

WASHINGTON POST NEEDS A REALITY CHECK

[Bill Donohue](#)

Jeff Bezos, the owner of the *Washington Post*, lives in the real world, but many of his readers and writers do not. He knows the media have lost their credibility but the others do not. They need a reality check.

Bezos put the squash on an editorial to endorse Kamala Harris. Now the sky is falling in Washington.

He took to the editorial page to defend his decision. Here's what he said about newspapers. "We must be accurate, and we must be believed to be accurate. It's a bitter pill to swallow, but we are failing on the second requirement. Most people believe the media is [sic] biased. Anyone who doesn't see this is paying scant attention to reality, and those who fight reality lose."

He's right. The data prove it. In the 1970s, when Gallup first started asking about the media's credibility, trust ranged from 68 percent to 72 percent. Today it is at 31 percent. That's a record low. And it may be worse than that. Another national survey, released last month by Populace, found that 24 percent *publicly* agree the media tell the truth, but only 7 percent *privately* believe they do.

Just recently, a Rasmussen survey found that 50 percent of likely voters believe the media are biased in favor of the Democrats. In fact, 49 percent agree that the media are "truly the enemy of the people." The *Washington Post* has contributed mightily to this perception.

Here's an example about the *Post* that shows its blatant bias against the Catholic Church (many more could be provided).

In a November 13, 2022 editorial, it was claimed that “high-level sexual misconduct and cover-up in France shattered illusions of progress by the church toward establishing a culture of transparency and accountability in its hierarchy.”

The evidence? A retired cardinal and archbishop in France admitted to sexual misconduct with a teenage girl 35 years earlier.

At the time I wrote, “There are over 5,000 bishops in the world and the *Washington Post* found two of them who were involved in sexual misconduct decades ago. The paper argues that this shatters ‘illusions of progress.’” I couldn’t help but say, “What is really shattered is the credibility of its editorial board.”

Those who write for the newspaper do not see themselves as biased. They see themselves as being right. Those who think otherwise are simply wrong. That is the liberal mentality, whether found in the media, education, or anywhere else.

The paper’s readers feel the same way. In retaliation against Bezos’ decision not to endorse Harris, more than 200,000 of them have canceled their digital subscription. Editorial board members and reporters are also quitting.

Journalist David Hoffman has had it, saying, “I stand against silence in the face of dictatorship.” He didn’t call him Hitler, at least not in public, but he did say, “I believe we face a very real threat of autocracy in the candidacy of Donald Trump.” His colleague, Mary Roberts, said she is quitting “because the imperative to endorse Kamala Harris over Donald Trump is as morally clear as it gets.”

As Jonathan Turley and others have documented, the Biden-Harris years represent the most anti-free speech administration in the history of the United States, yet according to the *Washington Post* they do not pose a threat to democracy—Trump does. Is there any air in their bubble?

Even richer is former *Washington Post* executive director Marty Baron. “To declare a moment of high principle, only 11 days before the election that is just highly suspect that is just not to be believed that this was a matter of principle at this point.”

It takes gall for Baron to accuse Bezos of not being principled.

In 2018, *60 Minutes* fired its executive producer, Jeff Fager, because he was a sexual predator. He would have been fired earlier had Baron not killed a story about his behavior. [See my book, [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse*](#), for more information on this story.]

Amy Brittain, the *Washington Post*’s investigative reporter, and Irin Carmon spent four months doing a story on Fager; it was a follow-up to an earlier piece on Charlie Rose, who was fired from CBS after sexual harassment claims were made. They spoke to several women who said Fager had sexually abused them. Baron, they said, kept delaying the story and refused to speak with them. When the story finally ran, all the allegations against Fager were deleted; only additional allegations against Rose made it into the print.

Why did Baron kill the story on Fager? According to Carmon, “The close relationship between the paper and *60 Minutes*” had something to do with it.

Bezos needs to clean house, and he is not alone. As the Gallup poll showed, the media are “the least trusted group among 10 U.S. civic and political institutions involved in the democratic process.” Small wonder why.

KAMALA'S RACIST IDEA OF BLACK MEN

[Bill Donohue](#)

We all possess several statuses. For example, Kamala Harris is Vice President of the United States, a woman, and a descendant of slavemasters. Furthermore, we all have a master status, the one that means the most to us. That may be our occupation. It may be our role as a father or mother. Those are our decisions. Problems occur when others define what our master status should be. That is none of their business. But increasingly it is.

When Kamala sees a man who happens to be black, she does not see him as a Baptist, or as a Texan, or as a police officer, or as a father, though he may be all of them. She sees him as being a black man. Period. Importantly, her observation is freighted with high expectations. It is not his individual characteristics that matter; it is his status as a black man. He is expected to think and act accordingly.

Following Barack Obama's dehumanizing characterization of black men—he called out “the brothers” for not getting on board the Kamala train—she also called out black men for supporting Trump, labeling them “misogynists.” As such, she took a page out of Hillary's playbook.

Hillary Clinton does not see women as having multiple statuses—they have but one. Their sex. After she lost to Trump, she blamed them. She singled out “married white women” who supported Trump, branding them as cowards. They were too weak to stand up to “a sort of ongoing pressure to vote the way that your husband, your boss, your son, whoever, believes you should.” They had an obligation to vote for her—because of their sex.

Ironically, Kamala, who says she opposes racism, sees black men the way Klansmen do. She recently said that one of the most important policies she will pursue to help black men—she singled them out—is to legalize weed. “Legalizing recreational marijuana and creating opportunities for Black Americans to succeed in this industry.”

Now why, of all the things that could benefit black men, would she prioritize having more of them on dope? Is that how she thinks of them? Her father says it is.

Kamala doesn’t exactly get along very well with her dad. One reason for that is because she says his side of the family, which hails from Jamaica, are a bunch of potheads. In 2019, she was asked on a radio show if she supports legalizing marijuana. She responded, “Half my family’s from Jamaica. Are you kidding?”

Donald Harris wasted no time slamming her. He said his grandmothers and deceased parents “must be turning over in their graves right now to see their family name, reputation and proud Jamaican identity being connected, in any way, jokingly or not with the fraudulent stereotype of a pot-smoking joy seeker and in pursuit of identity politics. Speaking for myself and my immediate Jamaican family, we wish to categorically dissociate ourselves from this travesty.”

Why does Kamala see black men as misogynists who like to smoke weed? She doesn’t think that way about her husband. She is married to a rich white guy whose idea of masculinity expressed itself vividly when he knocked up his nanny while married to his first wife. But he is not a misogynist—the black guys who like Trump are. Also, since he is a white dude, he has no need to make a living selling grass.

Slavemasters did not see blacks as individuals; they were chattel. Kamala does not see blacks, especially black men, as individuals—they are defined by their race. She also

entertains some patently racist ideas about them.

KAMALA CAN'T STOP TALKING ABOUT ABORTION

[Bill Donohue](#)

When Trump was in office, the average year-over-year inflation rate was 1.9 percent. It has soared under Biden-Harris, making it the number-one issue for voters. Under Trump, illegal immigration was tamed, but under Biden-Harris it has quadrupled, making it the number-two issue for voters. Crime has increased dramatically under Biden (and the figures don't include the growing number of crimes that are going unapprehended), making it the number-three issue for voters.

Kamala Harris disagrees. She will be in Texas today, assisted by Beyonce, and all she will talk about is abortion. She's obsessed with it.

Sen. Bernie Sanders, a staunch champion of abortion rights, is advising against this approach. "She has to start talking more to the needs of working-class people." But she won't, and that is why blue-collar workers have abandoned the Democrats in favor of Trump.

Every honest person knows that abortion kills the innocent. Are not gender-reveal parties and baby showers tacit proof of this? After all, what are they celebrating? In a backhanded way, Harris recently appeared to acknowledge this verity.

A few weeks ago, in a Town Hall event, she said, "I'll tell you, there are probably many here and watching who, rightly,

have made a decision that they do not believe in abortion. The point that I am making is not about changing their mind about what's right for them or their family."

It's quite a concession to say that those who are pro-life have "rightly" made their decision. No one, including her, would say that those who believe in racial discrimination have "rightly" made that decision. That's because there is no moral justification for it. But to concede that there is a moral justification to oppose abortion begs the question: What is it that pro-life Americans are objecting to?

However, Harris' conviction that it is okay for Americans to "rightly" oppose abortion doesn't matter much to her. In her interview with NBC this week, she was asked if she would make religious exemptions for those who in good conscience cannot ascribe to her pro-abortion policies. She said no.

"I don't think that we should be making concessions when we're talking about a fundamental freedom to make decisions about your own body." But there is a fundamental freedom, enshrined in the First Amendment, that guarantees religious liberty, and conscience rights are at the heart of it. Nonetheless, that doesn't seem to matter. She is so thoroughly secular in her views that religious liberty means little. Indeed, those who believe in it are told to find another rally.

Inflation, illegal immigration, crime—none of them matter to those who are fixated on abortion. And no one is more fixated than Kamala Harris. If she loses the election, this will be one of the major reasons why. She is not only acting immorally, she is acting irrationally.

CATHOLIC CHURCHES TARGETED IN NYC

[Bill Donohue](#)

In the last six months, four Catholic churches in New York City have been vandalized, and St. Patrick's Cathedral was invaded during Mass for the second time this year. Here are the data.

June 11, 2024—St. Dominic's Church (Bensonhurst, Brooklyn)

- **Incident:** A hammer-wielding man attacked the statues of Mother Teresa and St. John XXIII outside of the church, destroying both their faces. He proceeded to damage the glass doors of the church.
- **Result:** Randy Maldonado Avila was arrested for this incident. Maldonado Avila has "a history of mental health issues."
- **Hate Crime:** Not charged as a hate crime

June 30, 2024—Holy Family Church (Flushing, Queens)

- **Incident:** At around 5:00 A.M., a man stopped his taxi on the other side of the street from the church. He then ran across the street and struck a statue of the baby Jesus multiple times leaving it headless.
- **Result:** Jamshaid Choudhry was arrested for this incident.
- **Hate Crime:** Choudhry was charged with criminal mischief as a hate crime and other related crimes.

September 24, 2024—Presentation of the Blessed Virgin Mary Church (Jamaica, Queens)

- **Incident:** A bearded man in a red t-shirt and baseball jumped over the fence and repeatedly struck the statue of the Virgin Mary outside of the rectory. The man

proceeded to break the hands of the statue.

- **Result:** Suspect at large
- **Hate Crime:** NYPD Hate Crimes Task Force is investigating the incident.

October 6, 2024–St. Frances Cabrini Shrine (Washington Heights, Manhattan)

- **Incident:** A man used black spray paint to deface the statue of Christ with profanity and strange markings. He proceeded to spray paint more profanity on the wall of the church and covered the face of the statue of St. Frances Cabrini with more black spray paint.
- **Result:** Suspect at large
- **Hate Crime:** NYPD Hate Crimes Task Force is investigating the incident.

October 22, 2024–St. Therese of Lisieux Church (East Flatbush, Brooklyn)

- **Incident:** A man wearing an orange headscarf used a brick to smash the hands of the Virgin Mary and break the cross from the hand of St. Therese.
- **Result:** Suspect at large
- **Hate Crime:** NYPD Hate Crimes Task Force is investigating the incident.

On Easter Sunday, a group of protesters invaded St. Patrick's Cathedral during the Saturday night Easter Mass. Standing front and center, they unfurled a banner with a depiction of an olive tree and the inscription, SILENCE = DEATH. They were screaming, "Free Palestine"; their allies were heard shouting similar chants from the street.

In February, at a funeral service at St. Patrick's Cathedral, men dressed as women and women dressed as men. They turned out to honor Cecilia Gentili. He was a man who falsely claimed to be a woman. He was an illegal alien, a drug addict, a prostitute, trans activist and an atheist. At the service,

many of these activists dressed as hookers, danced in the aisles, sang “Ave Cecilia” when “Ave Maria” was sung, and shouted, “St. Cecilia, Mother of All Whores.”

With the exception of the first incident, all of these crimes are the work of hate-filled anti-Catholic bigots. They are sending a message to Catholics. Regrettably, too many Catholics—clergy, religious and lay alike—continue to treat such attacks as if they were merely unfortunate episodes. They are not. Those who resort to violence and desecration know exactly what they are doing.

LAUGHING AT ABORTION

[Bill Donohue](#)

Can abortion be funny? Some think so. While most liberals would not agree that it is, it remains true that the only ones who do are secular liberals. Some are prominent Americans. If they are not mocking pro-lifers, they are joking about abortion.

On October 17, Vice President Kamala Harris mocked Christian students, much to the applause of her fans. When Harris began to defend abortion at a Wisconsin rally, two young people shouted, “Christ is King.” She could have let it go. Instead, she berated them.

[“You guys are at the wrong rally.”](#) As is her wont, she laughed heartily, and the crowd loved it. Yet when pro-Hamas protesters shout her down, she simply insists on her free speech rights. But on this occasion, that was obviously deemed inadequate. These were Christians—they deserved to be belittled.

Recently, Michigan Gov. Gretchen Whitmer insulted Catholics by going for the jugular—she ridiculed the Eucharist. We made sure everyone found out about it. Then she lied about what she did. What was not generally reported was how she reacted when the subject of abortion came up.

Liz Plank, the podcaster with whom Whitmer mocked Holy Communion, said to the governor, “Okay, and you have two daughters. When they come back home and they leave their Stanley Cups lying around, do you ever think about getting a post-birth abortion?” Whitmer broke out into uncontrollable laughter, [saying](#), “Thank you for raising that because there is no such thing.”

In fact, there is. Babies are born alive as a result of a botched abortion. Some not only live to tell their story, they have [organized](#) to inform Americans about it. Yet Whitmer thinks it’s funny. If she had any guts she would confront these survivors face-to-face, and then share her sense of humor with them.

Less well known pro-abortion advocates think the same way. About a decade ago, some male students at [Hunter College](#) in New York City decided to play a game mocking abortion. They stuffed balloons under their shirts, pretending to be pregnant, and then used plastic forks and knives on each other to pop the balloons. Students yelled, “Kill that baby! Kill it!”

Four years ago a girl went on [TikTok](#) bragging about her second abortion. Two years ago she was outdone by [Alison Leiby](#). She performed a comedy show, “Oh God, a Show About Abortion.” It was a celebration of her recent abortion. Why did she do it? “I wrote the show to help people understand and laugh about abortion.” That way more women will find it easier to make the decision to abort their child, and may even get a good chuckle out of it.

Almost as bad as these people are those with whom they live and work and refuse to confront them. Many of them know it is sick to laugh about abortion, but they don't want to appear "judgmental." But that in itself is a judgment.

Our society has become increasingly debased. When abortion is treated as legitimate comedic fare, the most vulnerable among us are next in line. History shows that desensitizing the population yields ugly results.

NEW "CATHOLIC" FILM CONCLAVE TO DEBUT

[Michael P. McDonald](#)

On October 25, *Conclave* will appear in movie theaters across the country. This thriller about a fictitious papal-election has garnered glowing reviews on the film festival circuit. In fact, the movie has garnered a 94 percent score on Rotten Tomatoes.

In its fawning review, the *Hollywood Reporter* notes, "The film raises timely issues of sexual and racist prejudices within organized religion, while also acknowledging the sexual scandals that have rocked the Church in recent years." *Entertainment Weekly* adds that "much of the film interrogates the gap between the Catholic Church's sins and the true meaning of faith...."

Since *Conclave* is about the intrigue surrounding the election of a new pope, one might wonder how these negative elements fit into the plot. Unfortunately, the reviews are scarce on specific details, but looking at the 2016 novel it is based on

provides more insight.

Like the movie, the novel revolves around the political intrigue of a papal election. Of course, the leading candidates have some sort of moral failing.

- Cardinal Joshua Adeyemi from Africa who holds traditional views had an affair with a nun and fathered a child ruling him out of contention.
- Cardinal Joseph Tremblay a smooth Vatican insider is involved in a scandal of selling Church offices and appointments to bolster his support.
- Liberal Cardinal Aldo Bellini who favors modernizing the Church is a suffering hero rejected by the College of Cardinals.
- Foiling Bellini is the ultra-conservative Cardinal Goffredo Tedesco, a boorish man.

In the middle of the conclave there is an attack by Islamic terrorists prompting Tedesco to effectively call for a new crusade, ending his candidacy. Ultimately, the conclave selects Cardinal Vincent Benítez, a relatively unknown prelate from the Philippines who currently serves as the Archbishop of Baghdad. In a final twist, it turns out Benítez is intersex with what looks to be male reproductive organs but is female.

The author, Robert Harris, claims he has no real religious tradition. However, he is a devout British liberal, even authoring a novel to attack Tony Blair, which was made into a film in collaboration with sexual predator Roman Polanski. In fact, the pair worked on three films. Harris even defended Polanski from his critics saying his crimes are a problem of culture and fashion.

In the novel's Acknowledgements, Harris cites a slew of dissident Catholic writers including John Cornwell, a British author known for the totally discredited book *Hitler's Pope*.

It is equally instructive to consider what some of the people

associated with the movie have said:

- Director Edward Berger—"If the Catholic Church wants to survive and take a step into the future it needs to change quickly..."
- Leading actor Ralph Fiennes—"When religious things become so codified, so doctrinal and extreme, then they become for me very frightening." He then criticized Pope Benedict XVI, "I don't think anyone who considers themselves an enlightened Catholic can like him."
- Supporting actor Stanley Tucci played the anti-Catholic Boston lawyer Mitchell Garabedian in *Spotlight*, lauding his work. That tells us volumes about Tucci's real agenda.

Given what we know about *Conclave* from the fawning critics, the novel, and what people associated with the film have said, *Conclave* is more a piece of anti-Catholic propaganda than it is a work of art. It might have stunning cinematic sequences and a star studded cast, but those things do not redeem the underlying ugliness of the project, namely it aims to paint the Catholic Church in the most negative light possible.

HARRIS AND "Dr." JILL COMPETE FOR HONORS

[Bill Donohue](#)

The literary credentials of Kamala Harris and Jill Biden are quite a spectacle. Not sure who is more impressive.

Harris claims to be the author of a 2010 book, *Smart On Crime*. Jill Biden claims to have a doctoral degree. But there's more

there than meets the eye.

It's a sure bet Harris didn't write *Smart On Crime*. On the book's cover it identifies Kamala Harris "with" Joan O.C. Hamilton. Real authors know what that means—"with" wrote the book. This is acceptable if the "author" is a celebrity or an athlete, but when politicians, or TV personalities for that matter, sell themselves as real authors—when "with" wrote the book—it is simply dishonest.

But this doesn't excuse Harris from the charge of plagiarism. It has now been revealed that several passages in the book were lifted, word for word, from the Associated Press and Wikileaks. Harris put her name on it so she has to be held accountable. I begged off from buying it because it is selling on Amazon for \$395.

Her oral skills are no better. Known as the "Word Salad Queen," Harris has a penchant for scrambling her thoughts. Much of what she says is so incoherent, or just plain dumb, as to make heads spin. For example, when she says, "I grew up understanding the children of the community are the children of the community," it suggests that others grew up understanding the children of the community are *not* the children of the community. Would love to meet them.

Harris' understanding of what culture means is equally profound.

"Culture is—it is a reflection of our moment and our time. Right? And present culture is the way we express how we're feeling about the moment and we should always find times to express how we feel about the moment. That is a reflection of joy. Because, you know...it comes in the morning." For some reason, I thought it was after lunch.

An Ed.D. is not like a Ph.D. The former is a degree in administration; the latter is a research degree. Most Ph.D.s, myself included, don't identify themselves as Dr., though they

have every right to do so. To be awarded the degree, they have to write a dissertation, or what is regarded as an original contribution to research. This is not a requirement for an Ed.D. Therefore, when someone with an Ed.D. identifies as Dr., it makes those with a Ph.D. wince.

Jill Biden, armed with her Ed.D., insists on being called Dr. Jill, and the media dutifully comply (some people actually think she's a physician). After perusing what the University of Delaware calls her "dissertation/executive position paper" (never heard of an "executive position paper"—must be unique to Ed.D. candidates), it is clear that her "Dr." status is an embarrassment.

News reports say that her paper, which was on student retention in community colleges, is 137-pages long. Actually, the text is only 79 pages (the rest are introductory notes and the bibliography). It reads more like an encyclopedia than serious scholarship.

Readers can't get by the first two pages without wondering how any educator would sign off on it. Yet seven did, including the Provost. Then again, the Bidens are god in Delaware.

"Dr." Jill got off to a bad start. She writes, "The needs of the student population are often *undeserved*, resulting in a student drop-out rate of almost one third (my italics)." She obviously meant "underserved." This was the second sentence on p. 1.

On p. 2, she proves her mathematical illiteracy. Commenting on the demographic characteristics of the students at Delaware Tech, she writes, "Three quarters of the class will be Caucasian; one quarter of the class will be African American." She should have stopped there. But evidently she can't count. She added, "one seat will hold a Latino; and the remaining seats will be filled with students of Asian descent or non-resident aliens."

Sometimes she simply makes no sense. “Although students make friends through their classes and their technologies...” What’s that? Students make friends through “their technologies”?

Even better are her childlike constructions. She makes such pedestrian points that it makes the typical pub conversation sound Shakespearian.

“A faculty mentoring program can go hand-in-hand with the advisement process.” Isn’t that what mentoring programs are all about? Then we learn that “The best mentors are the faculty or staff with whom a student seems to connect.” Very insightful.

Furthermore, she says, “The mentor should be genuinely interested in helping the students succeed or meet their goals.” Extraordinary observation. Also, “The student retention committee should formulate a plan to increase retention.” Great idea.

On the conclusion page, we learn that “Because community colleges are education institutions, the most important focus must center on the academic success of the students.” Go to the head of the class, Dr. Jill.

Kamala and Dr. Jill are proof positive that anyone can make it in the USA.

WHY KAMALA STIFFED AL SMITH DINNER

[Bill Donohue](#)

None of us like to go to a party where we feel out of place.

This explains why Kamala Harris decided to stiff New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan and skip the Al Smith Dinner on Oct. 17. It would be uncomfortable for her, and, quite frankly, for everyone else. She has a lot in common with dissident Catholics (to the extent they can realistically be called Catholic), but not with practicing Catholics.

Harris was raised in a confused religious household. Her father was a Christian and her mother was Hindu. She attended a Baptist church but she says very little about her religious upbringing. Nor does she say much about her faith today.

The Religion News Service, a secular-leaning media outlet, says two things about her religious status. She likes to talk about the Good Samaritan and she likes to invoke liberation theology.

What does the Good Samaritan New Testament verse mean to Harris? It means helping our neighbor. Fine. But her comments are so pedestrian as to be childlike in their innocence. "Neighbor is not about having the same ZIP code. What we learn from that parable is that neighbor is someone you are walking by on the street."

I'll have to remember that the next time I see hookers and drug dealers hawking their wares in front of Penn Station.

Religion News Service tries to help her by offering a sanitized understanding of liberation theology, saying it is a "strain of Christian thought that emphasizes social concern for the poor and political liberation of oppressed peoples." Not really. It is a Marxist-driven ideology with a Christian veneer, just the kind of "theology" that secularists are okay with.

To be sure, Harris is not that different from the man she serves. While the media call Joe Biden a "devout Catholic," a survey by Pew Research Center found that only 13 percent of Americans think he is "very religious."

Her running mate, Tim Walz, is no better. His parents were nominally Catholic and he bolted the Catholic Church long ago to join the most liberal mainline Lutheran denomination, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. He wanted nothing to do with the more orthodox Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. During the debate with JD Vance, he admitted, “I don’t talk about my faith a lot,” which is certifiably true. He then quoted a passage from the Bible.

The religion problem is deeper than the candidates. The Democratic Party has been thoroughly secularized for some time.

In 2012, the Democrats deleted the word “God” from their Platform (they had to restore it after a pushback). Four years later, the 2016 Democratic Party Platform had 14 sentences on specific rights for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People, and two vague sentences on “respecting faith” at home.

The only time the 2024 Platform mentions God is in a throwaway reference speaking about the need for all of us to “live up to their God-given potential.” That’s it. Though it does make mention of Jews and Muslims, it makes no mention of Christians or Catholics. It’s as though we don’t exist.

People of faith don’t even merit their own section on religious liberty. Instead, there is a small section on “Combating Hate & Protecting Freedom of Religion.” It condemns anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, but says not a word about all the violence directed at Christian churches and crisis pregnancy centers. Nor does it comment on attempts to stifle Christian speech or punishing Christian foster parents. Maybe that’s because those engaged in anti-Christian bigotry are part of their base.

Kamala’s decision to blow off the Al Smith Dinner may seem insulting to some, but given who she is, and what the Democratic Party has become, it’s best for everyone that she

takes a pass.

WHITMER'S PHONY APOLOGY

[Bill Donohue](#)

Michigan Gov. Gretchen Whitmer dug herself a new hole when she offered a fundamentally dishonest apology, and then had her press secretary lie about what happened.

Whitmer said she would “never do something to denigrate someone’s faith,” which, of course, she did. Indeed, it is the very reason she was forced to say something. She also said the video that she shot with podcaster Liz Plank was supposed to be “about the importance of the CHIPS Act.” This is risible on the face of it—no one is buying it. We all know what she was doing: mocking the Eucharist.

Stacey LaRouche, Whitmer’s press secretary, lied when she said, “Liz is not kneeling in the video.” Plank also lied when she said, “No one was on their knees. I’m sitting on a couch that’s visible in the shot.”

The picture doesn’t lie. To see it click [here](#).

Plank was sitting on a couch for the interview, but when she pretended to be receiving Holy Communion, she got on her knees. Whitmer then placed a Dorito chip on her tongue. This is not debatable.

The only reason Whitmer said anything is because we contacted every parish in the state of Michigan, as well as every state lawmaker. We also blanketed the media. News stories exploded on radio and TV, and it was covered by newspapers and internet news and commentary sites across the nation. Michigan

Catholics took it from there and let their voices be heard. Good for them.

Whitmer could have put her anti-Catholic stunt behind her by issuing a sincere apology. Instead she decided to lie about it. Doubling down on her bigoted attack—ridiculing the most sacred aspect of the Mass—is a decision that will come back to haunt her. Bet on it.

Contact Whitmer's office of communications: Press@Michigan.gov

REASSESSING ELITE INDIAN CLAIMS THIS COLUMBUS DAY

This article appeared in [The American Spectator](#) on Oct. 10

[Bill Donohue](#)

As president of the Catholic League, I speak for my members and have never said I speak for all Catholics. Would that other leaders of advocacy organizations do the same. But they do not. Indeed, the gap between the elites and the people they claim to represent is more often than not quite big. That's because rich donors usually spend their money funding left-wing causes.

The same is true in the American Indian community. Those who claim to represent them typically do not. Take the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI). It 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 (NFL) to honor an actual Native American.” It is referring to Blackfoot Chief John Two Guns White Calf, who served as an inspiration for the Washington Redskins logo.

So who is right? The NCAI or the NAGA? The polls back up the survey cited by the latter.

In 2002, [Sports Illustrated](#) found that in its investigation of this issue, “three out of four Native Americans” believe that “even a nickname such as Redskins, which many whites consider racist, isn’t objectionable.” The sports publication concluded that “although Native American activists are virtually united in opposition to the use of Indian nicknames and mascots, the Native American population sees the issue differently.” Yes, there is a 3-1 difference.

In 2004, the [University of Pennsylvania’s National Annenberg Election 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.

Here's some good news. [NAGA](#) sued the Washington Commanders on grounds of defamation, civil conspiracy and civil rights violations for their role in suppressing Native American history. They also sued NCAI for its role.

The controversy over the name "Redskins" grew out of left-wing propaganda portraying Columbus as some kind of genocidal maniac. More trash.

[Carol Delaney](#) is associate professor of Cultural and Social Anthropology, Emerita, at Stanford University. In her book, *Columbus and the Quest for Jerusalem*, she notes that Columbus set sail to find gold so he could "fund a crusade to take Jerusalem back from the Muslims before the end of the world. A lot of people at that time thought that the apocalypse was coming because of all the signs: the plague, famine, earthquakes and so forth. And it was believed that before the end, Jerusalem had to be back in Christian hands so that Christ could return in judgment."

She was asked in an interview about the way Columbus interacted with the Indians. Her answer is a far cry from what radical revisionists offer.

"His relations with the natives tended to be benign. He liked the natives and found them to be very intelligent." In fact, he instructed his followers to be kind to them. "Columbus strictly told the crew not to do things like maraud, or rape, and instead to treat the native people with respect. There are many examples in his writings where he gave instructions to this effect. Most of the time when injustices occurred, Columbus wasn't even there. There were terrible diseases that got communicated to the natives, but he can't be blamed for that."

As usual, anti-American savants in the academy, along with

their George Soros-funded allies in the Native American community, misrepresent the truth. Their feet are well planted in the grievance industry, hoping to turn the public against their country.

Happy Columbus Day!