

SAMANTHA BEE'S OBSCENE LEGACY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the end of Samantha Bee's TV show:

TBS is pushing Samantha Bee to the curb, which is not a strange place for someone who has spent her entire professional life in the gutter. After seven seasons, "Full Frontal" will not return in the fall.

Bee is one of the most filthy-mouthed entertainers in American history. She is also a relentless anti-Catholic bigot.

In 2018, she showed how low she can go when she called Ivanka Trump the "c-word." After being blasted by critics, which did not include the National Organization for Women or the Feminist Majority, she issued an apology. "I crossed the line and I do apologize for that." She added that "A lot of women do not want to reclaim that word. They want it gone and I don't blame them."

A few nights later, she said that while she will refrain from using the "c-word," she admitted that it was her goal to "reclaim" it. As I said at the time, "Why would she want to normalize a word that if used to describe her own mother she would recoil?"

When this episode happened, Ben Weiss, an opinion writer for the New York Times, defended Bee and TBS. "TBS hired Sam Bee to be...Sam Bee. She's an edgy late-night comic. That's what she does."

Weiss is correct, though his observation is incomplete. Bee was chosen because she is a filthy-mouthed, anti-Catholic bigot. That's what she does.

Proof that Weiss is correct can be gleaned by considering her "comedic" content prior to starting her TBS show in 2016.

In 2010, she told NPR that she went to a Catholic school, even though her father is an atheist and her mother practices Wicca. She boasted that in her school, we “didn’t have big gory Jesuses everywhere...couldn’t see the blood dripping from the wounds.” When asked why she likes to mock Catholicism, she answered, “That is pure pleasure for me.”

In 2013, she talked about cardinals assembling in Rome to elect a new pope. She called the gathering a “grope,” likening it to “molestation,” saying the process was not complete until the cardinals reached “fellatio,” or an “oral consensus” culminating in “white smoke rising from the chimney.”

Three years later, she obscenely attacked an archbishop who had raised concerns about the pro-abortion ties of the Girl Scouts. She replied, “if you don’t want girls knocked up, and you won’t let them have contraception, you better teach the Boy Scouts to use some of those fancy knots on their “d***.”

In October 2016, on her new TBS show, Bee took aim at Catholic healthcare policies, as defined by the bishops. She said these “decisions affecting millions of American vaginas are being made by people who have never owned one or touched one.” After showing a robed Catholic priest explaining healthcare directives, she said, “Thanks, Friar Suck. When I need reproductive advice from a virgin in a bathrobe, I’ll let you know.”

Many more examples could be provided. In 2017, she defended legislation that discriminated against the Catholic Church in New York by exclusively holding it accountable for alleged sexual abuse offenses, giving a free pass to the public schools. When I objected, she made me the object of her condemnations.

In 2018, I started a campaign to get sponsors of her show to stop advertising on it. It worked. By providing the email addresses of her most prominent sponsors to our members, and

our list of email subscribers, we were able to pick off seven sponsors: Verizon, Proctor & Gamble, Wendy's, Ashley HomeStore, The Wonderful Company (maker of pistachios), Popeyes, and Burger King.

TBS and Bee got the message and she stopped bashing Catholics.

Really talented comedians don't have to descend to the gutter to make people laugh. Bee does. That's because she's not capable of rising above it.

Contact TBS director of publicity:
Shannon.Kerr@warnermedia.com

DISSIDENTS ARE “ASTONISHED” BY VATICAN EDICT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on reaction to the Vatican statement on German Catholic leaders:

In 2019, Pope Francis formally announced that the “Synodal Way” had begun. He called for a forum whereby the clergy and laity would weigh several issues facing the Church that need to be discussed, leading possibly to some reforms. From the beginning, Catholic dissidents seized the moment to promote their agenda, and nowhere was this more evident than in Germany.

Now the Vatican has stepped in warning the Germans that they need to tap their brakes. In a letter released by the Holy See on July 21, it was said that the German “Synodal Way” was guilty of overreach, maintaining it “does not have the power to compel bishops and the faithful to adopt new forms of

governance and new orientations to doctrine and morals.”

Moreover, it said no reforms could be countenanced “before an agreement had been reached at the level of the universal Church,” for if that were to happen it “would constitute a violation of ecclesial communion and a threat to the unity of the Church.”

The admonition could not be more clear: the German bishops have jumped the line. They immediately said they were “astonished” by the rebuke. They shouldn’t have been.

In April, more than 100 cardinals and bishops from around the world issued a “fraternal open letter” to the German bishops, sounding the alarms. They even went so far as to say that their radical reforms carry “the potential for schism.” They did not exaggerate.

Predictably, American Catholic dissidents such as Fordham’s David Gibson said the letter was “rather astonishing.” Their capacity for astonishment appears to be endless.

Even before these cardinals and bishops sounded off, Pope Francis expressed his concerns. In 2019, he wrote to the German bishops warning them not to seek autonomy—we are one Church. Cardinal Walter Kasper, a prominent liberal German leader, also expressed his misgivings with the radical agenda that was unfolding.

In this country, Denver Archbishop Samuel Aquila, noting what the German bishops were up to, released a 15-page letter in 2021 stating similar concerns; it was signed by many cardinals and bishops.

What was that agenda? Gay couples have had their “unions” blessed in defiance of the Vatican. Importantly, votes have already taken place saying gay marriage is not sinful, thus declaring homosexuality in “marriage” to be licit. They also want to do away with mandatory celibacy and allow for married

priests. Essentially, the Germans are seeking to Protestantize the Catholic Church.

The dissidents want more. Their focus is fourfold: a change in the Church's teaching on homosexuality, the ordination of women, allowing for married priests, and more input from the laity.

Homosexuality is at the top of the list. Marc Frings is the secretary-general of the Central Committee of German Catholics. He is quite open in declaring the "Synodal Way" to be "a conscious statement against the current Catholic catechism." He wants nothing less than a wholesale welcoming of gay marriage and homosexuality.

What is most perverse about this agenda is that the reforms are being touted as a way of addressing clergy sexual abuse. As I detailed in [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#), it is impossible to understand the scandal without giving due recognition to the critical role that homosexual priests played in generating it. To think that the corrective is to legitimize homosexuality is more than preposterous—it is suicidal.

The next synod assembly is in September; it is expected to end next March. The Holy Father has his work cut out for himself. When calls for prudential reforms are interpreted as demands for a revolution, the extremists cannot be allowed to prevail. They have already done much damage to the Catholic Church.

Catholic League Forum: The

Ruling Class' Credibility?

In this special episode of Catholic League Forum Catholic League president Bill Donohue and director of communications Mike McDonald give an update on some of the issues the League has been addressing throughout the month of July. In particular they highlight the role the ruling class has played in the spread of the monkeypox disease, the dismantling of human rights, and the corruption of higher education. To watch click [here](#).

World Health Organization Trashes Science of Biology: 'Sex Not Limited to Male or Female'

Bill in the news (The Star News):

Catholic League president Bill Donohue sounds off on changes at the World Health Organization. [READ MORE HERE](#)

IN DENIAL OVER GAY-DRIVEN

MONKEYPOX

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on reaction to monkeypox:

“Monkeypox can be exceptionally painful,” says Patrick Ashley, senior deputy director at the D.C. Department of Health, “especially if there are lesions on the penis, a lot of penile swelling, on the anus as well, it can be significantly painful.”

Now we all know who is the most likely to have these kinds of problems. They used to be called homosexuals, then they were called gay. Now they are often known as men having sex with men (as if this is not what defines homosexual behavior).

The D.C. Department of Health confirms our suspicion. So who is listed on its website as the most likely to get monkeypox? “Gay, bisexual, and other men 18 and older who have sex with men and have had multiple or anonymous sexual partners in the last 14 days; or transgender women [e.g. males who think they are a woman] and nonbinary persons assigned male at birth who have sex with men; or sex workers [prostitutes] of any sex; or staff (of any sex) at establishments where sexual activity occurs (e.g., bathhouses, saunas, sex clubs).”

In other words, promiscuous gay men are the problem.

This is not a generalization. While all health officials and gay activists will insist that everyone is at risk, they know full well that this is a gay-driven disease.

ABC News reports that in Britain, monkeypox is spreading in “defined sexual networks of gay, bisexual, or men who have sex with men.” The reporter adds, “Officials said there were no signs suggesting sustained spread beyond those populations.”

NBC News reports that “To date, more than 99 percent of

monkeypox cases in Britain are among men, and the majority of those are in men who are gay, bisexual or who have sex with men.”

California state senator Scott Wiener, who is a homosexual, is angry about the news. “What’s most frustrating about this whole situation is that it is completely and utterly avoidable, and it’s impacting the queer community in a very significant way.”

He’s right, but not for the reasons he gives. The San Francisco Democrat is blaming government for not doing enough to combat monkeypox. He should instead hold those accountable for unnecessarily spreading the disease. There are many others like him, and they include healthcare officials and gay activists.

Charles King is a gay activist who has worked with AIDS patients. “Telling people not to have sex or not to have multiple sex partners or not to have anonymous sex is just a no-go, and it’s not going to work. People are still going to have sex, and they’re going to have it even if it comes with great risk.”

He’s right. You may as well talk to the wall. Gays who practice dangerous sexual acts, and who have multiple sex partners—with men they never met before—are impervious to reason. They will stop at nothing. For them, the pain and suffering that they endure is worth the risk. That they may spread their disease to innocent unsuspecting persons seems not to matter.

After AIDS was discovered in 1981, those who demanded that the bathhouses remain open—even though they were a popular venue for the spread of HIV—were not gay bashers. They were gay activists.

In the 1980s, Bruce Mailman was the owner of the four-story St. Mark’s Bath in the East Village. He said people like New

York City Mayor Ed Koch, who called bathhouse owners “merchants of death,” were demonstrating “a regrettable lack of sensitivity to our constitutional rights,” rights that included “the right of individuals to associate freely, to practice private sex and to operate a lawful business.” [The Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia University is named after him, even though he proved to be an existential threat to the health of all New Yorkers, especially gays.]

Jim Downs recently wrote a piece in *The Atlantic* lamenting the closing of bathhouses in the 1980s; he now opposes calls for restraint among gays. “When public-health authorities shut down bathhouses during the early days of HIV, many gay people saw the closures as a violation of their governing liberation.” He’s right—many gays, then as well as now, define freedom in terms of genital liberation.

Downs goes further today, heralding bathhouses as a plus for public health. “Rather than treating bathhouses, clubs, and dance parties exclusively as spreaders of infectious diseases, they should be recognized as potential promoters of sexual health.”

The combination of narcissism and suicidal thinking is stunning. It proves, once again, that it is not the public that gays need to fear—it is the advocates in their own community. Their advice is deadly.

THE GALL OF WORLD HEALTH OFFICIALS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on officials at the World Health Organization:

The World Health Organization (WHO) has released its updated manual on Gender Mainstreaming for Health Managers. WHO officials boast that they now have “new gender, equity and human rights framework and tools” that will enable them to counter gender discrimination and related issues.

The new features go “beyond non-binary approaches to gender and health to recognize gender and sexual diversity, or the concepts that gender identity exists on a continuum and that sex is not limited to male and female.”

Also included is an expanded statement on “the concept of intersectionality,” or how “gender power dynamics interact with hierarchies of privilege or disadvantage.” Intersecting factors include sex and a host of other demographic characteristics.

There is not a credible person in the entire world who can persuasively tell us what “beyond non-binary” means. From the beginning of time, the only humans who have ever walked the face of the earth have been males and females. Similarly, contrary to what WHO says, sex is in fact limited to male and female.

While these issues are important, what really gets WHO into trouble is its commitment to gender equity and a new “human rights framework.” [Click [here](#) to read our report.]

Currently there are 33 members on the Executive Board of WHO (one, the U.S. seat, is currently unfilled). Of this number, 28 are men and 5 are women; there are no “non-binary” creatures on the board. If this passes as gender equity, then the rest of the world gets a pass as well. If it doesn’t, then most of the men need to resign immediately.

WHO’s purported commitment to human rights is particularly galling.

We checked the latest U.S. State Department “Country Reports

on Human Rights Violations” and found that only 6 of the 33 members come from nations where there are no serious human rights violations (Canada, Denmark, Slovenia, United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, Micronesia and Japan). Torture is ongoing in 15 of the nations, and genocide is being waged in China.

Which raises the question: On what moral authority does the WHO executive board rest? To put it a little more straightforward—what gives these misogynists and human rights offenders the right to lecture anyone?

One more thing. Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus is the Director-General of WHO. He was elected by secret ballot in May 2022, after being proposed as a candidate in January 2022. But there was no need for a secret ballot—it was a total sham. Guess who ran against him? No one.

So much for equity and diversity. WHO’s credibility is totally shot.

Contact: Christian Lindmeier, WHO spokesman:
lindmeierch@who.int

Catholic League: Black Leadership Sides with White Supremacists over Abortion

Bill in the news (Breitbart):

Catholic League president Bill Donohue decries “the worrisome trend of black Congresswomen siding with white supremacists in pushing abortion for blacks.” [READ MORE HERE](#)

BLUE STATES' IDEA OF PARENTAL CONSENT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how parental consent laws differ across the country:

There are laws in all 50 states and the District of Columbia on parental consent as they affect [abortion](#), [marriage](#), [routine medical care](#), [body piercing and tattoos](#) and [indoor tanning](#). Just click on the links to access the information.

While there is not unanimity within the blue states (Democrat) or the red states (Republican) on these issues, when it comes to the blue states, there is an inverse relationship between the seriousness of the issue and support for parental consent laws. In other words, the blue states are the most likely to oppose parental consent laws on the most serious issues (e.g., abortion) while insisting on it for the least serious ones (e.g. indoor tanning).

Here are some of the most important takeaways from the data.

No state stands out as the most inconsistent than California. When it comes to abortion, there are no parental consent requirements at all, but there is a total ban on indoor tanning for those under the age of 18, and tattoos are illegal.

There is no age limit to marriage in California—pre-K kids qualify (with the consent of mommy and daddy)—and 15-year-olds can access medical care without parental consent (with the proviso that they are living apart from their parents and are managing their own financial affairs).

The runner-ups are Connecticut, D.C., Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Vermont and Washington. They all require no parental consent for abortion but are very strict when it comes to body piercing, tattoos and indoor tanning.

The data offer a birds-eye peak into the mind of liberals.

Indoor tanning is considered a more serious issue—it is either outlawed or demands parental consent—than abortion, which requires no parental consent. Why? Nothing matters more to liberals than sex, and anything that can impair their health cries out for government control (which is why they love masks). After all, good sex is conditioned on good health.

Pity the kids in blue states. When parental involvement is most needed, they are left on their own. But not really. It would be more accurate to say they are left to follow the dictates of adults who are not their parents, and who have an agenda of their own.

USCCB DID NOT CHANGE POLICY ON GAY ADOPTION

Catholic League president Bill Donohue explains why the USCCB did not change its policy on foster parents:

When it comes to assessing the human dignity of a person, the Catholic Church regards one's sexual orientation to be irrelevant: homosexuals and heterosexuals are equal in the eyes of God and the Catholic Church. When it comes to assessing the propriety of marital relationships, the Church is opposed to adultery, polygamy and same-sex marriages.

These distinctions are important to note, especially in light of a recent case involving a lesbian who sought to adopt a child through a sub-grantee of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB).

The best way to understand this case is to see how it unfolded.

In August 2020, a lesbian woman, Kelly Easter, inquired about a foster care program posted on the website of the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR). Less than a month later, she was told that her contact information was being sent to the USCCB. The USCCB affiliate in her area of East Nashville, Tennessee is Bethany Christian Services, an evangelical entity that shares the Catholic Church's teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality.

After some email exchanges with Bethany, Easter found that it does not permit gays and lesbians to be foster parents. She learned shortly after September 21, 2020 that she could not participate in the ORR's unaccompanied-minor programs because she is a lesbian. Bethany said it was bound by USCCB rules.

On January 22, 2021 (which just happened to be the 49th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*), Easter told ORR that she is being discriminated against because she is a lesbian. On February 9, she was told ORR was "looking into this."

On March 1, the New York Times ran a story saying Bethany has changed its policy and no longer excludes lesbian and gay individuals from participating in its foster care programs. On April 26, Easter was informed that Bethany was finalizing contracts for a new location for their program.

On June 24, Easter was told by Bethany that it had signed a contract with Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service that would allow her to become a foster parent.

This should have been the end of the case, but it wasn't.

In August, Easter said she would not participate in the Bethany program because the Lutheran office that accepted her case was not in her home town of East Nashville; it was a half hour away in Smyrna.

On October 13, Easter filed a federal lawsuit against the Department of Health and Human Services and other administrative agencies for allowing the USCCB to discriminate against her because she is a lesbian.

Easter has now dropped her case, and that is because in February 2022 the USCCB said there was a misunderstanding about this case: it is not opposed to a single parent adopting a child, drawing no distinction based on sexual orientation.

In other words, the USCCB, following the teachings of the Catholic Church, rejects homosexual couples from adopting a child. Homosexual individuals who are not in a marital relationship cannot be judged to having violated Church teachings on sexuality anymore than a single heterosexual individual would be who sought to adopt a child.

It is *behavior* that the Church objects to, not the status of a person.

William Canny, the USCCB's director of immigration and refugee services, explained, "In reality, neither the USCCB's religious beliefs nor its subgrant agreement with BCS (Bethany Christian Services) bars a single person with a homosexual orientation from serving as a foster parent by virtue of his or her orientation."

Lest there be any doubt about the position of the bishops on this subject, recall that on June 17, 2021, the U.S. Supreme Court sided with Catholic Social Services in *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia* saying that Catholic foster care agencies can reject gay *couples* from adopting children. The USCCB filed an amicus brief in that case.

The day after the decision was made, three chairmen of the USCCB issued a statement saying, "This is a victory for the common good and for thousands of children who rely on religious foster care and adoption agencies to find a loving home with a mother and father which is their right."

Those who reject the Church's teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality, such as New Ways Ministry, have no reason to raise the flag over this case. The Church is not changing its position on marriage and foster care arrangements.

PAYING FOR WORKERS' ABORTIONS IS A MINEFIELD

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on companies that will pay the travel expenses for an employee's abortion:

In light of some states electing to pass restrictive abortion legislation, woke corporations, and that includes dozens of the most powerful companies in the nation, have said they will pay the travel expenses for an employee's abortion. To see a list of some of the most prominent ones, and what they will cover, click [here](#).

The ruling class, which has lined up in jackboot fashion behind the left-wing agenda, is very proud of its virtue signaling. They will soon change their tune once they are faced with the realities of their decision. Make no mistake, they have created an ethical and legal minefield for themselves.

On the ethical front, how do these companies explain their

total lack of interest in paying women to access adoption services? If they are truly pro-choice, why is this option not being funded?

Peter Rex is founder and CEO of Rex, a Florida-based entity that builds and invests in tech companies. He, along with the Texas-based insurance company, Buffer, is paying for adoptions, “as well as covering the full costs of birth for employees who keep their children.” He chides the woke companies. “These businesses are ignoring the possibility that many employees may simply need a little more help to carry their baby to term.”

Rex is putting his money where his mouth is, saying that “my business has decided to give up to \$7,500 to employees who want to have their baby and give it up for adoption.” But adoption is not something that moves the ruling class the way aborting children does.

Some of these companies are in a race to show how courageously woke they are. For example, of the 101 companies we list, 11 also offer to pay for “gender-affirming care” (they are highlighted). Patagonia is even offering to pay for the “Training and bail for those who peacefully protest for reproductive justice.”

How this is going to play out legally remains to be seen.

Peter Bamberger, a business professor at Tel Aviv University, sees lots of problems on the horizon. “Even before dealing with the bigger issues—reputational harm, political retribution and exposure to legal liability—associated with using employee benefits to help employees access abortion services, employers are going to have to be prepared to face off against a byzantine mix of bureaucratic, legal and tax challenges.”

The minefield is actually worse than what he describes.

Will workers sue for discrimination saying their decision to explore adoption services are not being funded? What if those who “transition” to the other sex decide they want to detransition, citing mental health issues? If pro-abortion protesters who are locked up are entitled to bail benefits, how can pro-life protesters be treated any differently?

If an employee wants to travel to another state to obtain an abortion, how can she protect her privacy interests? How can the company insure that her co-workers won't find out? Will her boss know the reason for her absence?

How will the company know she is really pregnant, and not just seeking to get a vacation on their dime? Will they demand she submit to a pregnancy test? Will she be entitled to “loss of pregnancy” benefits (Vox Media does) if she is depressed after her abortion? Can part-time workers get this benefit?

Will a Texas man who claims to be a woman be given money to travel to his hometown in New York for his abortion? Or will he be denied funding on the basis that a man can't get pregnant and therefore cannot have an abortion? What a sweet lawsuit that would be.

This is hardly an exaggeration. In 2020, the Association of LGBTQ Journalists awarded Samantha Schmidt an Excellence in Journalism award for her 2019 story in the Washington Post. The online title of her piece was, “A Mother, But Not a Woman.” The man she wrote about insisted on being called “they.”

Companies should stay out of politics and just attend to business, providing for basic healthcare services. But if they insist on doing otherwise, workers should demand what Impossible Foods says it will cover: in addition to travel, it pays for lodging, meals and child care for employees who travel out of state to get their abortion. Employees should not settle for fast food—go to the best steakhouse in town and

enjoy a fine bottle of wine.

One final piece of advice. After the worker has enjoyed her stay she should go home and tell her boss she met a pro-life activist who convinced her not to kill her kid. If the company demands to be reimbursed, she should sue them for violating her pro-choice rights.