

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY TRIUMPHS; SUPREME COURT NEXT UP

According to the *Washington Post*, Donald Trump won the Catholic vote 56 percent to 41 percent. That's a great triumph for religious liberty.

Exit polls showed that it wasn't abortion that hurt Kamala Harris the most with Catholics, it was other issues. Among them, surely, was her stand on religious liberty. Moreover, when a candidate loses the Catholic vote by 15 points, it is hard to win the White House.

In late October, Harris was asked by an NBC reporter if she would consider any concessions on abortion. The reporter, Hallie Jackson, specifically asked Harris if she would allow religious exemptions. No, she said—not even one. That's the voice of extremism.

Harris' extremism on religious liberty was also evident on the subject of transgenderism.

The issue of gender ideology is laden with religious overtones. Harris not only supports attempts by minors to change their sex behind the backs of their parents, she co-sponsored bills that would force Catholic doctors and hospitals to perform sex-reassignment surgery and abortions.

Then there is Harris' record of anti-Catholicism, something which we documented more than any other organization in the nation. It is extreme, and it is obviously a religious liberty issue.

The battle for religious liberty is not over. We need the support of the courts.

Trump appointed Amy Coney Barrett, Brett Kavanaugh and Neil

Gorsuch; the first two are Catholic and Gorsuch, who was raised Catholic, is Protestant. All are good on religious liberty. Chief Justice John Roberts, another Catholic, is mostly reliable on this issue. Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito, both staunch Catholics, are rock solid on this First Amendment right.

Thomas is 76. Alito is 74. Both have served with distinction. They are bright and courageous and have been subjected to incredible vitriol. Indeed, they have survived attempts to destroy them by the masters of personal destruction: those who work in the media, left-wing advocacy organizations, the entertainment industry, and education have worked overtime to smear them.

The Left failed to bring them down. Halleluiah. But early next year it will be time for them to step down. If Trump can appoint two more just like them—he can't do any better—he will secure a religious-friendly court for decades.

The most important right in a democracy is the free exercise of religion, which is encoded in the First Amendment. That right, and another First Amendment right—free speech—were targeted by Biden-Harris more than any administration in American history. But their days are numbered.

Our work is never done. But if we get more Supreme Court Justices that support religious liberty, that will be a big step forward.

CHRISTMAS BILLBOARD

Every year the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF), a group of militant atheists—whose love for abortion is on a par

with their love for Christian bashing—like to erect a silly Winter Solstice exhibit at the Capitol in Madison, Wisconsin. This year they are in for a surprise.

We have decided to send these activists a lesson, reminding them that the Christmas season is our season. We rule. They lose.

We will have a billboard displayed in the vicinity of Madison, Wisconsin from December 16 to December 29. It will be on the beltway, south of Mineral Point Road. The panel size is 12 x 50.

(We will feature a picture, or a facsimile of the billboard, in the next edition of *Catalyst*, but the wording can now be revealed.)

It is headlined, "ATHEISTS STRIKE OUT AT CHRISTMAS," we opine, "Celebrating Winter Solstice is a Child's Game." We remind them that "*This Is Our Season—Not Theirs*," and that it is meant to "Celebrate the Birth of Christ." We end by saying, "*Merry Christmas*."

We chose Madison because it is home to FFRF and we wanted them to see it. Call it our Christmas gift to them.

They put up their Winter Solstice display to compete with the manger scene; it is only apropos that we compete with them.

They filed a bogus complaint with the IRS against us in the fall, so this is our way of saying, "we're not going away."

WHITMER MOCKS EUCHARIST; APOLOGY FAILS

On October 10, Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer insulted Catholics nationwide when she intentionally ridiculed the Eucharist in a video. She then compounded the problem by lying about it. We led the charge against her, resulting in a media blitz, forcing her to say something.

The short video was posted by podcaster Liz Plank on her Instagram account. Whitmer, who is wearing a Harris-Walz hat, is standing above Plank, who is kneeling in front of her. Plank opens her mouth and Whitmer places a Dorito chip on her tongue, mocking the Eucharist. Whitmer is shown staring into the camera with a blank look on her face.

There is no way to understand this stunt other than as an expression of vintage anti-Catholic bigotry. Whitmer's team, and her allies in the media, tried to distort what she did. They said she was merely mimicking a popular trend on social media where people are shown feeding each other. Some apologists even said this is being done to support the CHIPS Act, a bill that supports the semiconductor industry.

This is a lie, and it is easy to disprove.

There are indeed many clips of people feeding each other on social media, but there is no reference to the CHIPS Act, nor are they eating chips. The typical video on TikTok shows one person sitting at a table, often in a restaurant, being fed—usually with a fork or spoon—by a friend.

None of them are kneeling. None of them are receiving food on the tongue.

What Whitmer did was to deride Holy Communion. There is no wiggle room for her to deny the obvious.

We pulled out all the stops on this one. In addition to our big list of email subscribers and media outlets, we contacted every Catholic parish in Michigan and every state lawmaker. We also blanketed the media. News stories exploded on radio and TV, and it was covered by newspapers and internet sites across the nation. Our role was prominently noted on national TV.

Whitmer dug herself in deeper when she offered a dishonest apology, and then had her team lie about it. Whitmer said she would “never do something to denigrate someone’s faith,” which, of course, she did. Indeed it was the reason she was forced to say something.

Her press secretary lied when she said, “Liz is not kneeling in the video.” Liz Plank also lied when she said, “No one was on their knees. I’m sitting on a couch that’s visible in the shot.” She was sitting on the couch for the interview, but she was kneeling when they mocked the Eucharist. See p. 2.

WALZ’S ABORTION LIES

In the vice presidential debate, Senator J.D. Vance accused Minnesota Governor Tim Walz of signing a bill that allows for infanticide. He said, “as I read the Minnesota law that you signed into law, it says that a doctor who presides over an abortion, where the baby survives, the doctor is under no obligation to provide lifesaving care to a baby who survives a botched late-term abortion.”

Walz accused Vance of distorting the law, saying, “That is not the way the law is written.”

Walz lied. That is exactly the way the law is written.

In 1976, Minnesota passed a law that required medical personnel to “preserve the life and the health of the child” who was born as a result of an abortion.

In 2023, Walz signed a law that amended this law to read that in such cases all that is needed is to “care for the infant who is born alive.” Stricken was the requirement to “preserve the life and the health of the child.”

Vance was right to say that in these cases “the doctor is under no obligation to provide lifesaving care.”

Now why did Walz remove the requirement that medical personnel “preserve the life and the health of the child,” replacing it with the much lower standard of merely providing “care for an infant who is born alive”? Keeping him warm is not sufficient.

Vance said that what Walz did was “fundamentally barbaric.” We agree.

MEDIA DISTORT ABORTION ISSUE; SHAMELESSLY GUILTY

During the presidential debate on ABC in September, former president Donald Trump took issue with vice president Kamala Harris and her running mate, Tim Walz, on the subject of abortion.

While he engaged in some hyperbole, Trump’s basic points were unassailable. Yet the media “fact checkers” took issue with him—they claimed that what he said was false. They are the ones who got it wrong, not Trump.

The media found fault with Trump for his claim that former

Virginia Governor Ralph Northam, and vice presidential candidate Tim Walz, find “execution after birth” to be acceptable.

As Bill Donohue said in his defense of Trump (see p. 3), what he said was “basically true.” In discussing Northam, Donohue pointed out that “while the baby would not be ‘executed,’ per se, he could be put down, or left to die, after he was ‘kept comfortable.’” That is true.

Intentionally allowing a baby to die—it does not matter if the physician and the mother want that to happen—is to effectively kill the child. As governor of Minnesota, Walz revoked legislation that requires lifesaving care for newborns. In practice, this is a backhanded way of permitting infanticide.

Similarly, the media argued that Trump cannot be right because infanticide is illegal in every state. Infanticide may be proscribed in law, but as just pointed out, Northam and Walz allowed it to happen.

Factcheck and ctinsider noted that abortions in the ninth month are “exceedingly rare.” But Trump never contested how frequent they are—he simply said that Harris and Walz defend late-term abortions. They do and it is dishonest to pretend otherwise.

USA Today tried to rescue Walz by saying Trump was wrong to say the vice presidential candidate “says abortion in the ninth month is absolutely fine.” It claimed that “There is no evidence that Walz said this, though he signed a bill that removed limits to abortion based on gestational duration.” So who cares if Walz didn’t say he was “absolutely fine” with his decision? He indisputably favors no limits on abortion through term.

Poynter contended that when Northam said it was okay for a physician and the mother to decide not to resuscitate a baby who survived a late-term abortion, “Northam declined to say

what that discussion would entail.” So what? It does not change the fact that they may decide not to treat the child, thus passively allowing infanticide to take place.

The media, in general, are so rabid in their defense of abortion rights that they are incapable of accurately reporting on this subject. Either that or they are lying in service to their cause.

POPE OPINES ON CANDIDATES

Pope Francis recently ripped into Kamala Harris and Donald Trump, saying American voters were stuck with choosing “the lesser evil.”

He condemned Harris’ support for abortion rights as being an “assassination,” and he condemned Trump for his position on illegal immigration, saying “not welcoming the migrant is a sin.”

The Catholic Church regards certain acts to be “intrinsically evil.” Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, before he became Pope Benedict XVI, wrote that “Not all moral issues have the same moral weight as abortion and euthanasia.”

He said it was acceptable for a Catholic to disagree with the pope on issues such as war and capital punishment, adding that “he would not for that reason be considered unworthy to present himself to receive Holy Communion.” But that was not true of abortion or euthanasia.

The bishops’ conference also singles out abortion and euthanasia as being among the most non-negotiable issues. Other examples include genocide, torture, racism, and the

targeting of noncombatants in acts of terror or war. They are always wrong.

Stopping migrants from entering a country illegally was not mentioned by either Pope Benedict nor the bishops.

Harris' position on abortion is identical to that of President Biden. Yet after Biden met with the pope in 2021, he told the press, "We just talked about the fact he was happy I was a good Catholic and I should keep receiving communion."

Catholics will have to sort all of this out in November.

OLYMPIC STUNT WAS PLANNED; FRENCH LEADERS COMPLICIT

The vulgar parody of the Last Supper at the opening ceremony of the 2024 Olympics in Paris was not simply the product of one very sick anti-Christian bigot. There is good reason to believe that senior French officials gave their blessings to this attack on Christianity. That is why we asked the International Olympic Committee (IOC) to launch an investigation.

Much of the attention focused on the antics of the man who created the offensive skit, Thomas Jolly. According to the New York Times, growing up his parents "nurtured his passions for dolls and classical dance." Not surprisingly, they raised a homosexual.

Days before the opening ceremony, the Associated Press reported that Jolly was being "extremely tight-lipped about what would eventually transpire at the ceremony." But everyone

knew he was up to something. “‘I’ll be fired if I tell you anything,’ Jolly says with a ‘cheeky laugh.’” Now why in the world would Jolly say that? Was he planning to mock Muslims?

President Emmanuel Macron was not kept in the dark. It was reported by the New York Times that Macron had “a keen interest in the show” and met with Jolly “regularly.” It is hard to believe they didn’t discuss the show’s content.

Paris Mayor Anne Hidalgo also had strong interest in the show; she, too, met with Jolly regularly. She said his production would be “playful, with a message of the city’s ‘openness to the world and the pleasure of diversity.’” Now why in the world would she say that? What kind of “playful” skit would someone like Jolly craft that would celebrate the “pleasure of diversity”?

Tony Estanguet, the President of Paris 2024, is the one who appointed Jolly to be Artistic Director of the Olympic ceremonies. In his statement in 2022 heralding his choice, he bragged how Jolly’s “extraordinary shows are proof that he knows how to break norms and take them to the next level.” Now why in the world would he say that?

Bill Donohue wrote to IOC President Thomas Bach explaining why a probe of French officials was needed. We published an email contact for him and we are happy to report he was bombarded with letters.

We contacted him a second time about the closing ceremony, asking that he do what he can to make sure that Jolly does not offend again. We also contacted the 15 major sponsors of the games, leading Republicans and Democrats, and the U.S. Olympic Committee, asking them to do the same.

The closing ceremony went off without a problem. Whether Jolly had scripted an offensive skit that he felt pressured to nix is not known.

CENSORS FAIL

Over the summer, one of the nation's leading hate groups, Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF), filed a formal complaint with the IRS arguing that the Catholic League has "engaged in unlawful political campaigning." The atheists are a vicious bunch.

It cited a recent news release where Bill Donohue said, "Kamala Harris is not religion-friendly." It provided not a single instance whereby we violated any IRS stricture—it simply repeated criticisms we made of Harris. That is not only our First Amendment right, it does not run afoul of IRS rules.

For more than 30 years, there have been many attempts made to hound Donohue from public life. Some have tried to get him kicked off TV while others have falsely accused him of libel (he won in court). Some have tried to get him fired. Still others have gotten to the point where he has had to contact law enforcement, at the federal and local level. He has even had to secure bodyguards.

This latest effort—the militant atheists would like to take away the Catholic League's tax-exempt status—will fail, just like the rest of them. As long as we stay clear of endorsing candidates, which we never do, we are free to express our concerns about the issues.

Our foes should have learned by now that no one can shut Bill Donohue up. We will continue to publicly hammer anti-Catholic bigots. We will be deterred by no one. Bet on it.

BIGOTED AGENDA IN TWO AGENCIES: FBI AND HOMELAND SECURITY

An anti-Christian animus has been evident in the Biden administration. Traditional Catholics have been spied on, abortion protesters have been treated like violent thugs, etc. Now we have two new developments.

Last year, a 28-year-old female who considered herself to be a male killed six people at a Christian school in Nashville, Tennessee. She kept a journal detailing her thoughts about a range of things, including her negative sentiments about her Christian parents and the Christian school where the shooting took place (she once attended the school).

The police apparently wanted to release the manifesto, but the FBI intervened and stopped it. Nonetheless, some portions of it made their way to print. What Christians want to know is whether the woman was motivated by hatred or revenge, and whether she was influenced by others who shared her ideas.

Bill Donohue wrote to Rep. James Comer, Chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, asking him to hold the FBI accountable. Why are they resisting the release of her manifesto? What is it that they don't want us to know?

Donohue also wrote to Homeland Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas asking about documents that were made public concerning national security threats. An advisory group was formed within his department to offer suggestions about who might be a domestic terrorist. That's a good thing. But it is not a good thing when noble criteria are now considered troublesome.

On the list of would-be extremists and domestic terrorists are those who served in the military, are religious and who support Donald Trump. As Donohue pointed out, that could include him (he never endorsed Trump but the former president has spoken warmly about him).

What's going on? Why is the FBI apparently covering up for a transgender mass shooter who harbored a deep animus against Christians? Why is the Department of Homeland Security worried about people like Donohue but not Antifa, Black Lives Matter and violent protesters who take over college campuses and praise Hitler and Hamas?

Why is the president, who identifies as a "devout Catholic," allowing this to happen? Why are Christians and patriotic Americans under fire? Why are the media not reporting on this story?

To read Donohue's letters on these issues, see pp. 4-5. He knows that if he says nothing, nothing will be done. But he also knows that if he says something—and it gets into the right hands—it might result in some needed changes.

At the very least, it's our job to let our adversaries know that we are keeping tabs on them, informing the public of what they are doing.

MEDIA SILENT ON GOOD NEWS

Whenever there is a whiff of bad news about the Catholic Church, the mainstream media never miss a beat in reporting it. But when there is good news, they go mute. The latest example is the news about the almost complete eradication of clergy sexual abuse. *Not one secular media outlet in the*

United States ran a story on this issue.

Every year, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops issues an annual report on clergy sexual abuse.

The 2023 report, which covered allegations made between July 1, 2022 and June 30, 2023, found that there were 1,308 allegations involving 17 current year minors. Four of the allegations were made by males and 11 by females; 2 were listed as unknown. Of the 17, only 3 were substantiated.

During this period, there were 47,987 members of the clergy. This means that **0.006 percent** of them had a substantiated case of sexual abuse made against him by a minor. Of the accused, 91 percent are either dead or have been kicked out of ministry.

If there had been a sharp uptick in the number of cases, such a story would have been picked up by the Associated Press, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, NPR, PBS, ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, MSNBC—and every left-wing internet and social media site.

Shame on journalists and the talking heads for the total media blackout. Their bias is palpable.