

HOW TO CHECK MONKEYPOX

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the spread of monkeypox:

If we are going to stop the spread of monkeypox, we need to first admit that nature is not a social construct. It is a stubborn fact of life. It has never changed and never will. Nature's God has seen to that.

One of nature's most stubborn facts is the body's limited capacity for abuse. If we eat too much, drink too much, have too many cigarettes, drugs or sex partners, the body rebels. Promiscuity does bodily harm.

There are two segments of society most responsible for the spread of monkeypox: promiscuous homosexuals and elites in medicine.

If homosexuals acted more responsibly and stopped engaging in lethal sex practices, stopped having multiple partners, and stopped having sex with anonymous men, monkeypox would not be the problem that it is today.

If the elites in medicine—including those at the CDC and the World Health Organization (WHO)—were straight shooters and told it like it is, monkeypox would not be the problem that it is today. It does not help when the best that the head of WHO can say to homosexuals is that they need to reduce the number of their sexual partners “for the moment.”

Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, who is not a medical doctor, sounded a lot tougher discussing social distancing to combat Covid-19. In April, amid a drastic decrease in Covid hospitalizations and deaths, he warned that if social distancing norms were relaxed “too quickly, we risk a resurgence that could be even worse than our present situation.”

Ever since we learned about monkeypox in mid-May, it has been painfully evident that too many leaders have pretended that “anyone can get monkeypox.” While technically this is true, we’ve known from the beginning that in Europe and the United States that *almost all those who have the disease are gay men*.

What seems to be bothering gay activists and medical elites more than anything is the stigma attached to monkeypox. By contrast, we hear little about the extent to which it is behaviorally induced.

There are signs that a reality check is taking place. More stories are being published arguing that the government has not done enough to make vaccines available, thus raising questions whether the passivity is driven by an anti-gay animus. But how could this be if the “anyone can get monkeypox” refrain is true? There’s the rub. For there to be victim status, there must be a clear admission that monkeypox is a gay-driven disease.

On July 26, the New York Times reported that it was not until June 23 that New York City decided to offer the vaccine “to all men who had recently had sex with multiple or anonymous male sexual partners”; the federal government did so five days later. By singling out this group, the elites finally acknowledged the truth: everyone does not have an *equal* chance of contracting monkeypox. It discriminates on the basis of behavior.

The Times story quoted a “transgender queer man” who tried unsuccessfully to get vaccinated a week before Pride Weekend. Did that affect his behavior? Not at all. “He hooked up with a few people, and about a week later, began to feel abdominal pain, swollen lymph nodes and body aches. Lesions spread across his body, and some made it excruciating to urinate.”

A man who works for George Soros also opened up about his behavior during New York’s Pride events. He said he “had sex

with several guys over the weekend.” He got monkeypox.

Another gay man, who admitted that several of his friends came down with monkeypox after a weekend of partying in Fire Island in early June, was worried that more gays would contract it during the New York Pride festivities. He rightly assumed that after Pride weekend, “monkeypox cases would skyrocket to thousands.”

Too bad these people didn’t listen to reason. On June 22, in an article titled, “Gay Role in Monkeypox is Serious,” I said, “With ‘Pride’ festivities about to be launched over the last weekend in June, it is incumbent on government officials to warn the homosexuals of the necessity of practicing restraint.”

They didn’t. We now know what happened.

CALLING OUT JOE ROGAN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks recently made by Joe Rogan:

Joe Rogan has a reputation of being an independent thinker. From what he said on his July 27 podcast about the Catholic Church, it is clear that his reputation is unearned. He sounded more like your typical uneducated anti-Catholic buffoon.

Referring to the Vatican, he said, “It’s a country filled with pedophiles. It’s a country filled with pedophiles and stolen art.”

One of his fellow podcasters, Konstantin Kisin, exclaimed, “This is why I love America, man. Cause in the UK, we have

libel laws. So if you say something like that and you then have to be able to prove it, otherwise you can get sued.”

He’s right. Our elastic libel laws allow irresponsible persons like Rogan to defame people with impunity. More interesting was Rogan’s reply. “Well, you can kind of prove that.”

I am calling you out, Mr. Rogan: Why not invite me to join you in a discussion of this issue and see if you can “kind of prove” your smears? Before doing so, you may want to read my latest book, [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#). You might find it enlightening.

If you don’t want to debate me, I will conclude that you are a coward.

Contact his publicist, Michael O’Brien: michael@mobe.nyc

Pope Francis Decries Imposition of ‘Cancel Culture’ in Canada Meeting

Bill in the news (Breitbart): In a biting critique Wednesday, Catholic League president Bill Donohue declares that the Canadian Prime Minister himself – Justin Trudeau – is guilty of exactly the sort of ideological colonization that the pope is referring to. [READ MORE HERE](#)

MOST JOURNALISTS LIVE IN A BUBBLE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why journalists are held in such low regard:

A recent [Gallup poll](#) found that only 16 percent of Americans have a great deal, or quite a lot, of confidence in newspapers. Just 11 percent have some degree of confidence in TV news. Among Republicans, just 5 percent have confidence in newspapers, as contrasted to 35 percent among Democrats.

Of course Democrats are less critical—most journalists are liberal Democrats; they give them what they want. This is not debatable. A [large survey](#) published in April that was authorized by three political scientists found that 8 in 10 journalists who cover politics identify as liberal Democrats.

“On average, the journalists in our samples are far to the left of the average Twitter user and even to the left of prominent liberal politicians like former president Barack Obama.” Yet both the journalists, and the political scientists, believe this has no effect on their stories.

The political scientists contend that “journalists are just as likely to cover ‘conservative’ candidates as they are to cover ‘liberal’ candidates.” Thus they conclude that “In short, despite being overwhelmingly liberal themselves, journalists show a great deal of impartiality in the types of candidates that they choose to write about when a potential story is presented to them.”

The bubble these people live in is gargantuan. It is not the subject of a news story that counts the most—it is what is said about it. Jim Acosta covered President Trump. Did that make him impartial?

Similarly, a [Pew survey](#) published a few weeks ago found that 55 percent of journalists say every side does *not* always deserve equal treatment. However, the public sharply disagrees: 76 percent say journalists should always strive to give all sides equal coverage. This obviously accounts for why journalists are held in such low regard.

To be fair, there are times when covering both sides is not justified. Are there two sides to rape? Also, covering both sides can sometimes show partiality, not impartiality. Consider two recent stories affecting Catholics.

On July 27, a news story in the Press Herald, a Maine media outlet, said that Rev. Robert Vaillancourt, who had been placed on administrative leave for an entire year, is being returned to ministry following an investigation that concluded that allegations that he sexually abused two girls in the 1980s could not be substantiated. Records and documents were checked and 30 people were interviewed.

Where's the slant? In a vain effort to show "both sides," a spokesman for the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP) was given much coverage, saying he believes the women. Not only did he not offer a single piece of evidence to support his position, [SNAP has been totally discredited as a monumental fraud](#). It exists on paper only. Take away this guy's cell phone and it doesn't exist.

Real journalists would dig deeper seeking to see if these women made up their stories to shake down the Catholic Church.

Real journalists would also have reported this week that the majority Canadian schools that housed and taught Indigenous persons were not run by Catholics. They were run by the government and Protestant denominations.

Make no mistake, there are still good journalists who strive to be objective. Sadly, they are in a minority—most of them function more like activists than true professionals. That

they live in a bubble is incontestable.

VIOLENCE AGAINST PRO-LIFERS; ATTORNEY GEN. ASKED TO RESPOND

In the run-up to the release of the Supreme Court ruling in Roe v. Wade, those associated with the pro-life movement were targeted by domestic terrorists. On June 17, Bill Donohue wrote a letter to Attorney General Merrick Garland, asking for his intervention. Here is an excerpt.

We have witnessed a rash of vandalism against Catholic churches, firebombings of crisis pregnancy centers (many of which are run by Catholics), Masses being interrupted, illegal protests outside the homes of Catholic Supreme Court Justices, and an attempted murder of one of the Catholic Justices. While there are several groups involved in these attacks, none is more dangerous than Jane's Revenge.

Jane's Revenge is a domestic terrorist group, par excellence. Recently formed, it brags about blowing up crisis pregnancy centers. Worse, it is calling for a "Night of Rage" on the day the Supreme Court is expected to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

Jane's Revenge made its first public statement on May 8, following the firebombing of a crisis pregnancy center in Madison, Wisconsin. It demanded that these facilities be shut down, pledging to destroy them if they remained open.

It was on May 30 when it issued its "Night of Rage" threat. "On the night the final ruling is issued," it said, "we are

asking for courageous hearts to come out after dark." It said it had chosen "a time of 8pm for actions nationwide to begin..."

On June 14, Jane's Revenge issued another online post, citing operations in 16 cities, as well as in "countless locations invisibly." Saying that "it's open season" on "anti-choice" groups, it pledged to "never stop, back down, slow down, or retreat." It sent a message to pro-life entities saying, "Eventually your insurance companies, and your financial backers will realize you are a bad investment."

On June 16, the FBI admitted that it is investigating these attacks on pro-life and faith-based institutions, though it did not say which groups it is probing.

We have learned, from credible sources, that there is a link between Jane's Revenge and Antifa, the far-left anarchist group. Their modus operandi and goals are very similar.

We have now reached the stage where probes are academic. The clock is ticking.

We need aggressive action against those who have not only taken credit for violence across the nation—they are pledging to engage in more of it. Jane's Revenge fits the bill in both instances. The "Night of Rage" that it is threatening must never be allowed to commence.

Please take immediate action to see to it that these threats never materialize.

VICTORY FOR LIFE

For a half century, abortion has been legal across the United States. Those days are over: the Supreme Court has overruled the 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade*. What is not over is the issue of abortion—the states will now decide how to address it.

Justice Samuel Alito, writing for the 5-4 majority, held that “*Roe* was egregiously wrong from the start. Its reasoning was exceptionally weak, and the decision has had damaging consequences.” That is why, he said, “It is time to heed the Constitution and return the issue of abortion to the people’s elected representatives.”

The Supreme Court did more than overturn *Roe*—it negated the 1992 ruling in *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pa. v. Casey*. This decision went beyond *Roe* by making abortion a near absolute right, through term.

Honest abortion-rights legal scholars have long said that while abortion should be legal, it is not the business of the courts to settle such matters. Alito picked up on their admission, saying, “The Constitution makes no reference to abortion, and no such right is implicitly protected by any constitutional provision....”

Aside from the legal matters, abortion involves a host of biological and moral issues. The DNA that makes us all unique human beings is present at conception, and not a day later.

Thank God the Catholic Church led the fight for the rights of the unborn for 49 years. It finally paid off.

June 24th was a special day for Catholics and for life.

COLLAPSE OF A COMMON CULTURE

In the May issue of *Catalyst*, I wrote how elites in our society are bent on dividing us. This month I want to look at technology's contribution to polarization. Not to be misunderstood, I am not against technology; my observations deal exclusively with its ineluctable effects on our culture.

When I was growing up on Long Island, we had ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS and three local channels on TV. I later learned that having seven channels was actually a high number compared to other parts of the country. This meant that most Americans pretty much watched the same news shows, and while differing views were commonplace, we could all agree on what the news of the day was.

Today we still get news from the big three—ABC, CBS, and NBC—but they carry far less weight than in the past, with far fewer people watching them. Many prefer to get their news from cable TV, but the people who watch Fox News and Newsmax, which appeal to conservatives, seldom watch CNN or MSNBC, which appeal to those on the left, and vice versa.

The big difference is not the slant—it is the news stories that are not covered. For example, CNN and MSNBC will not cover news stories that upset its liberal viewers, the result being that their audience is often in the dark about major events (e.g, the bogus Russian collusion story, Hunter Biden, etc.).

It used to be that families disagreed over the news of the day. Now one side doesn't know what the other side is talking about.

It's not just news stories that have changed. The

proliferation of TV channels and social media platforms means we don't watch the same entertainment shows. As a youngster, I remember that nearly everyone watched the Jackie Gleason show, "The Honeymooners," as well as the "The Ed Sullivan Show," the number-one entertainment program. Now some watch rappers while others watch the rodeo.

In the late 19th and early 20th century, families were big, houses were small and cars were few, if non-existent. Now families are small, houses are big and cars are everywhere.

Think of the row houses in big cities at that time. There was no TV and no air conditioning. So where did everyone go during the summer? They hung out outside on the stoop, the sidewalk and the street. All the neighbors knew each other and the kids played ball and other games while adults partied and had a few cold ones. They actually talked to each other. There was no need to schedule a "block party"—they happened spontaneously every weekend.

Now family members have several rooms to isolate from each other. They don't have to be outside in the heat; they can stay inside in the AC and watch TV, play video games and engage in social media, all by themselves. They don't have to talk to anyone.

How sad. What we are witnessing is the collapse of a common culture. People get their news and entertainment from a multiplicity of sources, and are content to absorb themselves on their phones. They must have their phones—all the time.

There are other problems. Email is a fast and effective way to communicate with others about everyday matters, but it is a lousy way to communicate when it comes to serious issues. It is easy to misinterpret someone when the issue is a hot one.

When we are with someone, we can pick up on facial expressions, body language and the like, and we have an opportunity to get instant clarification. This is not true of

email correspondence, which is why we often come away hurt. It is easy to be mistaken. Did he really mean what I think he meant? Did she not get back to me because she's angry at me? It is so easy to mistake the sentiments of someone when we are not with them.

In other words, there is no substitute for face-to-face interaction. That takes time and effort, but it's worth it, especially when the issue is sensitive.

Gen Z (1997-2012) is the youngest segment of our adult population. The "zoomers" are known for many things, but none is more disturbing than the high degree of loneliness that so many are experiencing. It is a major problem, and it affects girls worse than boys. Indeed, social media is a big generator of loneliness among young girls.

When I was a kid, if I saw someone walking down the block with ear phones talking to himself, I would be tempted to call the asylum. Now I look away. Similarly, when I was young and took a train or bus, people spoke to those near to them. Now they speak to someone no one can see on their phone. And because we are a captive audience, we all have to hear the conversation of these narcissists.

No wonder we are a divided people. We no longer have anywhere near the same common experiences. We have plenty of autonomy, but the underside is we lack a sense of community. Unfortunately, when that goes, much is lost.

THE HATEFUL LEGACY OF GEORGE

SOROS

Bill Donohue

Few persons have done more damage to free societies than George Soros, the Hungarian-born billionaire. Yet in left-wing circles, the 91-year-old is regarded as a hero. That may have something to do with the fact that his Open Society Foundations have been greasing them for decades.

Soros' fans in the media and education consider him to be a champion of social justice causes. In reality, he is doing more harm to African Americans today than any single person in the nation.

His war on blacks stems from his funding of local D.A.'s who go easy on violent criminals—these attorneys are a main reason why there has been a big spike in crime in urban areas—and by opposing educational reforms, such as charter schools and school choice. Similarly, he supports the legalization of drugs, and the open borders' policies that facilitate it.

In all cases, the victims are mostly blacks. If Soros were a Klansman, he would surely be known as one of the Imperial Wizards.

Soros has always been in love with power, the signature attribute of the Left. In 1946, he told his father, "I'd like to go to Moscow to find out about communism. I mean that's where the power is." He was right—Stalin's genocidal regime was all about power. The power grab that most interests Soros today is the international regulation of speech on the internet. He wants to control speech worldwide.

Like many of those rich persons on the Left, Soros milked the capitalist system that he later tried to destroy. Unlike most Americans, he disparages the Declaration of Independence, proclaiming there are no "self-evident truths." Not

surprisingly, his idea of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness does not impel him to defend the life of the unborn; he is also a strong advocate of assisted suicide.

Soros is known as a “self-hating Jew.” As a young man in Hungary he became a Nazi collaborator. In a “60 Minutes” interview, Soros admitted that he helped confiscate property from Jews. He told Steve Kroft that he never regretted doing so. When asked if this was difficult, Soros said, “Not, not at all. Not at all.” Stunned, Kroft said, “No feeling of guilt?” “No” came the reply.

The hatred that Soros has for Israel is indisputable. He funds groups such as Bend the Arc, a far-left Jewish group that supports anti-Semites such as Rep. Ilhan Omar and Rep. Rashida Tlaib. He also throws considerable money at the BDS movement (boycott, divestment and sanctions) which is trying to bankrupt Israel. By funding the Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International, he is instrumental in branding Israel an “apartheid” racist state, the two bodies promoting this cause.

There is no shortage of influential persons who have tried to defend Soros from these accusations. Their favorite tactic is to accuse his critics of anti-Semitism. The Associated Press rallied to his side in 2017 by publishing a hackneyed story, “Demonization of Soros Recalls Old anti-Semitic Conspiracies.”

The New York Times often smells a whiff of anti-Semitism whenever Soros is criticized as a “globalist” and a “left-wing radical.” It declared such terms to be “barely coded anti-Semitism,” even though both labels are undeniably true and have nothing to do with bigotry.

To show how flatulent these accusations of anti-Semitism are, consider that the former prime minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, was accused of making “common anti-Semitic canards” for his criticism of Soros. More recently, when the ADL criticized Tucker Carlson for being an anti-Semite—the Fox

News host said Soros' goal was "destruction aimed at the West"—it was rebuked by the Coalition of Jewish Values, which represents more than 2,000 Orthodox rabbis; they said the ADL's characterization was "grossly misplaced."

Soros has a long history of supporting anti-Catholicism, and that means lining up with the Democratic Party. When President Obama was in power, the atheist billionaire threw his weight behind Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United, two Catholic front-groups founded to manipulate Catholic voters.

Under President Trump, the Open Society Foundations funded by Soros gave money to organizations seeking to undermine the State Department's Commission on Unalienable Rights. Faithful America, another Soros operation, asked for a Justice Department investigation of Attorney General Bill Barr for the crime of speaking about militant secularists at Notre Dame Law School.

President Biden has won the backing of Soros-funded organizations on several occasions. Even before he became president, Vote Common Good drew on 1,600 faith leaders (they were really a motley crew of left-wing activists) to openly support Biden in the race for the White House. Soros underwrote this effort as well. Earlier in 2020, after Cardinal Timothy Dolan thanked President Trump on a conference call for his outreach to Catholics, Faith in Life, another Soros entity, started a campaign to discredit Dolan.

Once Biden took office, the president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Archbishop José Gomez, raised concerns about having a pro-abortion Catholic in the White House. That was enough to trigger an enormous backlash; pro-abortion forces piled on him nationwide. Simply raising the propriety of a pro-abortion Catholic president receiving Holy Communion was sufficient to attack Gomez again. Faith in Public Life and Faithful America led the charge.

No one person in the United States has funded more Catholic dissident organizations than Soros. In actuality, these entities are more like letterheads than organizations. They typically have no members and some would not exist without Soros' backing. It's a shell game—they were founded to weaken the moral authority of the bishops by convincing Catholics and non-Catholics alike of the legitimacy of dissident voices.

Some Soros-funded activists used to work for the bishops' conference, thus suggesting that there are sources working within the Church to submarine it. One of the most prominent is John Gehring of Faith in Public Life. An anti-Catholic extremist, he wraps himself in Catholic cloth, telling the media he is an authentic Catholic leader. Meanwhile he libels the "white hierarchy" of bishops for not supporting Black Lives Matter, the wholly discredited Marxist organization that is under investigation for fraud in many states.

Gehring is a master manipulator of the media. In 2012, he sent a memo to many reporters and commentators instructing them on how to handle the bishops. He was concerned that a bishop-sponsored project, "Fortnight for Freedom," could hurt left-wing causes.

He taught the media how to deal with declarations about the "war on the Catholic Church," a reference to Catholic League admonitions that some bishops took to heart. He accused the bishops of making "inflammatory and irresponsible rhetoric," all the while inflaming anti-Catholic sentiment in the media. A copy of his memo was leaked to me by a reporter and I issued a news release exposing his deceitful campaign.

When Pope Francis visited the United States in 2015, Faith in Action did Soros' bidding by seeking to engage the pope on economic and racial justice issues he was sympathetic towards. It, too, was a stealth campaign, organized to politicize the pope's message. Soros invested \$650,000 in this effort.

Catholics for Choice is the oldest anti-Catholic “Catholic” entity in the modern era. Though no organization has given it more money than the Ford Foundation, Soros’ foundations have not been miserly. This letterhead has a history of lying about the Church’s official teaching on abortion.

Soros likes abortion so much that he dropped a bundle in 2016 trying to convince Catholics in Ireland that they needed to get rid of their “pro-life” beliefs and vote to repeal its Eighth Amendment ban on abortion. He scored a victory for death in 2018.

Some who now receive money from Soros have turned to violence to further their cause. Two years ago, mobs took to the streets to smash statues of American icons. A favorite target of these saboteurs were statues of Father Junípero Serra (later made a saint), the 18th century priest who pioneered the rights of Indians.

One of the most prominent persons to justify the violence was Morning Star Gali, an American Indian. Her command of history was so bad she couldn’t distinguish between Spanish colonizers who mistreated Indians, and heroes like Serra who championed their cause. Who funded her? Soros, of course.

In January, Catholics for Choice vandalized the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C. At a prayer vigil that was held there before the March for Life, the Soros-funded entity desecrated the Basilica by using light-projecting technology to post anti-Catholic messages on it.

If there are two Soros-operated entities that the Catholic League has fought the most it would be Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United. We don’t engage them anymore—our relentless attacks on them have effectively disabled them.

Both of the two anti-Catholic “Catholic” groups were founded

in 2005, following the defeat of John Kerry the year before. Kerry lost to President George W. Bush in part because of the “values voters,” a bloc of mostly Catholic and evangelical Protestants who stood for traditional values. Soros wasn’t happy with these traditionalists, or the outcome, and sought a corrective by establishing phony Catholic groups to alter the political landscape.

It was a stealth campaign to end all stealth campaigns. There was nothing Catholic about either of these entities, but they gave the impression to the public that one could be a Catholic in good standing and oppose the Church’s teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality. In 2016, they came crashing down.

That is when the Wikileaks revelations became public. Leaked emails showed that John Podesta, Hillary Clinton’s campaign chairman, sought to create mutiny in the Catholic Church by funding Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United. One of Podesta’s associates, Sandy Newman, said there was a need for a “Catholic spring,” and that the goal should be to “plant the seeds of the revolution.” Made possible, of course, with Soros’ money.

There is one other aspect to this story that’s worth mentioning. After Obama was elected in 2008, the IRS contacted me to say that the Catholic League was under investigation for violating IRS strictures for non-profit organizations. After the probe was finally finished, we received a slap on the wrist. I promised the IRS official I would not stop hammering pro-abortion anti-Catholic politicians, and that he should inform his superiors of my pledge.

More important, I told him that I knew who was behind the attempt to destroy me. Just before the 2008 election, a CNN staffer sent me copies of a long document detailing news releases I had sent that allegedly violated IRS rules. She did this because the person who sent it to her tried to get me

kicked off TV; he sent the document to validate his request.

When the IRS complaint was sent to me before Thanksgiving in 2008, I quickly concluded that it looked amazingly like the document forwarded to me by the CNN employee. It was sent to her by Catholics United.

In other words, Soros was behind the attempt to silence the Catholic League. He lost. It's too bad he hasn't lost more often—his legacy of hate has done much harm.

PELOSI HAS BEEN BEGGING FOR A CONFRONTATION

Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi, who has been told by her bishop, San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone, not to present herself for Holy Communion, has been begging for a confrontation with him for many years. Now she has succeeded.

Less than two years after Cordileone was installed as the new archbishop in 2012, Pelosi, who was House Minority Leader at the time, “took the lead,” according to the San Francisco Chronicle, “in a high-profile lobbying effort to pressure San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone not to attend the controversial March for Marriage event....”

The March for Marriage was held to promote the idea of marriage, properly understood: in other words, as the exclusive union between a man and a woman. This bothered Pelosi immensely, which is why she went public with her dissenting position. She has never stopped egging her bishop on since that time.

Americans of any religion, or none at all, would understand if an imam, minister or rabbi publicly called out a politician who claims to be of his faith for misrepresenting it. They would find it bizarre if the wayward politician called him out. This is exactly how the Pelosi feud with Cordileone began—she started publicly lecturing him, not vice versa.

Cordileone's letter to Pelosi, instructing her not to go to Communion, was not some impulsive act. He has tried to deal with her for many years, trying to bring her back into the fold, but she resists.

At what point does a prominent Catholic lawmaker who promotes the killing of unborn babies—for any reason and at any time of pregnancy—merit sanctions by her Catholic superior? That Pelosi defends her support for abortion-on-demand as the decision of a self-described “devout Catholic” makes her offense all the more hideous.

Worse, by publicly defending what the Church says is “intrinsically evil,” she is giving scandal to the Church. To be specific, she is not simply guilty of false advertising: She is giving scandal by leading Catholics to think that they can be pro-abortion and a Catholic in good standing at the same time.

It is rather amusing to read what non-Catholics have to say about this issue. To begin with, it is none of their business. To be sure, it is their business to be for or against the Church's teaching on abortion—that is a public policy matter—it is not their business to weigh in on the internal strictures of Catholicism, or any other religion.

The reverse is also true. We would not expect Archbishop Cordileone to tell the San Francisco Examiner how to handle their personnel matters. We would also not expect this newspaper to tell him how to deal with Pelosi. But they couldn't resist doing so.

The Examiner has called on Pope Francis not to discipline Pelosi—"she reflects the true spirit of Christian care"—but to remove Cordileone. They want the archbishop canned.

As it turns out, nothing Cordileone said violated anything the pope has said about this issue. While the pope has said bishops should not politicize these controversies, he has also said they had a right to address these matters in a pastoral way.

Indeed, he explicitly said last year that Catholic politicians who publicly support abortion are "outside the community." "These people who are not in the community cannot take communion, because they are out of the community. It is not a punishment: Communion is linked to the community."

What Pope Francis said on the papal plane on Sept. 15, 2021 is not in dispute. "Then, those who are not in the community, cannot receive communion: Excommunicated, it's a harsh word, but they don't belong in the community, because they were not baptized, *or because they are estranged from it* (our italics)." He then added that abortion is "more than a problem: It's a homicide. No middle terms. Whomever does an abortion, kills." It doesn't get much plainer than that.

Ever since Cordileone became the leader of the Catholic Church in San Francisco, the local libertine-minded media have had their sights set on him. That's because he was a leader in the Proposition 8 movement trying to secure marriage as the exclusive union between a man and a woman. So their latest salvos are hardly surprising.

Over the past decade, Archbishop Cordileone has demonstrated great prudence and patience in dealing with Pelosi. He is a man of courage and goodwill, and a loyal son of the Catholic Church.

PELOSI IS AT WAR WITH THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

After House Speaker Nancy Pelosi proved to be insubordinate, continuously rebuffing her bishop, San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone, she was told not to present herself for Communion. On May 24, she went on MSNBC to say that not only is the archbishop wrong, the entire Church is wrong. She said the Church is wrong about abortion, gay and transgender issues, contraception and in vitro fertilization.

There is not a single Church teaching on women, marriage, the family or sexuality that Pelosi accepts, so out of touch is she with the Catholic Church. There are atheists who agree more with the Church on these issues than she does.

To top it off, she has the audacity to say that she is against imposing her views on others.

Yet she tried to force her pro-abortion views down the throats of the Little Sisters of the Poor, mandating that they pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plans. She is a strong proponent of the Equality Act and other measures that would impose her radical pro-abortion views on Catholic doctors and hospitals. She would also coerce Catholic doctors to perform immoral surgeries against their will.

Pelosi is at war with the Catholic Church.