

ABORTION, NOT THE PILL, FIRES THE LEFT

The birth control pill became commercially available in 1960, and in 1973 abortion was legalized. Those on the left who have been pushing for a libertine culture have won the PR battle on contraception (most Americans are okay with it), but they have lost the PR battle on abortion (most Americans want limits on when and why it should be performed).

The public has been trending pro-life in recent years. This has upset the abortion industry, forcing them to develop new strategies. One preferred tactic is to include abortion-inducing drugs in public policies that allow for contraception.

The Health and Human Services (HHS) mandate promoted by the Obama administration was designed to force all employers, including Catholic ones, to provide contraceptives in their insurance plans. They did not include abortion. However, they did include abortifacients, or abortion-inducing drugs. Why?

The Obama officials knew that abortion is viewed very differently than contraceptives, so that is why they left it out of the HHS mandate. They could have stopped right there—forcing employers to pay for contraceptives but not abortion. But they did not. They were bent on including abortifacients in their policy. In doing so, they showed their true colors: As we have been saying for years, the HHS mandate was never about contraceptives—it was always about abortion.

The long-term goal of pro-abortion activists is to have nationwide tax-funded abortions without any restrictions whatsoever. But they can't get that now, which explains why they have settled for public funding of abortifacients.

Regrettably, some on the pro-life side have failed to see what

the pro-abortion game plan is. That includes the University of Notre Dame.

In February 2018, Notre Dame president Father John Jenkins announced that the university would start providing coverage for what he called “simple contraceptives.” He said the plan would not cover abortifacients. If he thought this policy would prove to be non-controversial, he was wrong. Not only did some Notre Dame students, faculty, and alumni not agree with funding contraceptives, those on the pro-abortion side were livid. They sued because abortion-inducing drugs were not covered.

They didn’t wait long: their suit was filed in June, just four months later. Their incremental approach—push for abortifacients but not abortion—was exactly what the HHS mandate provided. Recently, on January 16, Notre Dame lost in district court in its bid to have the case dismissed. Jenkins should have known that the Left will never be appeased—they always want more.

Leading the charge for abortifacients in the school’s healthcare policy are Irish 4 Reproductive Health (a far-left student association) and three national pro-abortion and anti-Christian organizations. The students receive funding from Planned Parenthood and Catholics for Choice (a Catholic-bashing group).

What unites the four groups suing the University of Notre Dame is their contention that abortifacients are a form of birth control and should therefore not be excluded in a policy that allows for contraceptive coverage.

Are abortifacients really analogous to the pill as a form of birth control? Or are they really abortion-inducing medications?

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists says, “There is no scientific evidence that FDA-approved emergency

contraceptives affect an existing pregnancy; no EC is classified as an abortifacient."

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops disagrees, saying there is much confusion over what constitutes an abortion. "HHS uses it to describe only the disruption of an already implanted pregnancy. However, because a human life begins when sperm and egg meet to form a new living organism, the moral problem of abortion arises whenever a drug or device destroys the new embryonic human being, for example by preventing his or her implantation in the uterine wall needed to survive."

Who does the pro-abortion industry agree with? For them, the question is irrelevant. They maintain that abortion, abortifacients, and contraceptives are all the same: they are a form of birth control.

Planned Parenthood says, "The Paragard [copper] IUD is the most effective type of emergency contraception. It works up to 5 days after unprotected sex...." In other words, they agree with the bishops that it is an abortifacient.

NARAL Pro-Choice says, "Emergency contraception (EC), sometimes called 'the morning-after pill,' is birth control that significantly reduces the chances of becoming pregnant if taken soon after sex." So it, too, agrees with the bishops, but it also celebrates its usage as a form of birth control.

Interestingly, the idea that abortion is a form of birth control was rejected in 2016 by pro-abortion politician Nancy Pelosi. This earned her the wrath of her fans at NARAL.

Pelosi, who calls herself a Catholic, is constantly under criticism for her pro-abortion stance, so it behooved her not to be seen as a proponent of the position that "abortion is a form of birth control."

The pro-abortion students at the University of Notre Dame, and

their pro-abortion allies, are ultimately determined to sell the notion that abortion is a form of birth control. But because there are some nervous Nellies out there (e.g., Pelosi), they are now settling for equating abortifacients with contraceptives. It is not the pill that fires them—it's abortion.

FURTHER VINDICATION OF POPE PIUS XII

Ronald Rychlak

January 27 marked the 75th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz-Birkenau in Nazi-occupied Poland. That day, the International Day of Commemoration in Memory of the Victims of the Holocaust, was observed at the United Nations with a symposium entitled: "Remembering the Holocaust: The Documented Efforts of the Catholic Church to Save Lives."

It was co-sponsored by the Permanent Observer Mission of the Holy See to the United Nations, and Pave the Way Foundation. The conference brought together international experts on Catholic rescue efforts during the Nazi persecution. I was happy to be one of them.

Gary Krupp, who heads the Pave the Way Foundation, kicked off the event with a personal statement about his father's role in liberating the camps. He is the most vocal supporter of Pope Pius XII in the Jewish community. He asked the scholars many questions.

"During the rise of Adolf Hitler from the early 1920s, was the future Pope Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli), as Holy See Ambassador

to Germany, and the Catholic Church silent about the coming dangers?"

The scholars noted that neither the future pope nor the Church itself was silent. Pacelli recognized the dangers of National Socialism and warned others about them early on. At first he did this in reports to his superiors, and later he did so both publicly and in diplomatic messages to other nations. He also had a significant hand in the strong condemnations (including the encyclical published in German, *Mit brennender Sorge*) issued by Pope Pius XI. The Church was by no means silent.

"Did the Holy See officially recognize the Nazi regime by signing a concordat with Germany in 1933?"

It was pointed out that the agreement signed by the Holy See with Germany was not a recognition of the regime. It was made with the nation, and it remained in effect after the fall of Nazism.

The concordat ended up being very important in helping the Church continue to function during the war. It also provided a basis for protecting Jews with baptismal certificates, because it defined Jewishness as a faith and not a race. It is important to note that the concordat came after the regime had reached agreements with France, England, Italy, the Soviet Union, and had been recognized by the League of Nations. Clearly, the concordat was not an endorsement of the regime or mark of approval from the Church.

"What was the Nazi opinion of the Catholic Church and, consequently, why was it targeted by Hitler for destruction?"

All of the speakers set forth reasons why Hitler and the Nazis hated the Catholic Church. The Church sheltered victims, cooperated with the Allies, regularly filed diplomatic protests, used both its radio and newspaper to warn others about the Nazis, and Pope Pius XII joined in the plot to oust Hitler by any means necessary. The Nazis despised the Church

and Pius XII, and they had good cause to do so.

“Was Pope Pius XII an anti-Semite? Was he silent during the Holocaust? Why didn’t he protest with a forceful public condemnation of the killing of the Jews?”

Pius learned early in the war that public words would not influence the Nazis in a positive manner. In fact, as several of the experts explained, those closest to the matter – including the Allied military and bishops in occupied territories – often asked him to withhold public statements lest they lead to greater harm.

As for his actions, Pius provided the Allies with information about German troop movements, was deeply involved in the plot to overthrow Hitler, and he mandated that those who could shelter Jews from Nazi persecution do so. No, he was not an anti-Semite.

“Was Israeli diplomat Pinchas Lapide right when he estimated that the Catholic Church saved between 847,000 and 882,000 Jews during the Holocaust?”

The scholars all agreed that Lapide’s estimate is accurate as a minimum. With new archives opening and new information being found, many think the number is significantly higher. As Krupp noted, about a quarter of the Jews alive today can trace their fate back to ancestors who were saved by the Vatican of Pope Pius XII.

“How, why, and when did the esteem for the lifesaving actions taken during the Holocaust by the Holy See and Pope Pius XII begin to change? Was this the result of scholarship or propaganda?”

I took the opportunity to note the massive disinformation campaign run by the Soviets. They sought to discredit the pope, the Church, and religion itself. It was disinformation, not honest scholarship, that changed Pius XII’s reputation

after his death.

“Pope Francis has ordered that Vatican Archives be opened eight years early, on March 2, 2020. What can we expect to learn from each archive and why did it take so long to open them?”

All the speakers said they were convinced that the new documentary evidence will only strengthen their cases. Indeed, the opening of the Archives in March will shed further light on the truth of Pope Pius XII and the Church during the Holocaust.

Ronald Rychlak is Professor of Law at the University of Mississippi and a member of the Catholic League's advisory board.

WEINSTEIN'S ANTI-CATHOLIC BIGOTRY RUNS DEEP

As the Catholic League has pointed out before, Harvey Weinstein has a long history of making anti-Catholic movies, but only recently have we learned that his bigotry is not reserved to his artistic endeavors.

“Sopranos” star Annabella Sciorra has accused Weinstein of raping her. Some weeks after it allegedly occurred, she ran into him at a restaurant. She says she tried to talk to him about what happened. She told the jury last week what his reply was: “That’s what all the nice Catholic girls say.”

This shows how deeply ingrained is his bigotry. It also shows how this story, which was widely reported, was received by the media. Not one media outlet characterized his remark for what

it is—a vile anti-Catholic slur.

If an Irish Catholic producer made one anti-Semitic movie after another, and was then charged with saying, “That’s what all the nice Jewish girls say”—in reply to fending off an accusation of rape—the media would be all over it.

If Weinstein is a bigot, what does that make the media?

THE END OF PRO-LIFE DEMOCRATS

When Bill Donohue taught in a Catholic elementary school in Spanish Harlem in the 1970s, he quoted to his African American and Puerto Rican students what Rev. Jesse Jackson said about abortion: It was genocide against black people. Senator Ted Kennedy also railed against abortion, as did virtually every Democrat.

The pro-abortion party was the Republicans, home to WASP elites like the Rockefellers who saw abortion as a way to resolve “the urban problem.” That’s why their lavish funding of Planned Parenthood wound up establishing clinics in minority neighborhoods.

But by the end of the 1970s, the parties flipped: Republicans became pro-life and the Democrats became pro-abortion. They did so because of religious reasons.

Evangelicals, most of whom were Republicans, supported *Roe v. Wade*. They did so largely because Catholics, most of whom were Democrats, were pro-life. But they quickly got over their irrational opposition and, by the time Ronald Reagan became president, they joined the pro-life cause. In the Democratic party, feminists took command and drove out the pro-life

Catholic leadership. This pushed more Catholics to join the Republican party.

In the subsequent decades, the number of pro-abortion Republicans and the number of pro-life Democrats dwindled, though there was some room left for pro-life Democrats. Now that is over. What happened last week marked the end of pro-life Democrats.

Charles Camosy is a pro-life Democrat who teaches at Fordham University. He resigned recently from the board of Democrats for Life in America because the party has left him with “no choice.” Bishop Thomas Tobin, who heads the Diocese of Providence, Rhode Island, asked on February 4, “Are pro-life voters not welcome in the Democratic party?”

They are not. Recently, Senator Bernie Sanders said, “I think being pro-choice is an absolutely essential part of being a Democrat.”

Does that mean that all abortions are justified, including those where the baby is just about to be born? Yes. Are there any Democrats running for president who draw the line when it comes to partial-birth abortion? No.

During a Feb. 7 debate, Senator Elizabeth Warren and Joe Biden both endorsed congressional legislation that would codify *Roe v. Wade* should the Supreme Court reverse this decision. Pete Buttigieg, who is unemployed, had a chance at a Fox News town hall to carve out a more moderate position, but refused to do so.

In May 2018, a Gallup poll found that 13 percent support third-term abortions. Why, then, would not one Democrat running for president agree with the 87 percent of Americans who say late-term abortions are indefensible?

Four years ago, Hillary Clinton hurt herself badly when she defended partial-birth abortion in a debate with Donald Trump.

Apparently, nothing has been learned from that experience.

There was a time when New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan and New York City Mayor Ed Koch, both Democrats and supporters of Roe, said “count me out” when it comes to late-term abortions. Now the Democrats have become the “count me in” party, the consequences of which will soon be known.

SETH MEYERS LIKES NEO-NAZI TACTICS

Brooklyn has been hit with a wave of anti-Semitic attacks, and no one uses this as a pretext to make light of them. A Catholic church in Brooklyn was vandalized on January 12—a man interrupted Mass and desecrated the altar with red juice—and Seth Meyers took the occasion to make fun of it on his NBC show.

“A Brooklyn man was arrested at a Catholic church on Sunday for allegedly pouring juice on the altar and splashing it at the priest. Wow, that’s crazy, a crime in a Catholic church that led to an arrest. We will tolerate a lot of stuff here, but you can’t splash the juice. That’s where we draw the line.”

The Nazis used to bust into houses of worship in Germany, and now we have people like Seth Meyers thinking it is cute when neo-Nazis bust into Catholic churches in America. No, Catholics are not fearing pogroms, but it is alarming nonetheless to think that public personalities think it is cute to disrupt a religious service and vandalize a church. The man is sick.

Meyers crossed the line this time.

RADICAL MUSLIMS AND LEFTISTS ARE A THREAT

Attacks on Christianity, throughout the world, emanate from two principal sources: radical Muslims and leftists. The role played by radical Muslims is detailed in the 2020 World Watch List published by Open Doors; the Gatestone Institute cites radical Muslims as well, but it also mentions the role played by radical left-wing groups.

By using the data provided by Open Doors, of the 50 most oppressive nations for Christians to live in, 38 are run by Muslims and 4 are Communist controlled; the other 8 are neither Muslim nor Communist states.

For all the talk about an Islamic Reformation, it appears that nothing has changed. The violence against Christians is epidemic, yet there is little in the way of Christian persecution of Muslims.

If Muslims run three out of four of the most violent places in the world for Christians to live, radical left-wing groups are responsible for the lion's share of anti-Christian attacks in the secular nations of Western Europe. The Gatestone Institute's research shows that approximately 3,000 Christian churches, schools, cemeteries and monuments were defaced or destroyed there in 2019.

France and Germany are the most anti-Christian nations in Europe; Spain is also notorious for its assaults on Christianity. That these nations are beacons of secularism

cannot be denied. Theirs may be a softer persecution than is true in Islamic nations—the left-wing activists favor arson, defecation, looting, mockery, profanation, Satanism, theft, urination, and vandalism to armed attacks on individuals—but it is no less menacing.

Muslim nations that persecute Christians have their origins in the most extreme interpretations of Islam. But what accounts for the anti-Christian assaults by radical secularists?

The Gatestone researchers sought to understand the motives of the anti-Christian acts in Western Europe. Vandalism and theft were two of the four listed in the report; there was nothing extraordinary about these findings. The other two motives were more revealing: they were grounded in politics and religion.

“Some attacks” they said, “especially those against Roman Catholicism, which some radical feminists and radical secularists perceive to be a symbol of patriarchal power and authority, are political in nature. Such attacks include defacing churches and religious symbols with political graffiti, much of it anarchist or feminist in nature.”

“Many attacks that appear to be religious or spiritual in nature reflect a deep-seated hostility toward Christianity. Such attacks include smearing feces on representations of Jesus Christ or statues of Mary, the mother of Jesus. Other attacks involve the defilement of or theft of Communion wafers...[which] may be the work of Satanists, who use the consecrated host in a ritual called the Black Mass.”

Radical feminists, radical secularists, anarchists, and Satanists. What do they have in common? They are all aligned with the politics of the left.

No one doubts that radical feminists and radical secularists are among the most influential left-wing activists in the western world. More contentious is the proposition that anarchists and Satanists are also associated with left-wing

politics.

Historically, some extremists on the right have been anarchists, but today anarchists more typically resemble Antifa in the United States. "Anarchists and antifascists, often called the antifa, are factions of the far left who feel they are not represented by the mainstream Democratic Party." That description, offered by a reporter for the *Washington Post*, is accurate.

The Church of Satan says it has no "official" political position. Yet a look at the positions staked out by The Satanic Temple are squarely on the left: for instance, their support for abortion-on-demand is so extreme that it is impossible to go beyond it.

Many who have followed the litany of anti-Christian offenses in Western Europe have noted how left-wing the perpetrators are.

Ellen Fantini, director of The Observatory on Intolerance and Discrimination Against Christians in Europe, says her organization has documented that "churches and other symbols of Christianity in Europe are targets for many groups—from Islamists to radical feminists, LGBT activists to anarchists and self-proclaimed Satanists." Four of the five groups mentioned (the last four) are clearly in the camp of leftists.

The bishop of Fréjus-Toulon, Dominique Rey, agrees, but goes one step further. "We are witnessing the convergence of laicism—conceived as secularism, which relegates the faithful only to the private sphere and where every religious denomination is banal or stigmatized—with the overwhelming emergence of Islam, which attacks the infidels and those who reject the Koran."

It is striking to note that radical Muslims and radical left-wing activists prefer to attack Christianity, but not each other. Yet in terms of their respective worldviews, they could

not be more different, particularly on matters governing marriage, the family, and sexuality. Moreover, as Bishop Rey observes, Christianity is being privatized while Islam is expanding in Western Europe. How can this be?

There is no cabal at work. What conjoins the two radical wings, one religious and the other secular, is hatred of Christianity. But the source of their animosity is not the same. Radical Muslims want to conquer the West but cannot do so without attacking the Christian roots of Western civilization. Radical secularists want a full-blown libertine society—a sexual Shangri-La—but cannot do so without also attacking the Christian roots of Western civilization.

Christians are fighting for their lives against radical Muslims, and are fighting for their heritage against radical left-wing activists. They are the only sane players in this very sick development. More important, Christianity is the only tonic that can save us from their ravages.

WHY ARE DEMOCRATS SO UNHAPPY?

The Democrats are an unhappy people. This has nothing to do with their hatred of President Trump: it's who they are.

Gallup released a poll on February 6 measuring personal life satisfaction. The survey was broken down on the basis of age, sex, income, marital status, family status (e.g. those who have young children), education, race, and political preference.

It was found that those who make over \$100,000 a year are the most likely segment of the population to say they are satisfied with their personal life. In second place are

Republicans. In last place are those who make less than \$40,000. Democrats are second to last.

Similarly, a Gallup poll released in January on happiness found that Republicans are happier than Democrats. Moreover, the gap is widening between Republicans and Democrats on the scale of being "very happy." No data were collected based on income.

Money may not buy happiness but it clearly has an impact on personal life satisfaction. That is easy to understand. But why are Democrats so unsatisfied and so relatively unhappy?

Some might say that because African Americans are more likely to be Democrats and are more likely to be at the low end of the income scale, that racial discrimination is indirectly causing the outcome. That assumption is wrong. The real reason for this divide is religion, not race.

Surveys done on wellbeing have consistently found that there is a positive correlation between religiosity (religious beliefs and practices) and happiness; the more religious a person is the happier he is likely to be.

This is true worldwide. A survey by the Pew Research Center released last year that measured religion and happiness on a global scale found that "actively religious people are more likely than their less-religious peers to describe themselves as 'very happy.'"

We know from many surveys that blacks are much more religious than whites. Indeed, they have more in common with Republicans when it comes to religiosity than they do with white Democrats. The latter are the most secular segment of the population.

So when religion is factored in, we are left with the conclusion that it is white secular Democrats who are the most dissatisfied and the least happy. It is not race and party

preference that makes one happy or unhappy. What matters is religiosity.

“Why Are Democrats So Unhappy?” The answer lies more with their lack of religious beliefs and practices—driven by white Democrats—than any other factor.

PLAYING FAVORITES WITH TWO POPES

On New Year’s Eve Pope Francis had an altercation with a woman as he walked a line of greeters.

The pope slapped an Asian woman twice on the hand and walked away in a fit of anger. That much is indisputable. Why he did it and what it means is a matter of debate. The Vatican attributed his reaction to being grabbed by the woman as she sought to shake his hand, causing “a shooting pain.”

The larger issue here is the way many in the media treated the pope’s reaction, and how they typically respond when the source of controversy is Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI. Benedict is rarely given the benefit of doubt when a controversy arises.

Claire Giangravé wrote a piece for Religion News Service noting the Holy Father apologized for “being grumpy.” The Vatican never indicated that he was grumpy on New Year’s Eve, or that he reacts intemperately when he is.

AFP, the French news agency, blamed the pope’s bodyguards—they should have been more vigilant.

Several commentators blamed the woman.

Dave Armstrong at Patheos said her reaching out to him with both arms was “shocking and staggering.”

International Business Times said the pope’s violent reaction was very “human.”

John Allen at Crux blamed the Asian woman as well. He said “it was the grasping woman rather than the pope” who was guilty. He also blamed the pope’s ethnicity, saying “the revelation that an 83-year-old Argentinean male has a temper wasn’t exactly a thunderclap.”

Why is it okay for those on the Left, who are the masters of identity politics, to blame a woman of color while using as exculpatory the pope’s alleged machismo upbringing?

There is a game going on here. We have the good pope, Francis, and the bad pope, Benedict. This is currently being played out on the big screen. Those who have reviewed “The Two Popes” have noted the unfair nature of the contrasting portrayals. This includes *Commonweal*, Bishop Robert Barron, *First Things*, the *Washington Post*, and *Vanity Fair*.

This is nothing new. On March 3, 2014, we published an op-ed ad in the *New York Times* titled, “Happy Anniversary Holy Father.” On the day of Pope Francis’ first year anniversary, March 13, we mentioned the Catholic League’s tribute to him in a news release. But we also took the opportunity to comment on the way the media were treating Francis and his predecessor.

“What is particularly odious is the increasing tendency of agenda-ridden Catholics to trash Pope Benedict XVI, as well as Blessed Pope John Paul II: this is done so that their inflated image of Pope Francis stands in sharp contrast to Benedict and John Paul II.

“To those who constantly look at the world through a political lens, there are good popes (Francis) and bad ones (his predecessors). This is a jaundiced view of reality, and it is

unfair to all of them.”

LOOKS LIKE VICTORY IN NEW YORK STATE

New York State Department of Education has put on ice its proposal to allow public schools to exercise control over private schools. We fought this power grab on two occasions in the past two years and will continue to do so again if it is resurrected. We are delighted to learn that the vast majority of those who responded to the invitation to make a public response to this initiative were opposed to the plan.

On April 5, 2018, we wrote a letter to the Commissioner of Education at the New York State Education Department, Mary Elia, expressing the concerns of the Catholic League. Though the proximate cause for allowing a partial takeover of private schools was alleged curriculum deficiencies in some yeshivas operated by Orthodox Jews, there were passages in the guidelines that actually allowed the state to exercise more control of parochial schools than yeshivas.

We not only protested this idea, we rejected the entire scheme. At stake is the religious autonomy of Catholic and Jewish schools. “To be sure, there are legitimate educational matters that should concern the state,” we said, “regardless of whether a school is private non-sectarian, religious, or public. There are also legitimate church and state issues involved when it comes to the public policing of religious education.”

On August 28, 2019, we issued another statement, this time encouraging our allies to contact the New York State Education

Department; we provided the email contact information. The notion that a local public school, which may be a failed institution, would be given oversight over an academically excellent Catholic school is something right out of the Twilight Zone.

Albany education officials should have hit the “stop button,” not the “pause button.” This proposal was killed in the court of public opinion and was certain to be killed in the courts as well. It should be withdrawn and buried.

POPE BRANDS TRANSGENDER THEORY AS EVIL

Pope Francis is on the left of the political spectrum on economic and environmental issues, but he remains a conservative on moral issues. His defense of the rights of the unborn is as strong as his two predecessors, and there is nothing heterodox about his comments on marriage, the family, and sexuality: he is a defender of traditional moral values.

In his apostolic exhortation responding to the Amazon synod’s call for the ordination of married men and a reconsideration of the Church’s position on women deacons, he gave the so-called progressives nothing. In fact, he didn’t even answer their plea—they were summarily dismissed. Worse, as far as the dissidents are concerned, was his embrace of complementarity, that is, the commonsensical observation that men and women are not identical but are indeed complementary.

The Holy Father goes beyond his two predecessors by strongly condemning gender theory. He was recently asked where he sees evil at work today. “One place is ‘gender theory.’” He went on

to say that gender theory is “dangerous” because it seeks to destroy basic differences between the sexes. “It would make everything homogenous, neutral. It is an attack on difference, on the creativity of God and on men and women.” These remarks are nothing new for the pope. In 2014, he said, “Gender ideology is demonic.”

Such comments would be enough to get Pope Francis banned from speaking in England—Franklin Graham was just banned for voicing similar comments—and from most colleges and universities in the United States. Many Catholic ones would like to deny him the right to speak the truth about this subject as well, though they wouldn’t have the nerve to do so.

If this madness about men and women being interchangeable were just a theory confined to the asylum and the academy (increasingly indistinguishable), no one would care. But unfortunately, it has been operationalized.

Connecticut allows men to compete in women’s sports providing the guys consider themselves to be girls. They call such people transgender athletes. But real girls keep losing to these guys in girls’ sports and so three real girls have sued claiming that they are being discriminated against under Title IX: it is a federal law that bars discrimination on the basis of sex.

The ACLU, which worked hard to defeat the Equal Rights Amendment for women for 50 years, is defending the discrimination against the girls. “The truth is,” it says, “transgender women and girls [meaning men and boys who think they are not men and boys] have been competing in sports at all levels for years, and there is no research supporting the claim that they maintain a competitive advantage.”

That’s right, the lawyers at the ACLU need to see the research. We don’t. That argument implodes by considering the Olympics. The reason why the Olympics is a showcase of sex

segregation is precisely because men are stronger and faster than women. If there were not a competitive advantage enjoyed by men, the Olympics would be unisex. It never will be. That is because men have more testosterone than women, and even the ACLU can't do anything about that.

Why is this subject even a matter of debate? Because of the geniuses who populate the academy. It all comes down to the postmodern assault on truth, nature, and nature's God.

Once that is done, a man can consider himself to be a dog and compete in a dog show. He can even be walked by a professor of sociology and access a hydrant. Wonders never cease.