

CUOMO'S DREAM HAS COME TRUE

Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. had a dream: it was to unite the races. While that dream remains unfulfilled, much progress has been made, thanks largely to him. Gov. Andrew Cuomo also had a dream: to allow children to be killed in their mother's womb right up until birth by non-physicians. Now his dream has been realized.

It is indisputable that in the third trimester the baby is capable of feeling pain, so when the baby has his head punctured with a blunt instrument—that's what happens in partial-birth abortions—he feels it.

Cuomo has also sanctioned the killing of infants. Even babies who survive a botched abortion are now allowed to die unattended by staff. Infanticide is usually associated with Hitlerian regimes, not democratic ones.

Cuomo was so ecstatic about winning that he ordered One World Trade Center to light up the sky in pink. Red would have been a more apt choice.

It would be impossible to find any politician in the United States who is more enthusiastic about abortion than Andrew Cuomo. He is literally orgasmic about it. "Because it's her body, it's her choice. Because it's her body, it's her choice. Because it's her body, it's her choice."

Cuomo's three-time refrain was voiced in 2013. He failed then, largely because of the Republican controlled Senate. But now that the Democrats own both houses of the legislature, he finally won. Gloria Steinem, who aborted her child when she was 22, was among the first to congratulate him. In his victory speech, the former altar boy ended by saying, "God bless you."

If this isn't demonic, the word has no meaning.

There are many parts of Cuomo's bill that are obscene, but there is one part that deserves special mention. That is the part that allows non-physicians to perform abortions. Not surprisingly, the media downplayed this aspect of the law.

Under the new law, physician assistants, midwives, and nurse practitioners can now perform abortions. This has never been done in New York State. That this is being championed by those who say they are pro-women makes it all the more sickening.

Licensed midwives, for example, are trained in maternity care, pre-conception counseling, routine gynecological care, family planning, and how to administer health screenings and exams. They are not trained to perform an abortion, and they certainly have no competence in how to deal with serious complications arising from an abortion.

Cuomo knows there aren't enough doctors who will agree to suction a baby out of the mother's womb at nine months, so he has to allow those who have no training as a physician to do so. By the way, when Planned Parenthood pushed for the same type of legislation in California in 2012, the California Nurses Association fought it.

What will Cuomo do if there aren't enough non-physicians to do the dirty deed? Permit orderlies to do it?

Here's a fast quiz. Which women will be the most likely to have a non-physician do their abortion? Rich white women? Or poor blacks and Hispanics?

Doing an abortion successfully (meaning not hurting the woman) takes a lot of experience, so don't expect the midwife to catch on quickly. In 1990, Minnesota abortionist Jane Hodgson received The Margaret Sanger award from Planned Parenthood. Here is what she said.

"When I first started doing abortions, I took my boards in Obstetrics and Gynecology, and therefore I knew I was

competent to do it. After I had done my first few hundred I realized how silly I had been. At this point, having done somewhere around 12,000 procedures, I'm beginning to think I am reasonably competent."

It is not likely that the average nurse practitioner will be able to reach that level of competence about this "procedure" any time soon.

So what happens to the women who undergo an abortion and wind up bleeding all over the place? What will the midwife do? We know from the work of emergency room physician Dr. Matt Zban that trained doctors have a difficult time as it is tending to women pushed out of clinics after experiencing severe complications following their abortion. What can we reasonably expect the physician assistant will do?

The family of the first woman to die as a result of an abortion performed by a non-physician should sue New York State.

Rep. Lee Zeldin is an observant Jewish congressman from Long Island. Here is what he said the day Cuomo signed his bill.

"As a parent of identical girls born in their 2nd trimester at less than 1.5 pounds, I'm especially disgusted by the NYS legislature voting today to allow late term, partial birth abortions up to the end of the 3rd trimester & allowing non doctors to perform abortion. So wrong!"

It's a tragedy that the non-observant Catholic governor of New York can't see the truth in Zeldin's observation.

VIRGINIA GOVERNOR JUSTIFIES INFANTICIDE

Virginia Governor Ralph Northam, following the lead of New York Governor Andrew Cuomo, is not content to promote the killing of children in the womb through term. He wants, as Cuomo has already sanctioned, the killing of children who survive an abortion.

When asked about a bill by Democrat Kathy Tran that would allow women going into labor to abort their child, Northam said he was just fine with that.

“If a mother is in labor, I can tell you exactly what would happen. The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that’s what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.”

It is so thoughtful of Gov. Northam to assure us that the baby would be “kept comfortable” before they put him down or let him die.

Here’s an early 19th century analogy.

“The slave would be resuscitated if that’s what the master and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between lawmakers and the owner.”

The Democratic Party is fast becoming the party of death. Every Democrat running for president, including those who may run, should be asked whether they agree with Northam. This is a defining moment. They should also be asked who else they think does not merit the most basic of human rights.

REACTION TO NORTHAM IS STUNNING

It is a sign of the times that more liberals are upset about the decades-old racist antics of Virginia Gov. Ralph Northam than they are his blood-curdling remarks about infants. Whether Northam is guilty of dressing in Klan garb for a yearbook photo is debatable—he seems not to know—but his blackface imitation of Michael Jackson is not. To be sure, his racist behavior is offensive, but his support for murdering innocent infants is far worse.

When asked about a bill by Virginia lawmaker Kathy Tran that would allow a woman going into labor to abort her child, the governor, who is a pediatric neurologist, said that in such a situation the child would be delivered, “kept comfortable,” resuscitated, and then, if the mother and her physician decided to end his life, he would be left to die.

When prominent Democrats were asked if they agreed with Northam’s support for infanticide, they demurred, saying they did not have all the facts. The media also played games with these stories, running four-to-five times as many reports on his racist stunts than they did his statements on the child.

No media outlet was more stunningly obscene than the *Washington Post*: It ran an editorial condemning Northam for his racism yet said not a word about his Hitlerian ethics. Looks like their moral compass has crashed.

Here is another way of looking at these issues.

What would the reaction be if instead of his blackface stunt, Northam had dressed in priestly garb that featured him sporting an erection (such an outfit is sold every year at Halloween)? Would those calling for him to resign because of his racism ask him to resign for his anti-Catholicism?

What would the reaction be if instead of okaying the killing of an infant, he okayed the killing of newborn cats and dogs? Would those making light of his support for infanticide be as complacent about his death wish for animals?

Tragically, we know the answers. Such is the state of morality in liberal quarters these days.

CUOMO'S ABORTION LAW WREAKS HAVOC

Last month, a New Yorker from Queens, Anthony Hobson, beat and dragged his girlfriend, Jennifer Irigoyen, down a flight of stairs and then stabbed her in the neck, abdomen and torso. He stabbed her in the stomach because he wanted to kill the baby he fathered (some news stories say she was 14 weeks pregnant and others put the figure at 20 weeks). The pregnant woman shouted, "He's got a knife. He's going to kill the baby!"

Hobson killed both the woman and her baby. He was immediately charged with two crimes, but the charge for killing her baby was subsequently dropped: it was noted that Gov. Andrew Cuomo's new abortion law provides no penalties for the killing of unborn children; abortion was removed from the criminal code and inserted into the public health law. Cuomo has not commented on what he has wrought.

The Albany lawmaker who sponsored the bill that Cuomo lobbied for, State Sen. Liz Krueger, and her colleague in the senate, Anna Kaplan, authored an article in the *Times Union* that disagrees with the Queens prosecutor's interpretation of the law. They say there is nothing in the law that prevents any prosecutor from charging someone like Hobson for a crime. They

say Hobson could be prosecuted for first-degree assault, a sentence that is harsher than the previous sentence for “unlawful abortion.”

Who’s got the better of the argument? The only way to settle this is to have clarity, and that means a new statute needs to be written that addresses this issue. We are calling on Sen. Krueger to work with other lawmakers, in both chambers, to draft legislation that makes it a crime to murder the baby of a pregnant woman.

MEDIA IGNORE POPE’S REMARKS ON GAY PRIESTS

When it comes to reporting what Pope Francis says about sexuality, the reaction of the mainstream media is stunning. Whenever he says something they consider ill-liberal, they simply don’t report it.

The cover-up continued recently when excerpts from a new book by the pope, *The Strength of a Vocation*, were made public. The Holy Father spoke frankly about homosexual priests. To say he has soured on gay priests would be an understatement. He gets it. Here is a selection of his comments.

“The issue of homosexuality is a very serious issue that must be adequately discerned from the beginning with the candidates [for the priesthood], if that is the case. We have to be exacting. In our societies it even seems homosexuality is fashionable and that mentality, in some way, also influences the life of the Church.”

That is putting it mildly. The gay subculture in the Catholic

Church has done tremendous damage, and it is one that still needs to be purged.

Speaking of homosexual attractions, the pope said, "It's not just an expression of an affection. In consecrated and priestly life, there's no room for that kind of affection. Therefore, the Church recommends that people with that kind of ingrained tendency should not be accepted into the ministry or consecrated life. The ministry or consecrated life is not his place."

Yes, "people with that kind of ingrained tendency," or what Pope Benedict XVI said in 2005, those with "deep-seated homosexual tendencies," are not suitable for the priesthood. Pope Francis could not be more clear, saying, "It's better for them to leave the ministry or the consecrated life rather than to live a double life."

In other words, it's time for homosexual priests who are more gay than they are priests, to exit. That this even needs to be said—and it does—is an index of the problem.

This story made the International News component of the Associated Press, but was not picked up by its U.S. counterpart. Where was Nicole Winfield?

This story never made the *New York Times*. Where was Laurie Goodstein? How did she miss it?

This story never made the *Washington Post*. Where was Michelle Boorstein? How did she miss it?

This story never made the *Los Angeles Times*, but it did make the much lower circulation newspaper, the *Daily News of Los Angeles*. How did the Times miss it? [We are happy to note that AP and Reuters picked up this story.]

None of this is by accident. The reporters and sources named never miss a chance to report on any of the pope's more

liberal pronouncements. Their goal is to downplay the pope's more conservative positions lest Catholics, and the public more generally, conclude that the pope doesn't subscribe to the "progressive" sexual agenda that elites favor.

It is striking to note that the gay press, and pundits on the left, did not play the cover-up game. Pink News expressed its displeasure with the pope, the *Advocate* called his remarks a "new broadside against gays," and the Daily Beast screamed, "Pope Francis Goes Full Homophobe, Now 'Very Worried' About Homosexuality in the Church."

What the pope said is a good start. But we need those in positions of influence in the Catholic Church, beginning with seminaries, to follow through. He's given us the green light—now it's time to finish the job.

MEDIA POLITICS EXPLAIN POPE COVERAGE

A cardinal holds a beatification ceremony in Algeria for 19 monks, nuns and other Catholics who were killed during Algeria's civil war in the 1990s.

Pope Francis addresses an international conference celebrating the 70th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights wherein he highlights the rights of the unborn.

It is not a stretch to say that most Americans would think that the second story would merit the most coverage. They would be wrong.

The first story on the beatification ceremony was picked up by

the Associated Press, *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Florida Times-Union*, *Post-Courier*, *Sunday Telegraph*, *Washington Post*, and the *Winston-Salem Journal*. All these newspapers ran at least a part of the AP story by Nicole Winfield.

Not a single newspaper in the nation picked up the AP story on Pope Francis' address.

What's going on? Abortion. That's what.

Some may say that there is no news here: everyone knows the Catholic Church opposes abortion. But for the pope to give the rights of the unborn the prominence he did while celebrating an historic event—on a subject where there are dozens of other human rights that could have been mentioned—this is at least as worthy of note as the Algerian story.

Moreover, in its release on the pope's address, the Vatican News listed 18 human rights that the Holy Father has spoken about in recent years. It listed at the top, "The right to life, particularly of the unborn and the elderly." It also cited, in its introductory commentary, the pope's critical remarks on ideological colonization (or gender ideology), i.e., the belief that male and female are interchangeable, not rooted in nature.

On economic issues, Pope Francis typically holds to a more liberal interpretation, but on moral issues he skews toward a more conservative position. This explains why the media give him plenty of coverage when he speaks on the former and are so dismissive when he speaks on the latter.

Media politics are quite evident.

NATIVITY SCENE ERECTED IN CENTRAL PARK

Can religious symbols be displayed on public property? Yes, but it is a qualified yes.

In December, the Catholic League erected a life-size nativity scene in Central Park, on a piece of public property in front of the Plaza Hotel, between 58th and 59th Street on 5th Avenue. We received a permit from the New York City Parks Department, as we have for decades. Sitting nearby is the world's largest menorah, which is also a religious symbol.

There are no Santa Clauses, reindeers, Jack Frosts, or any other secular symbols surrounding our religious display. We don't need to have them. Why? Because Central Park is a public forum, a place that is open to all ideas, concerts, artistic exhibitions, and the like. So the government cannot stop us from erecting our crèche.

So why do some say that religious symbols cannot be displayed on public property unless they are accompanied by secular symbols? They would not be correct if they were referring to a public forum, but they would be correct if they were referring to a swatch of public land near a municipal building, such as city hall.

The difference there is that it could be argued that the proximity of the religious symbols near a municipal entity might be interpreted as government sanction of religion. That argument cannot reasonably be made if the land is a public forum. Practicing Christians, Jews, and others, need to understand the difference so as to avoid unnecessary problems.

Regrettably, there are still instances where the government is acting irresponsibly, such as the denial of a nativity scene at the Bandstand in Rehoboth: officials in this Delaware

community should be challenged in court—the Bandstand is a public forum.

Another controversy arose in December in Springfield, Illinois when the Satanic Temple received permission to erect a Satanic display next to a nativity scene and a menorah in the Capitol rotunda. This mean-spirited “competition”—designed to neuter the religious displays—borders on hate speech and could be challenged on such grounds. Government officials said they had to honor the request. Really? Would they allow the display of a huge swastika to be placed next to a menorah?

Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas said several years ago that the high court has failed the public by not making clear what is permissible under the Constitution when it comes to religious expression. He was right then, and nothing has happened subsequently to invalidate his observation.

We hope that New Yorkers, and those visiting New York City this Christmas season, stopped by and saw the Catholic League’s nativity scene in Central Park. It was up through the New Year.

BANNING CHRISTMAS IN THE SCHOOLS

There is much ignorance about the state of the constitutional law as it applies to Christmas celebrations in the public schools. To cut to the quick—they are permitted.

A Christmas play by the Minden Junior Service League, performed at Minden High School in Webster Parish, Louisiana, was recently the source of much controversy. Two of the 35

minutes of the play discussed Jesus, and some objected, including the Webster Parish School Board.

The Superintendent Johnny Rowland was sympathetic to those who wanted the play, but insisted that there is a "federal court order [that] clearly spells out what is allowable and what is not." Despite attempts to censor the play, it was performed anyway, and was greeted with a standing ovation.

Officials at Manchester Elementary School, which is part of the Elkhorn Public Schools in Nebraska, got all ginned up over Christmas and decided to ban displays of Santa Claus, Christmas trees, Christmas songs, and the colors red and green. Candy canes were also banned. Thanks to Liberty Counsel, the decision was reversed and sanity prevailed.

What is permissible at Christmastime in the public schools?

In 1995, Secretary of Education Richard Riley issued a directive on this subject at the behest of President Bill Clinton. Here is the language of how the operative paragraph begins:

"Official neutrality regarding religious activity. Teachers and administrators, when acting in those capacities, are representatives of the state and are prohibited by the establishment clause from soliciting or encouraging religious activity, and from participating in such activity with students."

This first part makes good sense: it is not the business of school officials to lead students in religious activities. But the second part also makes good sense, yet it is frequently ignored.

"Teachers and administrators are also prohibited from discouraging activity because of its religious content, and from soliciting or encouraging anti-religious activity."

In other words, school officials cannot ban voluntary, student-led religious activity at Christmastime. Students cannot be punished for singing Christmas carols, distributing Christmas cards, wearing red and green, giving Christmas presents, writing Christmas poems, giving speeches paying tribute to Jesus, etc.

No federal court has ever ruled that Christmas must be censored in the public schools. It's about time the superintendents and their lawyers got up to speed and stopped listening to cultural fascists bent on banning Christmas: they know nothing about the First Amendment provisions regarding freedom of religion and freedom of speech.

BOY SCOUTS TOOK THE INCLUSION BAIT

The Boy Scouts of America (BSA) is exploring the possibility of declaring bankruptcy. How could an organization which had roughly 5.5 million members in the early 1970s, and now commands only 2.3 million, collapse so rapidly?

Several factors are at work, but none are more important than the left-wing assaults on the BSA, and the role of molesting Scout masters.

In the early 1990s, Bill Donohue was asked by the Center for the Study of Natural Law at the Claremont Institute in California to write a monograph on the problems facing the BSA. The second edition of *On the Front Line of the Culture War: Recent Attacks on the Boy Scouts of America* was published in 1993, the year Donohue came to the Catholic League. More than any other left-wing entity, it was the ACLU that first

declared war on the BSA.

The ACLU started suing the BSA left and right, and this, in turn, inspired other left-wing organizations to do likewise. The ACLU sued over the Three “G’s”—Gays, Godless, and Girls—hoping to force the organization to allow homosexuals, atheists, and girls to join. While the BSA officials initially fought these efforts, they eventually succumbed to the politics of inclusion, changing its traditional standards to appease its critics.

History shows, however, that hard-core ideologues are not interested in being appeased—they are interested in winning. In this case, victory meant the demise of the BSA.

The only one of the Three “G’s” that the BSA held the line on were the atheists. But even there, the organization that prided itself on honoring the Judeo-Christian ethos adjusted its sails to appease its critics. So they let anyone join who professed a belief in anything, ranging from devotees of Zeus to Wiccans.

Allowing girls to join the BSA was long considered a non-starter: after all, there is an organization called the Girl Scouts of America. But to zealots this is not enough—their radical egalitarian agenda demanded that the girls crash the BSA. Last year, the BSA gave in and allowed girls to join.

Two things immediately happened: the BSA lost 425,000 members in the month it made the announcement (October 2017), and last month the Girl Scouts sued them as well. Inclusion anyone?

The biggest headache for the BSA came from homosexual activists. They won the support of the media, higher education, left-wing legal groups, even corporate America. In 2013, the BSA allowed homosexual boys to join and in 2015 it ended its ban on gay adult leaders. In 2017, it yielded again, ruling that biological boys who identify as girls can join. Not much left after that.

In 1920, ten years after the BSA was founded, it started a "red flag" system to identify adult males who were known to sexually abuse the boys and young men. It would later be known as the "Ineligible Volunteer Files," commonly referred to as the "perversion files."

Fast forward to October 2012. The Oregon Supreme Court ordered the release of 1,200 confidential files detailing cases of sexual molestation that occurred between 1965 and 1985. It was this that started a wave of lawsuits, with victims, alleged and real, seeking lucrative financial settlements. This proved to be devastating.

In 2012, the *Los Angeles Times* also got its hands on 1,600 confidential files dating from 1970 to 1991. In most cases, the BSA found out about the sexual abuse after it had been reported to the authorities.

It is hard to say exactly how many of the molesters were pedophiles (those who hit on prepubescent boys or girls) and how many were homosexuals (those who hit on postpubescent males). For reasons that are entirely political, the media have shown no interest in getting to the bottom of this.

Why the left-wing assault on the BSA? It is a bastion of traditionalism, and that is one thing the Left hates, especially the core Judeo-Christian values. It is also a voluntary organization, one of the most important intermediate associations in the nation; these social institutions separate the individual from the state.

Leftists are nothing but statist: They want the power to control the people. Thus, anything that stands in their way—such as the family, church, and voluntary associations (the BSA)—are an obstacle to the power and reach of the state. Following the philosophy of Rousseau, these institutions must be destroyed.

Would matters have turned out differently had the BSA

officials not adopted the politics of inclusion? Hard to say, but at least they could have made their mark in the culture war. Instead, they caved, and now they are paying the price.

BOSTON GLOBE REJECTS REQUEST FOR DATA

Bill Donohue

On November 4, there was a front-page story in the *Boston Globe* alleging that more than 130 bishops, or about a third of those still living, have been accused of “failing to adequately respond to sexual misconduct in their dioceses.”

The news story, which was based on a study by reporters from the *Globe* and the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, garnered national headlines; it was released prior to a conference of U.S. bishops who were meeting in Baltimore to discuss the sexual abuse scandal.

How accurate was the study? We will never know. Why not? Because the *Boston Globe* is keeping it a secret: it denied me the right to examine its data.

That’s right, the same newspaper that insists on total transparency on the part of the bishops—they must allow full disclosure of their internal data—will not make public its data on the bishops.

What data are we talking about? The *Boston Globe* said the reporters from the two newspapers examined “court records, media reports, and interviews with church officials, victims, and attorneys.”

On November 16, I emailed Brian McGrory, editor of the *Boston Globe*, asking if he would allow someone to verify the study. He did not respond. On November 20, I made the same request in a letter mailed to him at the newspaper. On November 28, I received the first in a series of email exchanges with Scott Allen, Assistant Managing Editor for Projects.

"A group of seven reporters in Boston and Philadelphia reviewed public records of all living bishops, including media reports, court records and interviews with sources all over the country," Allen said. The information was then entered into a spreadsheet.

"We chose not to publish the spreadsheet because the point of our exercise was not to fault individual bishops," Allen wrote. "Instead, we were demonstrating the widespread lack of accountability in the church hierarchy."

This is pure rubbish. If the point was not to "fault individual bishops," why did the news story feature the photos of four bishops on the front page (three of whom were arguably innocent). And even if the point was to show lack of accountability, what does that have to do with my request to see the raw data?

My next request was to get permission to at least read the transcripts of the interviews that were conducted "with sources all over the country." Again, I was turned down. Allen said, "We don't circulate our interviews unless we plan to publish them." That's a nice Catch-22: I can't read the transcripts because they won't publish them.

I then asked why they wouldn't publish the transcripts on their website. Allen told me that they do lots of interviews every week and don't publish them. "But this is different," I told him. This is not a news story—it is a study.

As a sociologist, I said, I have an interest in seeing "the raw data of a research project whose conclusions have been

made public. It is common practice in professional research undertakings to make public the data upon which the conclusions have been made.”

This was the end of our exchange.

What is the *Boston Globe* hiding? Are they afraid that if people like me found out who they interviewed that it might blow up in their face?

A few years ago, Terence McKiernan of BishopAccountability told an audience of Church haters that Cardinal Timothy Dolan, Archbishop of New York, was concealing the names of 55 predator priests. This is an obscene lie. I have asked McKiernan several times for him to release the names and he never does.

Remember, the two newspapers are not saying that over 130 current bishops have been found *guilty* of covering up sexual misconduct. No, they said they have been *accused* of failing to *adequately* respond to sexual misconduct.

Accused by whom? The likes of McKiernan? Over the years, the Catholic League has shown many of the Church-suing lawyers and professional victims’ advocates to be liars. Moreover, who determines whether the bishop’s response was “adequate”? The same newspapers that have been at war with the Catholic Church for decades?

The study by the *Boston Globe* and the *Philadelphia Inquirer* cannot be taken seriously by any objective observer. By any professional standard, it is a sham.

I have notified every bishop who heads a diocese about this issue.