been more determined to promote racism in the schools than today. In the past, there have been texts that glossed over slavery, and curriculum that did not adequately address racial inequities in American history, but those are instances of omission. What we are witnessing today is a full-court press to deliberately divide the races, and it is coming from the top.

What makes this especially perverse is that this is not being done by Klan-like educators. No, it is being done by those who claim to be combating racism. The public is being played: Those responsible for indoctrinating students with critical race theory, and its ilk, are dishonestly maintaining that their agenda is anti-racist. In fact, they are mainlining racism in the schools.

To tell one race of students that they are morally inferior to the other is racist, and that is the point of telling white kids that they belong to the oppressor class. To tell white students that their skin color alone makes them racists is manifestly racist. This is what critical race theory espouses. The logical effect of this agenda is to divide the races. The Klan could not do better.

Those who champion this pernicious assault on racial equality often lie about their cause. Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) recently said that “Critical race theory is not taught in elementary school.” Yet the title of the msn.com article wherein she is quoted accurately notes, “AOC Defends Critical Race Theory Being Taught in Schools.”

To prove how dishonest AOC is, consider that in June the National Education Association (NEA) approved a motion to adopt critical race theory in the schools. Here are some of

the curriculum items the NEA instructed teachers to adopt.

- “Share and publicize, through existing channels, information already available on critical race theory (CRT).”
- “Provide an already-created, in-depth, study that critiques empire, white supremacy, anti-Blackness, anti-indigeneity, racism, patriarchy, cisheteropatriarchy, capitalism, ableism, anthropocentrism, and other forms of power and oppression at the intersections of our society, and that we oppose attempts to ban critical race theory and/or The 1619 Project.”
- “Join with Black Lives Matter at School and the Zinn Education Project to call for a rally this year on October 14—George Floyd’s birthday—as a national day of action to teach lessons about structural racism and oppression.”

This is the kind of Marxist claptrap we would expect from a brainwashed high school student, to say nothing of its illiteracy.

Nice to know that the NEA is opposed to capitalism but not socialism. There is a reason for this: The Zinn Education Project, a Marxist teacher-resource endeavor that the NEA endorses, is named after Howard Zinn; he was a member of the Communist Party.

The bulleted items listed were taken from “New Business Item 39” that was adopted by the NEA in June. But it does not want the taxpayers and the parents of students to know about it: it has been deleted from its website. We obtained a copy before it was nixed.

It is important to acknowledge that the leadership of the NEA, and those who, like AOC, support critical race theory, are not liberals. They are far left-wing activists. The problem is they are drowning out the voice of reasonable liberals. Unless those who were previously in the center, and were pushed to the fringes, recapture their command seats, the result will be more racism, not less of it.

MEDIA IGNORE TRANS MUPPET CHARACTER

Why would Disney, the alleged family-friendly entertainment giant, want to encourage kids to reject their sex? And why aren't the media covering this story?

The Muppet character, Gonzo, has "transitioned" to a girl, Gonzorella. That is why he is wearing a dress to the "royal ball." He does more than wear a dress—he instructs Miss Piggy and Summer that "doing things a little different can be fun."

The message to children is: a boy can be a girl, and vice versa. Making this choice, they are told, is not something abnormal, it's just "a little different." Moreover, it can be "fun" to reject your sex and pretend that you belong to the opposite sex.

This needs to be called out for what it is: child abuse. Anyone who is even remotely knowledgeable about what sex transitioning entails—the physical and psychological problems that boys and girls experience are multiple—knows how pernicious this process is. Seven in ten of those who transition are girls wanting to be boys, and the extent of their suffering is well documented.

So why is it that, aside from some gay and conservative news sources, this story was ignored by the most influential newspapers, as well as the broadcast and cable news networks? Is it their insouciance that is driving their passivity? Or cowardice?

The big disappointment is the lack of response from the conservative community (thank God we have some like Candace

Owens who will not be intimidated). Genuine conservatives are concerned about the three “M’s,” namely, markets, missiles and morality. In recent years, many have all but given up on the latter “M.” Hence, the advent of Disney poisoning the minds of children.

KANSAS CITY STAR IS A JOKE

In the 28 years that Bill Donohue has been president of the Catholic League, few newspapers have been more hypocritical in their coverage of the Catholic Church than the Kansas City Star. It added to its legacy on July 28 when it ran an editorial claiming that the Church is still not transparent in its handling of the sexual abuse of minors.

The newspaper says the Church can correct this alleged deficiency by publishing a list of priests who were “credibly accused.” It praises those dioceses which have done so. Donohue doesn’t. If anything, they are deserving of our condemnation, not commendation. The accused have rights, and that includes Roman Catholic priests.

Why should the Catholic Church publish a list of accused priests *when no institution in the United States publishes a list of its employees who have been accused of sexual misconduct* (or any offense, for that matter)? If they did, the list of those who work in the media would be extensive.

Moreover, if the names of those who have been accused, but not convicted, were made public by their employer, the employee should sue for reputational damage. In fact, the Catholic League filed an amicus brief in a case involving 11 Pennsylvania priests whose reputational rights were damaged when a grand jury report was made public listing their accused

status. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court ruled 6-1 in our favor in December 2018.

In a report on the public schools published in 2016 by USA Today, it found the following. “Congress passed a law in December 2015 requiring states to ban school districts from secretly passing problem teachers to other jurisdictions or face losing federal funds. But 45 states have not instituted the ban.”

The sentinels at the Kansas City Star should get on this one right away. But they won’t—it doesn’t involve the Catholic Church.

In 2011, when the Kansas City Star was relentless in its news stories on clergy sexual abuse, we sought a corrective: we offered the newspaper \$25,000 to pay for an advertisement that sought to set the record straight, especially about the work of SNAP. We were denied without an explanation. It was not as though the newspaper couldn’t have used the money—in the previous decade it had laid off a thousand employees. We all know why it was turned down.

For all of these reasons, the Kansas City Star is a joke.

HOUSTON CHRONICLE SHOWCASES ITS HUBRIS

In its July 1 editorial, the Houston Chronicle lectures the bishops about matters that they should leave alone. Not to be misunderstood, when the Catholic Church takes a public policy stand on any issue, it is fair game for criticism. But when it comes to internal matters, such as the sacraments, it is no more the business of a newspaper than it would be the business

of the bishops to opine on the hiring practices of a newspaper.

The editorial tells the bishops they are wrong to even consider denying President Biden Holy Communion. "Biden, who attends Mass and says he personally opposes abortion," the editorial says, "has nevertheless throughout his political career supported the legal right for women to decide for themselves to have one."

If a Catholic president attended Mass and was personally opposed to racial discrimination, but nonetheless felt it was good public policy to support it, would the Houston Chronicle consider that acceptable? Of course not. The difference is that the paper is opposed to racial discrimination but not abortion. The Catholic Church opposes both.

The paper is factually wrong to say that Biden has been a champion of abortion rights "throughout his political career." In 1974, a year after *Roe v. Wade* legalized abortion, Biden said the ruling went "too far" and that a woman seeking an abortion should not have the "sole right to say what should happen to her body."

In 1976, Biden voted for the "Hyde Amendment" which bans federal funding of abortions. In 1981, he introduced the "Biden Amendment" which prohibits foreign-aid funding of biomedical research involving abortion. In 1982, he voted for a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. In other words, in the decade following *Roe*, he had a mostly pro-life record.

In 1983, however, he reversed himself and voted against a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn *Roe*. That was the beginning of his pro-abortion stance.

After telling the bishops they are wrong to consider denying Biden the Eucharist, the editorial then contradicts itself when it admits that "what the bishops decide about who may

take part in sacraments is their decision. If lay Catholics don't like it, they can leave the church or press the bishops to reconsider." Well said. Why, then, did it violate these precepts in the remarks that preceded this concession?

Even more baffling, why did the newspaper then pivot and start lecturing the bishops again? It immediately said that "we'd like to remind the bishops of the words of Pope Francis." Next, they opine that if the bishops are going "to begin excluding politicians from communion on the basis of just one of those morale crusades," it is guilty of "cherry-picking."

What happened to the dictum that "what the bishops decide about who may take part in sacraments is their business"?

The editorial is a mess, from top to bottom.

PELOSI LIES AGAIN ABOUT HER CATHOLIC STATUS

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi lied again on July 22 when she described herself as "a devout Catholic."

Addressing the subject of abortion, she said, "As a devout Catholic and mother of five in six years, I feel that God blessed my husband and me with our beautiful family—five children in six years almost to the day. But that may not be what we should—and it's not up to me to dictate that that's what other people should do, and it's an issue of fairness and justice for poorer women in our country."

The Cambridge English Dictionary defines "devout" as meaning "believing strongly in a religion and obeying all its rules or

principles.” Pelosi does not obey the teachings of the Catholic Church on many key public policy issues.

Her enthusiasm for abortion is off-the-charts. She opposes laws that ban the killing of babies who are 80 percent born (partial birth abortion), and she even won Planned Parenthood’s highest award in 2014. In 2008, she stunned Tom Brokaw on “Meet the Press” when she falsely claimed that the Catholic Church has not taken a position on when life begins; the bishops unloaded on her for lying. That is not how “devout Catholics” act.

Pelosi not only rejects the Church’s teaching on marriage, she lied in 2015 when she said that her support for same-sex marriage is “consistent” with Catholic teaching. Last year she declared war on Catholic schools when she sought to rescind funding for Catholic schools that were granted money by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act. That is not how “devout Catholics” act.

Pelosi also lied when she said she does not want to “dictate” to others what they should do. Last September, she sought to dictate to San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone what to do about Mass attendance during the pandemic. To be exact, she lectured him for opposing the mayor’s rule that only one person at a time was allowed inside churches to pray. That is not how “devout Catholics” act.

Pelosi’s remark that she supports abortion rights out of “fairness and justice for poorer women in our country” needs explaining.

Why didn’t she say it is an issue of “fairness and justice for all women”? Quite frankly, it sounds racist. Is that her way of “taking care of the urban problem”? After all, population control of African Americans is what galvanized Margaret Sanger to found Planned Parenthood.

Non-Catholics, never mind Catholics, know Pelosi is lying

about her Catholic status. So does she.

CATHOLIC DEMOCRAT PLAYS THE VICTIM CARD

New Mexico State Sen. Joe Cervantes, a Catholic, was recently denied Holy Communion because he is pro-abortion. Now he is playing his constituents, as well as the general public. He wants everyone to think that he is the victim of Catholic persecution, when, in fact, he deliberately sought to place himself in a position so that he could make this false claim.

The teaching of the Catholic Church on abortion is very clear: it opposes the killing of innocent human life. In modern times, science has ratified what the Church has long taught, namely that life begins at conception. Cervantes knows this to be true, and he also knows that his pro-abortion stance is not in keeping with the teachings of the Catholic Church. More important, his recent bid to receive the Eucharist was done to create a stir.

There is a 1969 law in New Mexico that criminalizes abortion. It has never been enforced. That's because *Roe v. Wade*, which legalized abortion in 1973, made it moot. For grandstanding purposes, two years ago pro-abortion politicians like Cervantes sought to repeal this law. They failed.

It is common practice in the Catholic Church in the United States for priests and bishops who live in an area where pro-abortion Catholics live to reach out to them in dialogue. The goal of this outreach effort is to persuade the office holder of the seriousness of abortion and the need to respect the Church's teachings on this subject. In other words, contrary

to what some in the media say, the clergy do not take cheap public shots at wayward Catholic politicians. Regrettably, the obverse is frequently not true.

According to the Diocese of Las Cruces, both the pastor at Cervantes' church, and the local bishop, Peter Baldacchino, "reached out to him [Cervantes] multiple times in order to convey to him the teaching of the Catholic Church." And what did he do? He blew them off. "Cervantes never answered or responded to diocesan communications."

This was not the end of the outreach effort. The pastor of Cervantes' church "advised him [Cervantes] that a vote in favor of this particular Senate bill would constitute a grave moral evil and that he should not present himself for Communion." In other words, Cervantes sought to receive Communion on July 16th, knowing full well he would be denied. He did so purposefully.

Those who are not Catholic should know that it would have been perfectly legitimate for Cervantes to join the Communion line and then, instead of receiving the Eucharist, he could have elected to put his hands across his torso (one arm crossed over the other) and bow his head. At that point the priest would have blessed him. But this is not what Cervantes did. He wanted to be denied so he could claim victim status.

Phony Catholics have always been with us. But today we have an abundance of them, especially in political circles. Sadly, they are even found at the national level.

ANTI-CATHOLIC POL COOLS HIS JETS

In the last issue of Catalyst, just before we went to press, we mentioned that California Democrat Jared Huffman threatened to revoke the Catholic Church's tax-exempt status; he accused the bishops of being partisan because many of them registered their concerns over our pro-abortion Catholic president.

Huffman subsequently cooled his jets. He issued a statement complaining about the "colorful feedback from anti-abortion activists all over the country." He also cited evangelical leader Tony Perkins for helping to foment the backlash. He pointedly did not make the same threat again.

Huffman did not mention that the "colorful feedback" came as a direct result of our notifying our email subscribers to contact him—that's why he got pounded. Nor did he mention that the guest on Perkins' radio show who blasted him was Bill Donohue.

Thanks to everyone for making this happen. Huffman got the message.