

MAMDANI VEXED ABOUT USA'S BIRTHDAY

[Bill Donohue](#)

New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani is torn over the USA's 250th birthday. On the one hand, he knows he has an obligation to celebrate this key moment in American history. But on the other hand, his heart is not really in it.

I put the test to AI, asking, "Has Zohran Mamdani Ever Said Anything Positive About U.S. History That Was Unqualified?"

AI reports that Mamdani is a democratic socialist "whose worldview is rooted in a systemic critique of American institutions." It also found that "Extensive reviews of his legislative record and public statements indicate that he rarely, if ever, offers 'unqualified' praise for U.S. history."

I then asked the same question about me.

AI reports that Donohue "views the American founding as a monumental achievement but one that is inextricably linked to, and dependent upon, Judeo-Christian values." It also found that he "argues that the American experiment in ordered liberty was only possible because of the cultural and moral capital provided by the Christian tradition."

AI is twice accurate. Owing to his radical political views, Mamdani is at best vexed about America's historical record. Owing to my Catholic conservative views, I am proud of America's historical record.

Mamdani is not an American—he was born in Uganda. I decided to put his home country under the same critical lens (it should be noted that Mamdani owns four acres of land in Uganda).

Slavery exists today in Uganda. According to the 2023 Global Slavery Index, an estimated 190,000 people live in conditions of modern slavery. It is known as a hub for forced labor and sexual exploitation; children are treated the worst. This is consistent with its past record: it was a major transit and trading zone during the East African slave trade.

In addition to slavery, Uganda today is known for the persecution of Christians. Muslims routinely kill those who convert to Christianity, including members of their own family. Pastors are terrorized, churches are burnt to the ground, and wives abandon their husbands if they convert.

Here are six cases of this kind of barbarism in 2026.

May 2. A Christian convert received a call from his Muslim in-laws that his young child was seriously ill. When he arrived, he was severely beaten and left unconscious.

April 17. A recent Christian convert had his hands chopped off by his Muslim family members. The convert's father said, "That is what *sharia* [Islamic law] instructs us to do to those who deny the religion of Allah."

April 9. A Christian evangelist was murdered by several Muslim men after he and his wife spoke at an event to preach the Gospel.

March 11. A mother of six was severely beaten by her Muslim husband after he discovered she converted to Christianity and was attending Bible study.

January 30. Two Christian preachers were brutally beaten by five mask-wearing Muslim men after they were returning home from an all-night prayer meeting.

January 28. A 62-year-old man murdered his 33-year-old son with a long knife after the son converted to Christianity.

Mamdani is quick to find fault with America. Yet he has

virtually nothing to say about slavery in Uganda today. Similarly, he fails to address the killing of innocent Christians by Muslim barbarians in his home country in 2026.

Regarding the latter, innocent Christians are not being slaughtered by roving Muslim gangs—they are being slain because their religious laws demand it. There is no analog in Christianity. In those instances when Christians kill Muslims, not only are they not compliant with Christian teachings—they are in clear violation of them. That's the difference between Islam and Christianity: Muslims who murder converts to Christianity are being faithful to their religion.

Mamdani is too busy fretting over income disparities between whites and blacks to worry about his homeland's wholesale abuses of human rights.

AI is too generous to him. A more thorough examination of his views indicates that he has one set of rules for assessing America (he condemns our alleged history of "colonization, exploitation and racial oppression") and another for assessing Uganda (he never questions its fondness for slavery and religious persecution).

We are the home of the free. Uganda is the home of the oppressed. But listening to our Muslim mayor, he makes it sound like it's the other way around. Spoken like a true Marxist.

HISTORICAL LOOK AT SLAVERY

[Bill Donohue](#)

America's most vociferous critics love to trot out horror

stories about slavery in the U.S., mostly as a way of saying we need to chill our enthusiasm about our nation's 250th anniversary. As usual, they're wrong.

To begin with, slavery is one of the most common institutions in the history of the world. In fact, it began as soon as it became possible—the first slaves were prisoners of war. Slavery has been part of humankind ever since.

Harvard sociologist Orlando Patterson, who has written voluminously about the subject, found that there is not a place on the globe that has not witnessed slavery. The ancient Hebrews, Greeks and Romans not only tolerated slavery, they saw nothing wrong about it. Neither did Aristotle. Similarly, the Chinese and the Japanese were right at home enslaving their people.

In the U.S., free blacks owned black slaves. Indians also owned slaves. While slavery was interracial in the U.S., historically this was unusual: master and slave have typically been of the same racial and ethnic stock.

The U.S. outlawed slavery in the 1860s. It was outlawed in Africa in the 1980s. Regrettably, it still exists today in some African countries. It is an old African institution, one that enriched their warlords. But this is seldom taught in the schools, and as a result people like TV celebrity Don Lemon grow up ignorant of the subject.

In 2022, Lemon invited Hilary Fordwich, an English global consultant, to discuss the need for the English to provide reparations to Africans for the role the English played in the slave trade. He was stunned by her reply.

"If reparations need to be paid," Fordwich said, "we need to go right back to the beginning of that supply chain and say, who was rounding up their own people and having them handcuffed in cages. That was Africa."

Fordwich continued by saying it was a Christian Brit, William Wilberforce, who started the abolitionist movement. "In Great Britain, they abolished slavery. Two thousands naval men died on the high seas trying to stop slavery. Why? Because African kings were rounding up their own people. They had them in cages waiting in the beaches. No one was running into Africa to get them."

Also left out of discussions on slavery is the enslavement of white people by Africans. It is estimated that between 1530 and 1780, there were between 1 million and 1.5 million white European Christians enslaved by the Muslims of the Barbary Coast. This exceeded the number of Africans enslaved in the U.S. As economist Thomas Sowell wryly said, "Nobody is going to North Africa for reparations, because nobody is going to be fool enough to give it to them."

At the time of the Founding, there were slave states and free states, and there could not have been a union at that time if abolition had been a condition of forming the new nation. But this did not stop the Framers of the Constitution from setting in motion its eventual demise. Article I, Section 9, provided for the end of the Atlantic slave trade in 1808. Thomas Jefferson made it happen when he signed the statute that year, at the earliest constitutionally allowable date.

This history lesson was apparently never learned by Linda Thomas-Greenfield, U.S. ambassador to the U.N. under President Biden. She said "the original sin of slavery weaved white supremacy into our founding documents and principles." Wrong. It was our inalienable rights—encoded in the Declaration of Independence—that ultimately abolished slavery in America.

It was up to Lincoln to finish the job. He could not have done so without invoking natural rights and natural law. Lincoln did not care if the people wanted slavery—it was against natural law (i.e., we know in our heart of hearts whether something is inherently wrong) and against natural rights (all

of us possess equal rights, rights that are inalienable, and they come from God, not man).

The reason why slavery persisted in other nations, and the reason why it exists today in many nations throughout the world, is because they have no notion of natural law and natural rights. It was the application of these very Catholic concepts that led to slavery's abolition. This explains why, at the time of the Founding, the only place in the world without slavery was a Christian nation, namely, Great Britain.

As we celebrate our nation's birthday, we should indeed discuss our flaws, as well as our heroics. But it is intellectually dishonest to do so in a vacuum.

Once we put our failures in historical perspective, we come to a very different conclusion than the one favored by our carping critics. And once we factor in our stunning achievements, the overall assessment—especially when compared to other nations—is sufficient to make every American proud.

World Cup Pride Match

[Michael P. McDonald](#)

While the rest of the world is enjoying one of the largest sporting events that brings people together from all over the world, LGBT imperialists in Seattle are planning to turn a World Cup match into a vehicle to promote their disordered ideology. The local organizers have gone so far as to bill the game between Egypt and Iran on June 26 at Lumen Stadium as the "World Cup Pride Match."

Festivities celebrating "the mother of all sins" will take

place around the stadium on game day. The Pride+ Match Impact Council is assisting the local organizers in coordinating the spectacle. They pledge to take advantage of this “once-in-a-lifetime moment to showcase and celebrate LGBTQIA+ communities in Washington.” To this end the council will “validate [LGBT] community-informed priorities,” “curate Pride stories,” provide “economic opportunities for LGBTQIA+-owned enterprises,” and help “shape...cultural programming.”

Fans en route to the match will be subjected to the grotesque scenes of Seattle’s annual “Pride” weekend, which in recent years featured a large contingent of naked men on bicycles joining in a public parade. Closer to the stadium, local organizers will display the winning art work from the Pride Match Design Contest. This artwork will celebrate “the creativity, inclusion, and the vibrant spirit of Seattle’s LGBTQ+ community.”

What could possibly explain why the local organizers would move ahead with these efforts and continue to brand the game as the “World Cup Pride Match?”

Seattle Mayor Kate Wilson, a radical socialist, opined on social media that it is an “incredible honor” to lead the charge for diversity and inclusion. “With matches on Juneteenth and pride, we get to show the world that in Seattle, everyone is welcome.”

Interestingly, the governing bodies for soccer in Egypt and Iran have made it widely known that they do not feel welcome.

The Egyptian Football Association said of the “Pride” festivities that it “completely rejects such activities, which directly contradict the cultural, religious, and social values in the region, especially in Arab and Islamic societies.”

Meanwhile, the Iranian Football Federation described the event as “an unreasonable and illogical move that essentially signals support for a particular group.”

Both have called on FIFA, the global governing body of soccer, to do more to prevent Seattle's "Pride" celebrations from being foisted upon their teams and fans.

For its part, FIFA has long standing rules designed to ensure that messaging extraneous to soccer is kept to a minimum so the focus can be squarely on the competition. Of particular importance, Section 15(a) of the FIFA Statutes requires the national governing bodies of soccer "to be neutral in matters of politics and religion." Forcing players and fans to participate in promoting an ideology that runs contrary to their deeply held religious convictions is a blatant violation of this neutrality rule, and FIFA has asked the local organizers to comply with the statute.

However, FIFA's authority is limited only to the stadium and officially sanctioned "fan zones." While there appears to be some walking back of "Pride" celebrations inside the stadium, the local organizers, along with other Seattle-based LGBT groups, have promised to do as much as they can as close as they can to the match to celebrate "Pride." This may not be a technical violation of FIFA's rule, but it certainly flaunts the spirit of the law.

Even though the teams involved asked for the festivities to be tapered back and FIFA mandated that the local organizers comply with its rule "to be neutral," the "Pride" celebrations are scheduled to continue and the local organizers persist in calling it the "World Cup Pride Match." Clearly this is not about sending the message that "everyone is welcome." No, it is something much more sinister.

The Encyclopedia Britannica defines cultural imperialism as "the imposition by one usually politically or economically dominant community of various aspects of its own culture onto another nondominant community." The "Pride Match" is a textbook definition of this.

Wealthy elites in Seattle are telling athletes and fans from countries that do not embrace the LGBT agenda that they need to get onboard with it. The cultures of the nations involved in the match need to take a back seat to the machinations of LGBT imperialists in Seattle. While the teams thought they might be there to partake in a heated battle that will most likely determine a spot in the knockout rounds, the organizers are eclipsing their hopes and dreams to put the spotlight on this disordered ideology and forcing them to be complicit in these celebrations.

The “World Cup Pride Match” has nothing to do with diversity or inclusion, and it is certainly not making the traveling teams and fans feel welcome. Rather, it is cultural imperialism domineering over all other aspects of the beautiful game and overshadowing it with radical LGBT ideology.

TIMES SQUARE BILLBOARD NOW ON DISPLAY

[Bill Donohue](#)

The Catholic League’s digital billboard is now on display in Times Square; it will be featured from June 22nd to July 5th.

High above street level on the west side of Broadway, between 46th and 47th streets, passersby, tourists, World Cup fans and workers will get a chance to see our billboard—it will flash for 15 seconds every minute.

As we get ready to celebrate our nation’s birthday, we are making sure that the religious roots of our nation, which

undergird our freedoms, are not forgotten amidst all the fanfare. Here is the script.

HAPPY 250th BIRTHDAY USA

**RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
IS OUR FOUNDATIONAL FREEDOM**

**DEFEND OUR
JUDEO-CHRISTIAN HERITAGE**

In a time when religious liberty is under attack, and many refuse to acknowledge our Judeo-Christian heritage, this Catholic League billboard serves as a much-needed antidote to those who always look at the dark side of our history.

There is a reason immigrants from all over the world want to come to our shores. It's about time our nation's critics finally figured it out.

MLB "PRIDE NIGHT" STANCE IS MORALLY OFFENSIVE

The following letter lays out the Catholic League position on an issue that it is wrongly cast as a political controversy.

June 18, 2026

Mr. Robert Manfred
Commissioner
Major League Baseball
1271 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

Dear Commissioner Manfred:

As president of the nation's oldest Catholic civil rights organization, I am writing in support of Sen. Josh Hawley's recent letter to you regarding the controversy over some members of the San Francisco Giants who are protesting "Pride Night" by wearing a biblical verse on their caps.

I will not repeat what Senator Hawley has said, only to say that I am in complete agreement with his concern about the way Christian players are treated by the MLB. There seems to be a double standard: one for left-wing activists and one for practicing Christians.

At the heart of this issue is something that others who share my position have not addressed; ergo, I make no pretense that I speak for them.

This controversy is not about people with different political views on contemporary issues. It is about something much more serious: the right of those whose religious convictions does not allow them to affirm a set of *behaviors* they find morally offensive.

To be specific, to demand approval of the LGBTQ agenda—which is exactly what "Pride Night" proponents seek—is to violate the religious rights of objecting players. They have every right not to sanction behaviors that require them to prostitute their core moral values.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

cc: Sen. Josh Hawley

Contact Manfred: rob.manfred@mlb.com

THE PHONIES CELEBRATING JUNETEENTH

[Bill Donohue](#)

Juneteenth is a federal holiday that commemorates the freeing of the last slaves in Texas on June 19, 1865. It will be commemorated this year by elite colleges and universities across the nation. This is rich given that most of those who ran these institutions at that time owned slaves.

The Northeast Slavery Record Index is an online site that allows the public to access a host of records on slavery. Last year it posted, "Slavery by Alumni of Colonial Colleges." It provides information on college officials and faculty that owned slaves.

It listed the following Ivy League schools: Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth and the University of Pennsylvania. It also listed five other schools tied to slavery: Rutgers, University of Vermont, Williams, Union (Schenectady, NY) and Bowdoin.

It is striking to note that only one Ivy League school, Cornell, did not have any slaveowners associated with it. But that is not a tribute to the university—it was not founded until slavery ended in 1865. Here's a look at the Ivies.

- Harvard slaveowners included political leaders and the heads of prominent families. Records show that the university continued to benefit from slavery even after it was outlawed in Massachusetts in 1783.
- Yale was named after slave trader Elihu Yale. Under his tutelage, the school benefited greatly from the slave

trade.

- Princeton was home to slaveowning trustees—16 of 23 brought, sold and traded slaves; some inherited them.
- Columbia was run by ten men who served as president during the slavery years, and at least half were slaveowners.
- Brown was founded by a family of the university's namesake. They not only owned slaves, they were deep into the slave trade, participating in two voyages to secure more of them.
- Dartmouth founder Eleazar Wheelock owned at least 18 slaves, and at its Hanover campus in 1770, slaves outnumbered the faculty, administrators and trustees.
- University of Pennsylvania's benefactors, trustees and faculty owned slaves. The founder, Benjamin Franklin, owned seven of them.

Many graduates of these institutions—both the Ivies and the other five—are quick to condemn all expressions of racism, real and contrived, and will no doubt be beating their breasts over slavery on June 19. But few will mention their alma mater's slaveowning legacy.

If there is one man who flouts his interest in fighting racism, and is a graduate of one of these slaveowning institutions, it is New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani. He is a graduate of Bowdoin College.

Bowdoin received funding from benefactors who made their money from the slave trade. Most spectacular, in 1858 it awarded Jefferson Davis, who served as the president of the Confederate States of America during the Civil War, an honorary doctorate.

In 1972, it doubled down by accepting an endowed gift from the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and established the Jefferson Davis Award. It took until 2015 before this award was discontinued.

Mamdani graduated in 2014, before the award was nixed. Why didn't he lead a protest against it? He had plenty of time to join organizations that sought to punish Israel.

Today he is bellowing about the need of New York City to make reparations to African Americans. Where will he get the dough? He says the money should be collected through a targeted tax on white people who live in the city today. But wouldn't it be racist to fleece those who had nothing to do with slavery, save for sharing the same skin color of some of the slavemasters? (Note: free blacks also owned slaves.)

Given the slaveowning legacy of his alma mater, will Mamdani do something that shows he has some skin in the game? To be specific, will he return his Bowdoin diploma, now that he knows it is soiled by the legacy of slavery?

Will he dig into his own deep pockets—he is worth a fortune—and make reparations? He could begin by greasing every black person in his employ. But it should not be up to him to decide how much—he should ask his African American employees how much he needs to pony up. If he is running low on cash, he can always ask his multi-millionaire Marxist parents to loan him the money (preferably interest-free).

ARE WE AT A MORAL TIPPING POINT?

[Bill Donohue](#)

Throughout western civilization, there have been waves of moral relativism, periods when “non-judgmentalism” reigns supreme. Never mind that the decision not to judge moral

behaviors is indeed a judgment call, the most recent American iteration of this “live and let live” moral landscape began in the 1960s.

The Sixties was a time of “situation ethics” and a rejection of moral absolutes. It has not let up since, though there are signs of moral exhaustion. “Tune in, turn out and drop out” proved to be more attractive rhetorically than it did behaviorally.

A recent Gallup poll found that Americans are less enthusiastic about approving a host of behaviors now than they have been in recent years. There are eight behaviors that the public considers to be morally wrong: sex between teenagers, extramarital affairs, cloning humans, polygamy, suicide, cloning animals, pornography and changing one’s gender.

Five of these behaviors speak to sexuality; two to cloning; and one to suicide. That makes it clear that despite all the chatter about everyone being free to express oneself sexually, there is a growing reluctance to embrace libertinism.

Two of the behaviors—extramarital affairs and polygamy—suggest that cheating is still verboten. Three suggest that the public recoils at behaviors that cause social problems, namely sex between teenagers, pornography and changing one’s gender. From the perspective of religious Americans, who hold to traditional moral values, these are good signs.

What’s driving these changes? Though the poll does not address this issue, women, in particular, will never be inclined to take kindly to cheating; they want the undivided love of their husband. This explains their animus to adultery and multiple wives. Men and women alike have witnessed the real-life consequences of teen sex (e.g., abortion and illegitimacy), porn (dehumanization) and inane attempts to switch to the opposite sex (which don’t work anyway and are self-destructive).

In other words, a reality check is underway for many who fancy themselves as liberal Democrats. But it is also true that Democrats morally approved 14 of the 20 behaviors included in this survey, making them the most accepting. No matter, when it comes to cloning animals, changing one's gender and polygamy, Democrats are significantly less likely to find them morally acceptable today than they have in the past.

The big news is the moral rejection of changing one's gender. Finally, liberal Democrats are catching up with the rest of the public. Unfortunately, many people—mostly young girls—have suffered grave physical and psychological problems as a result of this sick fad.

All of this makes sense when we consider that just last month, Gallup found that a record-high 56 percent of Americans rate moral values in the U.S. as “poor” and 86 percent say moral values are “getting worse.”

So what's the answer? The most recent Gallup poll, released June 16, found that two-of-three respondents believe it would be positive for society if more Americans were religious; 22 percent disagree (only those who are not personally religious believe that religion is not a good sign).

It is not likely we will see a wholesale return to traditional moral values any time soon, though the vector of change is moving that way. Are we at a moral tipping point? We can only hope so.

WASHINGTON'S VALLEY FORGE

PRAYER

[Bill Donohue](#)

This originally appeared on [The American Spectator](#).

Most Americans will proudly celebrate the 250th anniversary of our nation, but there are some—all smug left-wing “deep thinkers”—who delight in telling us that many of the stories about the Founding that we believe are true are actually false.

A closer look at their account often reveals that they resort to challenging the conventional wisdom by making unsupported claims. In other words, they are very good at *asserting* something isn't true, without providing the evidence that discredits stories about the Founding. A classic example was recently published on the website of National Public Radio, the government-run media outlet that the “deep thinkers” adore.

NPR focused on “The Prayer at Valley Forge,” a painting by Arnold Friberg that was done to celebrate America's bicentennial in 1976; it shows Washington kneeling in prayer.

The painting is featured at the Museum of the Bible in Washington, D.C. The description on the wall says, “is a poignant portrayal of George Washington during one of the most critical moments in the American Revolution...many believe Washington knelt in a moment of solitary prayer, seeking guidance and strength from God.”

The NPR article seeks to punch a hole in this popular rendering, saying, “many historians do not believe there is much evidence to this story.” Many historians. How many of them are there? How many historians disagree with them? Moreover, to say there is not much evidence suggests there is some. Where is the evidence that those evidentiary claims are

wrong?

The NPR story cites Thomas Tweed, professor emeritus at the University of Notre Dame, as its source. Tweed claims that Parson Weems, Washington's early biographer, "concocted this story." How does Tweed know this to be true? Conveniently, he cites an essay he wrote for Yale University Press. So I accessed it.

I looked in vain to see the evidence that Weems "concocted this story." What I found, instead, was Tweed admitting that "There is some truth in the claim, and in the images. Washington did pray, though perhaps not the way Weems described..."

Some truth. How much, and on what basis did Tweed come to this conclusion? Moreover, to say "perhaps not the way Weems described" is to admit that perhaps *it is* the way Weems described. So why is Tweed so cocksure that Weems "concocted this story"?

Tweed cites two books to support his claim. I accessed them both.

One book is by Sheila Brennan, *Stamping American Memory*, and the other is by Mary V. Thompson, *In the Hands of a Good Providence*. Neither offers the level of proof Tweed would have us believe.

Brennan argues that the image of Washington "was completely contrived." How does she know that? She says it is "based on a tale first recanted by Parson Mason Weems in 1804." In an endnote, she cites as evidence, "Weems's claims have never been proven and attempts to debunk this particular myth were published in 1926 during the sesquicentennial." Now if the attempts succeeded, she would have told us. But she didn't.

Just as important, if Weems' claims have never been proven, it is also true that no one has disproven them. *To put it*

differently, why should we believe someone writing in the 21st century about an event that took place in the late 18th century, but not someone who wrote about an eyewitness account in the early 19th century?

Thompson is no better. She recounts the story told by Weems about a Quaker farmer named Potts. In the sixth edition of Weems' biography, published in 1808, he tells the story of how Potts came across Washington praying on his knees in the woods near his Valley Forge headquarters. Thompson is free to believe that this is a "highly suspect" story, but she offers zero evidence that disproves the Potts-Weems account.

On the website of "Historic Valley Forge" there is an examination of the evidence regarding this event. It says that the "nearest to an authentication of the Potts story of Washington's prayer in the woods seems to be supplied by the 'Diary and Remembrances' of the Rev. Nathaniel Randolph Snowden, an ordained Presbyterian minister, graduate of Princeton with a degree from Dickinson College."

Snowden handwrote, "I knew personally the celebrated Quaker Potts who saw Gen'l Washington alone in the woods at prayer. I got it from himself, myself." He then elaborated on what he heard, which supports the conventional wisdom.

The document ends by saying, "Is it not reasonable to believe that a man who had, on frequent occasions, paid homage publicly to the God of all nations and earnestly exhorted his soldiers and his fellow countrymen to 'express our grateful acknowledgement to God, for the manifold blessings he has granted to us,' may have sought seclusion for his own private communication with the Father."

The cynics don't want us to believe this story. They love to poke fun at patriotic Americans, setting themselves up as experts who are much smarter than the masses. Yet in the end all they have is conjecture. Their hubris is appalling.

CLERGY SEXUAL ABUSE AUDIT IS ENCOURAGING

[Bill Donohue](#)

If there is one member of the Catholic clergy who goes astray, the media will make sure everyone knows about him. But when the evidence shows that clergy sexual abuse has long been checked, the data are ignored. That's because good news about priests and deacons is not deemed worthy of disseminating. Just bad news.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) recently released its annual audit on clergy sexual abuse. It reports on its findings from July 1, 2024 to June 30, 2025. The "2025 Annual Report" was based on an audit by Stonebridge Business Partners, the Progress Report of the USCCB's Child and Youth Protection, and survey data from the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate at Georgetown University.

The Report found that during this period there were 1,070 allegations made by 973 persons about abuse that occurred extending back to 1950. Consistent with previous audits, most of the alleged abuse took place between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s, the heyday of the sexual revolution. The good news is that almost all of the alleged offenders are either dead or have been kicked out of the priesthood; none are still in active ministry.

Also consistent with previous findings, over 80 percent of the victims were postpubescent males. This means—though the Report is reluctant to admit it—that the lion's share of the abuse was committed by homosexuals. Not to admit that the Church had a homosexual crisis—not a pedophilia crisis—ill serves

everyone. Proper remedies depend on a proper diagnosis.

What about what cases of alleged abuse that took place between July 1, 2024 and June 30, 2025? There were 24 cases of clergy sexual abuse reported during this period. Of that number, four were substantiated. Given that there were 47,818 members of the clergy during this time period, this means that .008 percent had a substantiated case made against them.

Understandably, the Report does not compare this figure to data from other religious and secular institutions where adults regularly interact with minors. But I have done so (see [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#)) and I can say, without reservation, that there is no institution which has less of a problem with the sexual abuse of minors today than the Roman Catholic Church.

It is horrible for any adult to molest a minor, whether the victim is male or female. Having said that, it is important to note that of the 24 allegations, 6 were male, 17 were female and one was unidentified. This suggests that the steep decline in homosexual clergy members—a function of much-needed reforms—is working.

It would be great if those doing this audit had more to say about innocent clergy members who have had their reputations sullied by unsubstantiated accusations. The rights of accused priests have long been given a second-class status.

The fact of the matter is that it takes a whole lot more courage to stand up for the due process rights of priests than it does to stand up for the rights of victims. But this is not a zero-sum game.

There is no reason why the rights of accused priests should be treated any differently than the rights of victims. This is especially true now that the USCCB strengthened the Dallas Charter on June 11 to ensure that the accused are entitled to “the presumption of innocence.”

ATTACKS ON FATHERHOOD ARE ATTACKS ON NATURE

[Bill Donohue](#)

Attacking men, especially white, Christian, heterosexual men, is a popular sport enjoyed by left-wing pundits and activists. This is driven home every Father's Day. Normal people do not get exercised over this special day, but these folks do.

In New York State, there is a bill, supported by Democrats, to replace "father" with "non-gestating parent," and to call a "putative" father, meaning a deadbeat dad, "an alleged parent."

Why the adoption of "neutral" terms? Who is offended by calling fathers "fathers"? Radical gays and radical feminists object. They have long been at war with nature so this bill does not surprise. But why?

Radical gays, especially those who claim to be "married," object that terms like "father" and "mother" are exclusionary, leaving people like them out of familial conversations and governmental policies. They are right about that. But it is not men—it is nature—that has excluded them. To be blunt, nature has determined that people of the same sex cannot reproduce. That was part of God's design.

The problem for radical gays is that they do not believe in human nature: they think everything that exists is a "social construct." But male and female genital organs are not a "social construct"—they are an anatomical reality. Gays can carp all they want, but nature exists and they cannot change what it has ordained. It is a fight they cannot win. God has

seen to that, and it is useless to try to defeat Him.

Radical feminists deplore “patriarchy.” But there is a reason why it is universal: men are predisposed, as a function of nature, to rule. How so? Sociologist Steven Goldberg, who wrote a classical book on this subject, found that male dominance can be explained by hormonal factors such as the higher levels of testosterone that males have. As he noted, “*the hormonal renders the social inevitable* (italics in the original).”

Radical feminists like to point out that Goldberg’s thesis was contradicted by anthropologist Margaret Mead. Wrong. “Nowhere do I suggest that I have found any material which disproves the existence of sex differences.” She even went so far as to say, “It is true, as Professor Goldberg points out, that all claims so glibly made about societies ruled by women are nonsense. We have no reason to believe that they ever existed.”

In other words, radical gays and radical feminists can beat up on men, and especially fathers, all they want. But in the end, fatherhood is real and exclusionary, and so is patriarchy. The radicals may not like it, but most women throughout history have never had a problem with any of this. It’s only those with a fanciful ideological agenda who bitch about it.

Happy Father’s Day!