

WHO SPEAKS FOR AMERICAN INDIANS?

This is the article that appeared in the November 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Who really speaks for American Indians?

The National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) claims to be “the unified voice of tribal nations.” This is demonstrably false.

NCAI led the fight against the Washington Redskins football team, claiming the term “Redskins” was a pejorative. They succeeded in getting the team to change its name to the Washington Commanders. But do they represent the voice of American Indians?

There is one American Indian group that thinks not. Native American Guardians Association (NAGA) says that 90 percent of Native Americans disagree with the notion that “Redskins” is racist. In fact, it claims that “Redskins” is an honorific name.

“The name ‘Redskins’ carries deep cultural, historical, and emotional significance, honoring the bravery, resilience, and warrior spirit associated with Native American culture.” It adds that the Washington Redskins were “the only team in the National Football League to honor an actual Native American.”

The polls back up NAGA.

In 2002, a study by *Sports Illustrated* found that “three out of four Native Americans” believe that “even a nickname such as Redskins, which many whites consider racist, isn’t objectionable.”

In 2004, a University of Pennsylvania survey showed that 90 percent of American Indians did not find “Redskins” objectionable.

Similarly, in 2016, a *Washington Post* survey found that 90 percent of American Indians are fine with the name Washington Redskins.

So why does the NCAI continue to lie about what American Indians want? Because they are funded by George Soros, that’s why.

CHRISTIANITY TERRIFIES SECULAR LEFT

This is the article that appeared in the November 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Clara Jeffrey is the editor-in-chief of Mother Jones, a far-left political tabloid. The nicest thing we can say about her is that she has a phobia about Christianity.

When the plane she was recently on was about to land, the Alaska Airlines attendant wished the passengers a “blessed” evening. Most on board probably thought that was a sweet thing to say. But not Jeffrey. She was so engaged that she issued an “alert” on X accusing the attendant of fostering “Creeping Christian nationalism.” She berated the employee for not using adjectives such as “great, awesome, fabulous, amazing, fantastic.”

What kind of person gets exercised over a flight attendant wishing everyone a “blessed” evening? A left-wing fanatic,

that's who. Here are a few other tweets that Jeffrey has penned.

"Admitting women into the priesthood and allowing priests to marry would be the obvious way to begin to fix the Catholic Church's sexual abuse (and declining laity in US/Europe) problem." But it is not straight priests who were responsible for most of the molestation—it was homosexual priests. So why would ending celibacy matter to them?

"Women will feel increasingly alienated from a church that doesn't treat them as fully equal. Seen from that vantage point, the Catholic Church seems to be embracing ultimate extinction." Sorry, Clara, women go to Mass more than men and they are overrepresented in parish and diocesan offices. Moreover, it is the trendy religions that are dying, not those that are true to their moorings.

"We live in a white Christian ethnostate, where a radical minority is deploying anti-democratic structural advantages to subject the rest of us to their rule." Got us on that one. We have no idea what in the world she is talking about. But it doesn't sound good.

Mother Jones is consumed with the idea—it is more fictional than real—that we are on the verge of Christian nationalism. The writers seem to think that patriotic Christians are going to take over, mandating that all of us go goose-stepping off to church. They invented this bogeyman to energize their base. It's also good for fundraising—there's big bucks in demonizing white Christian men.

Here's a sample of the titles of articles posted on the internet by Mother Jones writers in the past few years.

- "We Need to Worry About Christian Nationalism."
- "The Looming Threat of Christian Nationalism."
- "A New Documentary Goes Behind the Scenes of Christian Nationalism."

- “Mike Johnson’s Long Flirtation With Christian Nationalism”
- “RNC Delegates Sound Off on Whether America Should Be a Christian Nation”
- “It’s a Good Time to Start Worrying About Christian Nationalism”
- “Mike Johnson Conducted Seminars Promoting the US as a ‘Christian Nation’”
- “Is Florida’s SAT Replacement Exam A) Christian Nationalism or B) Woke Propaganda?”
- “Confessions of a (Former) Christian Nationalist”
- “RFK Jr. Fundraisers Tied to J6ers, QAnoners, Christian Nationalists, and Far-Right Extremists”
- “Christian Nationalists Are Closer Than You Think to Running America”
- “For Christian Nationalists, the Trump Shooting Proves He Was Anointed by God”
- “Christian Nationalists Are Opening Private Schools”
- “Mike Johnson Has Ties to a Christian Movement That Played a Key Role in Spreading Trump’s Big Lie”

Last year, David Corn, one of the more prominent Mother Jones writers, took issue with Bill Donohue for a piece he wrote, “Christian Bashers Aim Beyond Mike Johnson.” Corn raised the question, “Is It Anti-Christian to Criticize Speaker Mike Johnson?” The answer is obvious—of course not. But, of course, that was not what Donohue said.

Donohue took issue with “the unrelenting attacks” on Johnson’s religion, which, he contended, were designed “to discourage younger Christian conservatives from running for office; they are also meant to discredit the Founders and our Judeo-Christian heritage.”

It is not mere “criticism” to label Johnson a “hard-core theocrat.” Nor is it fair to brand him a “Christofascist.” Writing that he is a “Bigger Threat to America than Hamas Could Ever Be” is simply mad. One nutjob even compared Johnson to a “mass shooter.”

The same mentality that objects to a flight attendant wishing passengers to enjoy a “blessed” evening is quick to cast proud Christians as a menace to democracy. Those hurling these invectives are the ones we need to fear, not the so-called Christian Nationalists.

BIG WIN FOR PARENTAL RIGHTS

This is the article that appeared in the November 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Parental rights v. transgender rights. Which should prevail? In a specific case involving a public school in a Pittsburgh suburb, a federal judge ruled on September 30 that parental rights should triumph.

A U.S. District Court judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania issued a summary judgment to three mothers who objected to Mount Lebanon School District defending a teacher who was instructing her students on gender ideology; this is not part of the school curricula. These were first-grade students and no attempt was made to notify the parents, seeking their permission in advance.

The lawsuit was filed after a first-grade teacher at Jefferson Elementary School, Megan Williams (who has a transgender child), allegedly told her six and seven-year-old students that sometimes “parents are wrong” and doctors “make mistakes” about whether a newborn baby is a boy or a girl.

The suit maintains that the teacher told a boy that he can dress like a girl. The boy then told his mother, saying his teacher told him, “I can wear a dress and have hair like my

mom.” When objections were raised, the administration and school board reflexively took the side of the teacher.

After the mother removed her child from Williams’ class, the teacher had the audacity to call her, wanting to know what her problem was. The mother invoked her parental rights. Williams responded, “As long as I am on this Earth, I am going to teach children what I feel they need to know” and hung up.

After the lawsuit was filed on June 8, 2022, LGBTQ advocates rushed to the side of the teacher. They were indignant over the idea that parents should be given the right to have their children “opt out” of these classes. The judge, Joy Flowers Conti, saw things differently.

“The case is about the extent of constitutional rights of parents of young children in a public elementary school to notice and the ability to opt their young children out of noncurricular instruction on transgender topics. A first-grade teacher, without providing notice or opt outs, decided to observe Transgender Awareness Day by reading noncurricular books and presenting noncurricular gender identity topics to her students. During the classroom presentation, the teacher told her students ‘parents make a guess about their children’s—when children are born, parents make a guess whether they’re a boy or a girl. Sometimes parents are wrong.’”

Judge Conti wrote that it was “constitutionally impermissible” for schools to “provide teachers with unbridled discretion to teach about a noncurricular topic—transgender identity—and not to provide notice and opt out rights based on parents’ moral and *religious beliefs* about transgender instruction, while providing notice and opt out rights for other sensitive secular and religious topics (our italics).”

This case shows, once again, that the public school industry has nothing but contempt for parental rights and religious

liberty. Wedded to the extreme LGBTQ agenda, it has become a force for intolerance and indoctrination of the sickest kind, even to the point of exploiting little kids.

If the school district wants to appeal this decision, the Catholic League will file an amicus brief on the side of the plaintiffs.

WHY NON-CATHOLICS GO TO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

This is the article that appeared in the November 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

At every level, non-Catholics are flocking to Catholic schools. The reasons vary, but no one argues with the numbers.

The rise of anti-Semitism on college campuses, many of them at elite institutions, has driven Jewish students to seek a more welcoming environment at Catholic colleges and universities.

Franciscan University of Steubenville is going out of its way to welcome Jewish students. It has joined a coalition of 100 organizations, lead by Yeshiva University, to expedite the transfer of Jewish students to Catholic colleges. The coalition has condemned Hamas, pledging a receptive milieu for these students.

For different reasons, non-Catholics have long expressed an interest in elementary and secondary Catholic schools. Nationally, more than one in five students (22 percent) in Catholic schools are not Catholic.

For several reasons, many African Americans choose a Catholic school over their competitors. One factor is the academic performance of these students: they do better than their public school cohorts. The Catholic graduation rate for high school students, overall, is typically close to 100 percent, and 85 percent attend a four-year college.

Another reason for choosing a Catholic school is that they teach virtue.

A teacher whom Bill Donohue knows who used to teach at St. Dominic High School in Oyster Bay, Long Island, recalls not only having a fair number of Jewish students, she had quite a few gay students who transferred from a local public school.

She learned that “these children had been bullied at their various public schools and labeled ‘queer’ and that St. Dom’s offered them a safe, loving home where respect, love and dignity was afforded every student.” As she pointed out, this is not what the media report.

Most Catholic schools do remarkable work, and it is too often underappreciated. They should be available to all parents, not simply those who can afford to pay tuition.

THE MYTH OF CHRISTIAN NATIONALIST VIOLENCE

This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Bill Donohue

As a sociologist and a Catholic advocate, I am quite interested in the left-wing accusation that Christian nationalists are a violent-ridden threat to America. Those who make this charge are mostly academics and activists. I was skeptical about their claim, so I decided to fact check their work.

I am no longer skeptical: I am convinced these people are not only frauds—their goal is to demonize conservative Christian activists.

Christian nationalists are defined by their critics as those who seek to integrate Christianity and American civic life.

Perhaps the most prominent person floating this charge is Amanda Tyler, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty (BJC) and lead organizer of Christians Against Christian Nationalism. A while ago I read the testimony she gave in October, 2023 before the U.S. House Oversight Committee's Subcommittee on National Security, the Border, and Foreign Affairs.

This prompted me to email Christians Against Christian Nationalism, asking them to provide me with the evidence that Christian nationalism “inspires acts of violence and intimidation.”

They wrote back referencing Tyler's October 25, 2023 testimony and her written testimony on December 13, 2022 before the House Oversight Committee's Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

The following analysis is based on the two testimonials.

In Tyler's testimony in 2023, she says, “The greatest threat to religious liberty in the United States today...is Christian nationalism.” Such a sweeping statement would ordinarily be peppered with one example after another. She provides none. She simply makes an assertion, providing no evidence.

Her testimony in 2022 offers some examples to support her thesis about the violence of Christian nationalists.

The first example she mentions occurred in Charleston, South Carolina in 2015. Dylann Storm Roof shot and killed 9 people at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church. By all accounts, he was a seriously disturbed neo-Nazi who wanted to start a race war. But there is no evidence that he was a Christian nationalist.

Roof came from a troubled home. When he was born, his divorced parents got back together for a while, but it didn't last. His father remarried and allegedly beat his new wife, before getting divorced once again.

Roof dropped out of school, spending most of his time taking drugs, getting drunk and playing video games. He was busted twice for narcotics. He was also known for burning the American flag.

No one doubts he was a racist. But no one ever accused him of being a Christian nationalist.

The second example cited by Tyler was the tragic Tree of Life Synagogue mass shooting in Pittsburgh in 2018. Robert Gregory Bowers killed 11 people and wounded six. It was the deadliest attack on any Jewish community in the nation's history.

His parents divorced when he was a year old. His father committed suicide while awaiting trial on a rape charge. Like Roof, Bowers was a disturbed racist and a right-wing nut. But no one who knew him ever said he was a Christian nationalist.

The third and fourth incidents mentioned by Tyler took place at Christchurch mosque in New Zealand on March 15, 2019. Brenton Harrison Tarrant was charged with 51 counts of murder, 40 counts of attempted murder, and one count of committing a terrorist act.

His parents separated when he was a young boy and his home was destroyed by a fire. When his mother remarried, he went to live with her and her husband. The new husband beat her (Brenton's mom), Brenton, and his sister.

Brenton left home and went to live with his father. That didn't work out: Brenton found his father dead by suicide. Those who knew him, which were only a few, said he was disturbed but none ever described him as a Christian nationalist.

The fifth example cited was a shooting that took place in 2019 at Chabad of Poway synagogue in Poway, California. John Timothy Earnest shot and killed one woman and injured three other persons. In an open letter that he wrote prior to the shooting, he said Jews were plotting to kill the European race.

Earnest was an evangelical. Church members were split on whether his religious beliefs had anything to do with his shooting rampage. There is no evidence that he identified as a Christian nationalist, nor is there evidence that he was branded as such by those who knew him.

The sixth killing spree took place at Tops Supermarket in Buffalo, New York in 2022; it is located in a predominantly black neighborhood. Payton S. Gendron shot and killed 10 black people.

He was a classic loner. His father was an alcoholic and a drug addict for 40 years, resulting in the demise of two marriages. Gendron had no friends and was known to wear a hazmet suit in the classroom.

He was fascinated by violence, even to the point of bragging how he stabbed his own cat and then smashed the animal's head on concrete. He finished the cat with a hatchet.

Not only was he not a Christian nationalist, he wasn't even a

Christian. Tyler concedes this point but nonetheless lists him as a Christian nationalist. This proves how desperate she is to make her case.

The seventh and last incident—the January 6, 2021 Capitol debacle—is labeled by Tyler as “an insurrection.” It was not. Insurrections involve the overthrow of the government. This was a rally that turned into a riot. The only person killed that day was an unarmed female veteran, shot by a cop. Security were shown on camera opening the doors of the Capitol to the protesters. Not exactly standard insurrectionist fare.

Most of Tyler’s claims were just that—assertions. They were not evidentiary. Her central thesis is that “The greatest threat to religious liberty in the United States today...is Christian nationalism.”

“Christian Nationalism and the January 6, 2021 Insurrection” is a report sponsored by BJC and the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF), a notorious anti-Christian atheist organization. It was published in 2022.

There are seven chapters in the Report, all supposedly chock full of evidence that the riot was a Christian nationalist event. Yet the first three chapters are merely a commentary on Christian nationalism, and don’t even attempt to tie the violence at the Capitol to it. Of the other four chapters, two were written by Andrew Seidel, an attorney who works for FFRF.

Katherine Stewart is an author and investigative journalist. Here is the first sentence in her chapter: “By now, most Americans understand that Christian nationalism played a role in last year’s violent attack on the Capitol.” She cites not a single source. It is simply an unsupported assertion. This is the extent of her “evidence.”

Seidel wrote chapters five and six. Chapter five covers events leading up to January 6, and chapter 6 claims to provide evidence that the riot was of Christian nationalist origin.

Chapter five says there were two violent Christian nationalist episodes leading up to January 6: one occurred on November 14, 2020; the other occurred on December 12, 2020.

Seidel argues that after supporters of President Trump rallied on November 14, "violence erupted in D.C." It did. But the source he cites from the *Washington Post* simply says that Trump supporters clashed with counterdemonstrators. So what? The news story says not a word about Christian anything.

The December 12 incident saw another nighttime clash between the two factions. The source he cites notes that the Proud Boys, a right-wing group that supports Trump, was involved. They were. What Seidel doesn't mention is that four of them were stabbed.

Chapter six begins by saying that Paula White, one of Trump's spiritual advisors, delivered "an explicitly Christian nationalist and openly militant prayer." What was it? "Blessed is the nation whose God is Lord" (Psalm 33:12). That was it.

Other "evidence" that the riot was a Christian nationalist event include statements by Katrina Pierson, a Trump campaign spokesperson. She said, Trump "loves the United States of America. He loves God." Ergo, this is an invitation to Christian nationalist violence.

Seidel also says that some people carried a cross and a Christian flag, and some were even spotted singing "God Bless America." More evidence that this was a Christian nationalist event was the sighting of men blowing shofars. A shofar is a Jewish musical instrument—not exactly a prop used by violent Christian nationalists.

Tyler wraps up the Report with similar "evidence." Signs such as "In God We Trust" are considered proof that Christian nationalists were on a tear. She says that as the violence took place, something curious happened: Christian leaders who condemned it "for the most part did not name Christian

nationalism as a contributing or driving factor." I wonder why.

There are some positive signs that the false alarms about Christian nationalism are taking a toll on those responsible for sounding them.

In July, Missouri Sen. Josh Hawley gave a speech before a friendly audience noting that "some will now say that I'm calling America a Christian nation." With confidence, he said, "So I am."

This was encouraging because Hawley sent a message to militant secular zealots that he will not be put on the defensive. Indeed, he is proud to defend the idea that America is rooted in the Christian faith, and that our society is best served by following its tenets.

We can have a nation based on secular values or Christian values. The former celebrates the perverse notion that everyone is entitled to his own sense of morality. The latter maintains that without a moral consensus, ideally anchored in our Judeo-Christian heritage, we are ensuring that moral destitution rules the day.

At bottom critics of Christian nationalism have a problem with America. The Founding Fathers were adamant in their conviction that a free society was dependent on the kinds of values that inhere in Christianity. In 1892, the Supreme Court even acknowledged that "We are a Christian nation." In 1952, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, a liberal, wrote that "We are a religious people whose constitution presupposes a Supreme Being."

Were all these famous Americans out to shove Christian teachings down the throats of the masses? Only those who want to upend Christianity think this way.

No doubt there are crazies who fit the label "Christian

nationalist.” But if those who make a living off of selling the idea that Christian nationalists are a violent-ridden threat to America, and they can’t provide convincing evidence, then they are frauds. Worse, accusing Christians of bomb threats and arson—absent any proof—makes *them* a bona fide threat to America.

DANGEROUS BALLOT INITIATIVE IN NEW YORK

This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

There is a ballot initiative in New York State this November that is downright dangerous. Bill Donohue wrote a lengthy rebuttal and had it published in booklet form; a Spanish version is also available. We did a mass mailing to our allies across the state.

It is being widely distributed in the state not only to Catholics, but to non-Catholics as well. Thanks to the support of New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan it has been placed in the hands of all New York bishops and many others.

A longer version is available on our website. This should be of interest to non-New Yorkers as well. If these activists succeed with their stealth campaign in New York, they will bring their proposal to other states.

Here is the shortened version.

On Election Day, November 5, voters in New York State will

cast their ballot for Proposition One. It would amend section 11 of article 1 of the New York State Constitution in two ways: Paragraph A would offer equal protection before the law to eleven new demographic categories; Paragraph B would revise the legal meaning of discrimination.

Those who champion Prop One are telling the public that it is needed because abortion rights are under attack. They manifestly are not under attack in New York State, but abortion-rights activists know that this is a hot button issue in many parts of the country—abortion is on the ballot in ten states—therefore they reason that if it is on the ballot, it will galvanize supporters to turn out on Election Day.

This is only one aspect of what is in reality a huge stealth campaign. Those behind Prop One have a very different agenda. *Their real goal is to undermine parental rights, eviscerate religious liberty and legalize selective discrimination.*

Currently, the New York State Constitution says that no one can be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed or religion.

Paragraph A of Prop One would add the following demographic categories: age, sex, gender identity, gender expression, and reproductive healthcare and autonomy. The implications are dramatic.

Age

To most people, age discrimination refers exclusively to older adults. To be sure, the rights of the elderly figure prominently in this discussion, but to children's rights advocates, those at the opposite end of the spectrum, namely minors, can also lay claim to being victims of discrimination. This is where Prop One can create enormous problems.

According to Beatrice and Ronald Gross, two of the leading children's rights advocates, the movement to liberate children

was launched “to rectify the shameful conditions that lead to the damage and death of so many children.” They claim that “young people are the most oppressed of all minorities.”

The idea that children are oppressed begs the question: Who are the oppressors? Adults, of course, especially parents. Those who champion the rights of minors do so at the direct expense of parental rights. That is not unintentional.

If Prop One becomes law, minors will be able to checkmate their parents whenever they claim that their rights are being encroached upon. Ditto for teachers who are accused of infringing on the rights of students (e.g., disciplinary measures). The kids will no doubt find public defense lawyers ready to come to their aid.

Sex

There are many laws on the books that already protect women from discrimination, which explains why there is no major push for more such laws. Still, some will say there’s no harm in including sex as a protected category in Prop One. But the fact is women have already said “No” to this proposal.

In 1975, voters in New York and New Jersey were given the opportunity to vote on the Equal Rights Amendment. The representatives in these two states, mostly men, had already voted to support this amendment, but when the vote was taken, it was defeated. As Linda Greenhouse of the *New York Times* noted, it was women, not men, who were responsible for the defeat. In short, New York women did not want to jeopardize their current status in law by living under a statute that could potentially work against their best interests.

Gender Identity and Gender Expression

Adding gender identity and gender expression to the list of protected categories would seriously impact on parental rights and religious liberty.

The medical literature continues to grow concerning the long-term consequences of sex transitioning. Minors who transition, mostly girls who seek to be boys, are suffering from serious mental health problems and need to be treated accordingly.

Prop One would enable young people to skirt the scrutiny of their parents by accessing therapists and medical professionals behind their back in their quest to transition. They could claim they are being discriminated against on the basis of age.

In the state of Washington, a young girl wanted to get sex-reassignment surgery behind the back of her parents, but the parents found out anyway. They learned that if their daughter wanted to flee and move to a home with a family that agreed to take her in, she could do so. Moreover, the host family was under no legal obligation to inform her parents that she was about to have her genitals amputated.

This is exactly the kind of thing that could happen under Prop One.

It gets worse. States are effectively kidnapping children in service to the pernicious ideology of transgenderism. And if it can happen in Montana, it can happen in New York.

Krista and Todd Kolstad have a sexually confused daughter, Jennifer, who mistakenly thinks she is a boy. Jen had suicidal thoughts and when her family found out about it, Child and Family Services (CFS) were called to deal with her condition. Bullied at school, her parents moved her to another school district, doing everything they could to stabilize the situation. But CFS was unimpressed. They took Jen from them because they refused to affirm her delusional state.

Look for more such cases if Prop One wins.

If Prop One succeeds, there would be no stopping biological males from competing in women's sports, effectively destroying

them. The guys could also use the locker rooms and shower facilities with the girls, and no one could stop them. If a coach complained, he could be fired.

In the name of gender expression, teachers could be required to address gender confused students by their choice of pronouns. In other words, a boy who thinks he is a girl could assert his gender expression rights by demanding that his teacher refer to him as “she” or “her.” For that matter, he may want to be called “they” or “them,” and his teacher would have to oblige.

This is not an exaggeration. Some schools, like one in Colorado, already have policies that assure this outcome. “Transgender and non-binary students have the right to discuss and express their gender identity and expression openly and to decide which, with whom, and how much to share their private information.”

Reproductive Healthcare and Autonomy

Reproductive healthcare, as interpreted by activists, means abortion-on-demand, without any restrictions. Parental rights would be non-existent—their daughters could get an abortion without their consent and at any time during pregnancy.

Establishing a right to healthcare autonomy clearly means that assisted suicide will become a reality. Even in cases where the patient is not suffering from a terminal disease, or where death does not appear to be imminent, the right to autonomy would give those who are merely despondent a right to die.

Religious Liberty Issues

The impact of Prop One on religious individuals and institutions would be disastrous.

It cannot be denied that the new category of rights mentioned in Paragraph A are on a collision course with the state’s

interest in religious liberty, thus putting religious rights in jeopardy. It must also be said that the amendment does not say a word about religious exemptions, and that is telling.

Those who are supporting the LGBTQ agenda have made it plain that religious liberty should take a back seat to their interests.

There is no shortage of organizations that take direct aim at religious exemptions, in general. They would definitely be mobilized if Prop One prevails. Prominent among them is the Rights, Faith, and Democracy Collaborative, the parent company of which is the Proteus Fund.

There are several issues affecting religious liberty where Prop One advocates will be very busy. One of them is adoption.

Advocates of Prop One say this is a bogus issue, citing the 9-0 victory in the Supreme Court in 2021. In that ruling it was decided that Catholic foster care agencies can reject gay couples from adopting children.

This ruling was significant, but so was the ruling in Massachusetts two years later. Mike and Kelly Burke were denied the right to be foster parents because they hold to Catholic views on sexual orientation and gender dysphoria. They said they would love any child, no matter what the sexual orientation or gender identity problems the child may have. But that was not enough to satisfy the militant secularists at the Department of Children and Families. This matter is still before the courts.

It's a sure bet that if this issue were to arise in New York, it won't be enough to satisfy government agents under Prop One. Religious liberty will be challenged, if not defeated.

Also last year, a Christian mother of five in Oregon wanted to adopt two children but was denied when she admitted that her religious beliefs would not allow her to take a minor to

receive cross-hormone injections. This case is also tied up in the courts. Prop One would ensure a similar outcome.

Catholic schools across the nation have been hit with a wave of lawsuits by homosexual teachers who claim to be married. Though eventually they do not succeed, Prop One would inspire more attacks on the right of Catholic schools to hold teachers accountable; they voluntarily sign a contract respecting the teachings of the Catholic Church.

Similarly, there have been several attempts to force Catholic doctors and hospitals to perform sex-reassignment surgery, in direct violation of Catholic teachings. This right not to cooperate is under attack by the Biden-Harris administration, which has directed the Department of Health and Human Services to go after Catholic individuals and institutions. Prop One would egg them on.

Consequently, Prop One would trigger an avalanche of lawsuits directed at Catholics and Catholic entities.

Paragraph B

This section of the amendment would make it easy to discriminate against white people. It says that the discriminations banned in Paragraph A are permitted if the discrimination is done to “prevent or dismantle discrimination.” To put it differently, it could be okay to discriminate against white applicants for a job if by doing so it would enhance the chances of people of color landing the position.

Once the principle is established that not all forms of discrimination are objectionable, the door is open to widespread abuse.

Conclusion

Prop One is the most deceitful and dangerous initiative ever

introduced. It needs to be defeated.

NASHVILLE MANIFESTO PROVES REVEALING

This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

On March 27, 2023, Audrey Elizabeth Hale, murdered three adults and three 9-year-old children at Covenant School in Nashville, Tennessee. A transgender person, who mistakenly thought she was a boy, Hale had been treated at the time for “emotional disorder.” She kept a log of her problems, detailing how she was planning a mass shooting. Thanks to a lawsuit brought by the *Tennessee Star*, her manifesto has been made public.

[The quotes are as written by Hale. No corrections were made.]

Hale, who sometimes referred to herself as Aiden, was a terribly despondent person who saw little reason to live. “Nothing on Earth can save me,” she wrote in her diary. Other times she would say things like, “Everything Hurts” and “I hurt bad enough & long enough that I Need to DIE.” She confessed, “Everything makes me sad. I’m sad about everything.” “Being Me Sucks.”

If there was one person she said she loved, it was Paige Patton, whom she referred to as P.A.P., or the “brown girl.” She was a radio host. They played basketball together in the eighth grade and remained in occasional contact thereafter. Hale referenced Paige in her diary, saying, “If I cry all day,

it's cause I need your love."

She was also fond of Nikki Tidwell, whom she met at the Nossi College of Art. On January 16, 2023, just over two months before Hale went on her shooting spree, she let her know of her plans. "I'm so sorry, Nikki. I didn't plan my massacre on the 17th, I'm going to be in terrible s*** for leaving you. How bad my heart hurts. Tomorrow is my last day on Earth. I love you, I am so sorry. Audrey (Aiden)."

Then she had second thoughts: "(P.S. Not leaving yet. I couldn't do it. I don't want to ruin your day. I'll wait as planned. Audrey." It was even more bizarre to learn that literally two days before the shooting began, Hale showed up at a birthday party for Nikki.

If there was one factor that accounted for Hale's profound unhappiness it was her adamant rejection of her nature. She hated the fact that she was not a male. "Why does my brain not work right?? Cause I was Born Wrong!!!" She opined, "A terrible feeling to know I am nothing of the gender I was born of. I am the most unhappy boy alive. I wish to be dead."

She took out her internal problems on society. "Everything hurts. And I hate society b/c society ignores to see me. I'm a queer; I am meant to die." She even wrote a statement titled, My Imaginary Penis wherein she said, "My penis exists in my head. I swear to god I'm a male."

Hale was angry that she somehow let girls down. "Major blow to girls; I am a boy that has no penis." She was also angry at God. "If God won't give me a boy body in heaven, then Jesus is a faggot."

She hated her father. In a post titled, "Dad problems," she wrote, "He never once loved me for years, maybe like ever." She declared, "You're a loser. I hate you...I don't care if you die. I want to kill you." She even condemned him on the day of the mass murder.

Days before she went on her rampage, Hale spoke of her darkness. "Soon I will leave this world...I will regret nothing...No regrets by the gun!!!"

She was mentally ready. "For 5 years I planned to die. Now I am finally ready to go."

Then, in a clear reference to Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, the high school seniors who killed 12 students and one teacher in the 1999 Columbine High School massacre, she wrote, "I want my massacre to end in a way that Eric & Dylan would be proud of."

On the day of the killing, Hale boasted, "Nature needs enigmas...I am one, Thank God." More ominously, she scribbled, "DEATH. Today is the day. The day has finally come!"

She gave a shout-out to Paige, saying she was ready to roll. "Please don't be mad..." She added, "P.S. I think God will enter me in heaven. If I do go there, I'll be waiting for you. All our pain will leave us."

She really did believe in God. Much earlier she had written, "God is love, so are you." But on that fateful day, she begged forgiveness. "Forgive me God, This act will be inglorious."

Hale gave Paige a heads up just before she pulled the trigger. She contacted her and said, "I'm planning to die today. This is not a joke. You will probably hear about me on the news after I die." Thirteen minutes later the shooting began.

Transgender persons are not normal and it is cruel to pretend otherwise. They need help. That does not mean affirming their sick status—it means getting to the source of their troubles. If that means anything, it means not treating conditions like Hale's as if they were merely an "emotional disorder." What she suffered from was much more serious.

TIM WALZ'S IDEA OF EDUCATION

This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Minnesota Gov. and vice presidential candidate Tim Walz has some very bizarre, even repugnant, ideas about education. He has been reluctant to talk about them, and the media have shown no interest in pressing him on this issue.

Walz has had little to say about the rigors of the curriculum, but he has addressed a variety of side issues. One of them involves equity, diversity and inclusion, code words for combating racism by promoting more of it. He is responsible for launching a center at the Minnesota Department of Education to further this cause.

The education gurus who are the key contributors to this radical agenda include Boston University professor Ibram X. Kendi—he believes all white people are inveterate racists—and Robin DiAngelo, the disgraced author accused of plagiarizing her University of Washington 2004 Ph.D. dissertation. Both have made millions hawking their ideology.

Walz is also responsible for making Ethnic Studies a requirement for graduation.

When Bill Donohue taught a college course on Ethnic Studies, he had the students learn about the Irish (the European example), Puerto Ricans (the Latino example), African Americans (the African example), the Japanese (the Asian example) and Jews (the Middle Eastern example).

This is not Walz's idea of Ethnic Studies. His notion involves

introducing students to lectures on oppression and “cisheteropatriarchy,” which roughly means the study of successful heterosexual males, though in the courses Walz favors it means these guys are responsible for oppressing the world.

Walz is also interested in advancing the LGBTQ agenda, which has no intrinsic bearing on education. He earned the tag “Tampon Tim” when he ordered tampons be made available in every men’s bathroom in the state. Men cannot menstruate, which explains why tampons have never been placed in men’s bathrooms. But this doesn’t matter to Walz.

His anti-science view is shared by Hillary Clinton; she commended him for his “compassionate and common-sense policy.” Also, Minnesota State Rep. Sandra Feist defended Walz by saying, “Not all students who menstruate are female.” She did not identify one person who has a penis, scrotum and testicles who menstruates. He doesn’t exist, except in their heads.

Walz is so passionate about the LGBTQ agenda that effective in July 2025 he is going to mandate that all teachers affirm the sex of a student who falsely maintains that he is of the opposite sex. In other words, if Johnny thinks he is Jane and wants to be called she/her, or even they/them, then the teachers must oblige.

As Joy Pullman, the executive editor of The Federalist, notes, this would effectively “ban practicing Christians, Jews, and Muslims from teaching in public schools.” They do not accept the anti-science view that one’s sex is a subjective determination.

What makes Walz so dangerous is that he refuses to promote school choice, thus ensuring that most students are indoctrinated with his left-wing ideas about race and sex.

Every poll taken in Minnesota on school choice shows that more than 70 percent favor it, and this includes a majority of

Democrats. Moreover, 26 states have some form of school choice program—21 run by Republicans and 5 by Democrats—but Walz refuses to offer minorities (whom he claims to champion) the same opportunity to select the school of their choice that those who are more affluent already enjoy.

The media are delinquent in not telling the truth about Walz's education record. It's a disaster, and so is the cover up.

SURGEON GENERAL SOUNDS ALARM

This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

U.S. Surgeon General Vivek H. Murthy recently said that from his own experience, parenting has been “more stressful than any job I’ve had.” He notes that his view is shared by parents across the nation.

After painting a dour picture of parenting, he explains, “That’s why I am issuing a surgeon general’s advisory to call attention to the stress and mental health concerns facing parents and caregivers, and to lay out what we can do to address them.” He further says that we must identify “policies” and “programs” to improve matters.

What he said is not backed up by the data. For example, married men in America are about twice as likely to be very happy, compared to their unmarried peers. Also, men and women who have the benefit of a spouse and children are the most likely to report being “very happy” with their lives. Finally, a combination of marriage and parenthood is linked to the biggest happiness dividends for women.

Now if these same people were asked if it is stressful to raise children, no doubt they would agree. So what? Experiencing stress does not negate the possibility of being happy.

Winning the World Series or the Super Bowl is stressful for the players. It is also a source of tremendous happiness. The two emotions are not necessarily contradictory.

This is a familiar pattern. Government officials announce they are going to fix a problem that is largely of their own making. They are good at contriving issues that demand an expansion of the government.

PHIL DONAHUE PASSES

This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

TV talk-show icon Phil Donahue died on August 18. He did not ascribe to Catholic teachings on sexuality but he was a very generous supporter of St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital. He was married to Marlo Thomas, daughter of entertainer and founder of St. Jude, Danny Thomas. St. Jude is known for treating children with severe health issues, and not charging anyone a dime.

Bill Donohue was a guest on Phil's shows for many years. He told the *National Catholic Register* that he "thoroughly enjoyed mixing it up with him. He [Phil] told his producers on several occasions the he loved having me on even though we usually clashed. That made him unusual—he was not afraid of confronting a conservative. He was a real man. And I always

appreciated his kindness. May he rest in peace.”