

RUSSELL SHAW R.I.P.

Russell Shaw, a prolific Catholic spokesman and author, has died at the age of 90. He was the former Secretary for Public Affairs of the National Catholic Bishops/United States Catholic Conference.

Last year he told Bill Donohue he was not doing well, and asked if he would still promote his latest book, *Turning Points: How Thirteen Remarkable Men and Women Heard God's Call and Responded to It*. He was delighted to endorse it.

Russ served on the board of directors of the Catholic League in the 1990s, and then moved to our board of advisors. Donohue used to joke with him that he is a "walking encyclopedia of Catholicism." It wasn't much of a stretch.

Russ had a reserved manner, but it belied a fierce devotion to his calling, namely to accurately and passionately discuss the affairs of the Catholic Church, past and present. His commitment to the mission of the Catholic League—fighting anti-Catholicism—was never in question.

When the notorious ABC-TV show, "Nothing Sacred," aired in the late 1990s, some on our board of directors questioned whether we should be hammering away at it. Not Russ. He stood by Donohue's side, knowing how pernicious this dissident-happy portrait of Catholicism was. ABC, a Disney product, tried to stop our attacks on the show, but did not prevail. We eventually won and the show was withdrawn.

Russ will be missed. His legacy is secure and the Catholic Church is its beneficiary.

NORMALIZING OBSCENITIES

A Catholic League staffer was recently having dinner with friends at a New York steakhouse when she witnessed a table of several mature women talking loudly, some of whom were throwing around the “f-word” with abandon.

It used to be that such language would be heard in pubs, but not in pricey restaurants, much less by women in their senior years. But times have changed. The dumbing down of language, just like the dumbing down of virtually every other standard of decency, has become the norm. President Trump, and Biden before him, have certainly made their contributions to this end.

We can blame the entertainment industry and the media for normalizing obscenities. Movies have long featured expletives, but now TV shows and the mainstream media are following suit.

Recently, I was reading a news story in the *New York Times* on the anti-ICE protest in Minneapolis. It quoted the Minneapolis mayor, Jacob Frey, saying the government’s position was “bull – – -,” I have been reading this newspaper for decades, and I honestly don’t recall reading this word spelled out in a news article before. Then I read the next sentence. It quoted Frey telling ICE to “get the f–out of Minneapolis”; the obscene word was printed in full.

The next night, I heard Fox News host Greg Gutfeld complaining how insincere the anti-ICE protesters are about the welfare of illegal aliens. He said, “they don’t give two s–s about these people.” He was not censored. The show airs at a time when children watch TV. And this is not the first time Fox has lowered its standards.

Then I read an op-ed by John McWhorter, a linguist who teaches at Columbia University, in the *New York Times*. He was celebrating the increased use in public of the “f-word.” He

said, "I actually think it's a positive development." He opined, "The normalization of the word...is a sign of maturity in American English." Ironically, he chose not to spell it, instead referring to it as the "f-word." He concluded saying he was "happy" that we are "getting to the point where we can all speak the way we think and live."

What about the "n-word"? Would McWhorter, who is black (I happen to admire his work on race), celebrate its invocation on TV and in newspapers? If not, why not? Why wouldn't it be a sign of maturity?

A number of years ago on CNN I was objecting to the display of some obscene artistic display when the host smugly chided me for not respecting free speech, the way the cable channel does. I immediately challenged him, saying they would not allow me to say the "n-word" on TV, only I actually said the word. I smiled, but he didn't, when they – rightfully – censored me. "See," I said.

We decided to find out how some of the big media have been handling this issue. We looked at AP (Associated Press), the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. They all have a "Standards" or "Stylebook" section that addresses this issue. While they generally don't print obscenities, they make exceptions. What is crystal clear is that in recent times all three are more likely to spell out the "f-word" than the "n-word."

Why are liberal elites more likely to find the "n-word" offensive than the "f-word"? They certainly don't object when blacks call each other the "n-word"; it is done in song all the time.

Good parents and teachers should teach their children how offensive both words are. Unfortunately, fewer appear to be doing so, and one reason why is because the frequent invocation of these words in public has a way of sanitizing

them. We are more upset about a high school football team adopting a Native American tribal name as its mascot than we are mature women screaming the “f-word” in a public establishment. Moreover, calling a team the “Indians” is seen as hate speech, but telling those who object to “f-” off is okay.

Why should this matter? Every survey in this century on the subject of civility and the moral order shows that Americans – across all demographics – are genuinely concerned about what has been happening. Things are going south. When people treat linguistic offenses like pedestrian commentary, they are letting their guard down. By itself such a phenomenon will not change our cultural landscape, when it is coupled with other attempts to normalize deviancy, it certainly does.

In the 1990s, Daniel Patrick Moynihan warned that “we have been redefining deviancy so as to exempt much conduct previously stigmatized, and also quietly raising the ‘normal’ level in categories where behavior is not abnormal by any earlier standard.” Agreeing with him in his *American Educator* article, “Defining Deviancy Down,” was John Cole. As an example of what Moynihan noted, he said were increased incidents of “profane and abusive language” targeted at teachers by their students. Today, matters are much worse. Cursing out a teacher is defended by some as free speech.

Normalizing obscenities is not worth celebrating. It only increases the coarseness that has engulfed our society.

JUSTIFYING THE CHURCH INVASIO

N

Prominent Politicians

Minneapolis Mayor Jacob Frey (MN-D)

He called the arrest of those who invaded the church a “gross abuse of power.”

Rep. Ilhan Omar (MN-D)

Omar condemned the arrests tied to the Cities Church protest, calling them a “clear violation of the Constitution.” She demanded that Don Lemon and others be released immediately and described the invaders as “lawful protesters.”

Sen. Chuck Schumer (NY-D)

“Once again, the administration is behaving no differently from the police states and authoritarian regimes across history—they’ve arrested a journalist for the crime of doing his job.” He added, “Don Lemon should be released and the frivolous charges against him dropped.”

Rep. Hakeem Jeffries (NY-D)

“The Trump administration’s arrest of Don Lemon and other journalists is a disgraceful affront to the First Amendment and a corrupt weaponization of the criminal justice system.” He opined, “There is zero basis to arrest Don Lemon.”

Gov. Gavin Newsom (CA-D)

“Putin would be proud.”

Rep. Nancy Pelosi (CA-D)

She said Don Lemon has “become the face of the First Amendment.”

Rep. Jasmine Crockett (TX-D)

“This administration has declared open war on the First Amendment.”

Sen. Chris Van Hollen (MD-D)

He condemned Trump for arresting “journalists for doing their jobs.”

Los Angeles Mayor Karen Bass (CA-D)

She urged her supporters to “register the seriousness of this assault on democracy.”

Rep. Dan Goldman (NY-D)

“Putin’s America is here. I’m confident Don will prevail, but make no mistake: the First Amendment is under its greatest threat since our founding.”

Rep. Katherine Clark (MA-D)

“A journalist was arrested by Trump’s DOJ for doing his job. This is a blatant attack on our First Amendment.”

Rep. Shontel Brown (OH-D)

“Don Lemon’s work is protected by the First Amendment. This arrest is chilling, outrageous, and wrong. He should be released immediately.”

Rep. Ami Bera (CA-D)

“Don Lemon’s work as a journalist is protected by the First Amendment. His arrest is another chilling example of the Trump administration weaponizing the federal government against its critics. Don must be released immediately.”

Sen. Cory Booker (NJ-D)

“Don Lemon has been on the ground in Minnesota like hundreds

of others doing the vital work of covering Trump's lawlessness and chaos. These charges should be dropped and he should be released."

Minnesota Attorney General

Keith Ellison (MN-D)

He described the storming of the church as "First Amendment activity."

Rep. Adelita Grijalva (AZ-D)

She did not find anything appalling about the behavior of the radicals storming the church, arguing "they have the right to go in there," and as far as she is concerned, "churches have always been an open door."

Prominent Organizations

ACLU

"These arrests are the latest in a series of attacks by the Trump Administration on the First Amendment's guarantee of a free press."

Amnesty International

It demanded the release of Don Lemon, calling his arrest "a critical threat to our human rights."

Constitutional Accountability Center

It said this was the latest in the Trump administration's "shocking assaults on the First Amendment."

Freedom From Religion Foundation

The arrest of Lemon represents "a dangerous escalation of government overreach." It also said, "It's also an unconstitutional prioritization of certain pastors and

religious institutions over the civil liberties of citizens.”

GLAAD

“The freedom of the press is a cornerstone of American democracy, but that pillar is being shockingly eroded by government intimidation.”

Legal Defense Fund

It charged the Trump administration with “disdain for free and open press.” It said, “This attempt to suppress and intimidate journalists for reporting on facts and events...is an alarming further descent into authoritarianism.”

NAACP

“The NAACP demands the immediate release of Nekima Armstrong and her fellow protesters. The only reason the FBI and DHS arrested them is that they didn’t like what they had to say.”

PEN America

“The arrest of independent journalist Don Lemon is yet another blatant violation of press freedom and the First Amendment.”

NOTHING IS MORE COUNTERCULTURAL THAN LENT

We live in a world where self-absorption reigns supreme. Accordingly, the concept of self-denial is incomprehensible to most, and an anathema to others. Yet this is what Lent means. It is the most countercultural idea in America, and indeed in the entire Western world. That’s because we’ve lost our

moorings, which are grounded in Christianity.

The dominant culture celebrates self-indulgence, not self-denial. Drug users are only one example.

The streets of New York abound in smoke—the sweet smell of marijuana is everywhere. This is also true in many urban areas, as the pace of legalization quickens. Some, like the editorial board of the *New York Times*, which supported legalization, are now shocked to learn that a record number of Americans are hooked on drugs, jamming hospitals and driving recklessly. Habitual users are psychotic, functioning like zombies. Their non-stop vomiting should be a wake-up call, but it isn't. This is the cost of "liberation."

The dominant culture also celebrates gambling, yielding similar results.

We not only can bet on games, we can bet on each play. Bookies have been replaced by phones, and allegiance to the home team is waning as the only thing that matters is winning. Some ballparks, like the home of the Washington Commanders, even have betting stations for fans too bored to simply watch the game. A growing number of young men are addicted to gambling, finding themselves deeper in debt. This is the cost of "liberation."

Many young women chose sex to satisfy their craving for self-indulgence. If they wind up pregnant, they find their "solution" at a Planned Parenthood clinic. Young promiscuous men are just as irresponsible, looking to medical technology to rid themselves of their self-induced diseases. This is the cost of their "liberation."

Self-denial is admittedly not easy, and it is more difficult in societies that glamorize self-indulgence. But it is a virtue that actually does liberate.

One way to show someone that we love them is by making

sacrifices that redound to their benefit. Making sacrifices requires a degree of self-denial, giving up something to aid someone else. Mother Teresa could not have comforted those in her employ without great sacrifice, and it was her capacity for self-denial that allowed her to prevail.

Like any virtue, self-denial atrophies if it is not practiced, the results of which are inauspicious for everyone. A society that views self-denial as oppressive is nurturing narcissism, not selflessness. Yet that is what we are doing, led, as always, by the ruling class.

Self-indulgence is not only self-destructive, it is ultimately anti-social. We are all affected by those who allow their appetites and passions to conquer them, and that is why it is incumbent on those who occupy mantles of moral authority—clergy, parents and teachers—to welcome Lent, regardless of their religious convictions.

MAMDANI STIFFS CATHOLICS FOR THIRD TIME

Representatives of the clergy from several religions were present at the inauguration of Zohran Mamdani. But no Catholic priest was there.

Representatives of the clergy from several religions were present at Mamdani's Interfaith Breakfast on February 6. But no Catholic priest was there. Significantly, the UJA-Federation of New York, the New York Board of Rabbis and the Anti-Defamation League, all of which had previously sponsored this meeting, declined to do so this year.

The mayor of New York City traditionally attends the installation of the new archbishop of New York, but Mamdani—who was invited—ghosted the event. The installation began a few hours after the Interfaith Breakfast at the New York Public Library; it is a short walk up Fifth Avenue to St. Patrick's Cathedral.

He could easily have been there. Instead, he attended to business as usual.

One in three New Yorkers are Catholic, making them the largest faith community in the city. Mamdani's professed interest in diversity and inclusion obviously hits a brick wall when it comes to Catholics. He wants nothing to do with them.

He is already in trouble with Jewish New Yorkers. He blames Israel, not Hamas, for the terrorist attack on October 7, 2023, and to this day he says Israel has no right to exist. This explains why he wants to cripple the Israeli economy by supporting the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement. To top it off, he is purging his administration of Jews who are pro-Israel, replacing them with Jews who are anti-Israel.

His animus against Catholics is not as clear cut. But given his rabid support for abortion, gay marriage and transgenderism (including the child abuse inherent in sex-reassignment surgery for minors), it makes sense that he wants nothing to do with Catholics either.

Mamdani has been in office for just over a month, and already he is signaling to Catholics that they are not welcome. He is also telling Jews that either they side with him in bashing Israel, or they, too, can take a walk.

This is shaping up to be something serious, the likes of which New Yorkers have never experienced. Stay tuned.

ST. JOHN'S UNIV. REJECTS TURNING POINT

Turning Point USA, founded by Charlie Kirk, has been denied a chapter status at St. John's University. The student government at the Queens, New York campus did not give any reason, requesting that they reapply. But they have already been denied twice, and without cause.

There is reason to believe that a political bias may be in play. Instead of focusing on whether the club was a good fit at St. John's, attention turned to how it would respond to a potential backlash on campus.

St. John's hosts a LGBTQ+ Center, one that is expressly committed to norms and values that are counter to Catholic teachings. Was anyone worried about a potential backlash when it was instituted? The Vincentian school also features a "Lavender Graduation," which not only sanctions segregation on campus, it gives succor to students who reject Catholic moral teachings.

Charlie Kirk was an advocate for civil discourse on campus. That was his trademark. Why any school, especially a Catholic one, would find fault with that boggles the mind. St. John's idea of inclusion clearly extends to the LGBTQ cause, but not the cause of free speech.

ROGUE CATHOLIC SHOWN THE GATE

At 9:57 a.m. on February 11, we called for the ouster of Carrie Prejean Boller from President Trump's Religious Liberty Commission. At 10:03 a.m., the chairman of the panel, Dan Patrick, announced she was booted.

What triggered her ouster were her remarks she made on February 9. She told her fellow panelists and the audience that "Catholics do not embrace Zionism, just so you know." She objected to definitions of anti-Semitism that equated opposition to the state of Israel as an expression of anti-Semitism.

It is not a stretch to say that those who are *activists for the anti-Zionist cause* invariably harbor an animus against Jews. And yes, this would include self-hating Jews.

Prejean Boller is a former Miss California and a convert to Catholicism. She does not run a Catholic organization, has no Catholic credentials as an author or instructor, and indeed represents no one but herself. For her to say, without qualification, that "Catholics do not embrace Zionism," is presumptuous and arrogant.

In reply to Prejean Boller, fellow panelist Rabbi Meir Soloveichik said, "This is an incredibly diverse country, and the one thing we should be careful about is speaking on behalf of all members of a religious community, even if one is a member of that religious community. I certainly wouldn't claim to speak for all Jews on all subjects."

He was too kind. Her audacity is stunning. Bill Donohue told the media that he has been running the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization for over three decades, and never once has he said that he represents all Catholics. He always says he represents the Catholic League, period. Hopefully, he says, he also represents many others who share

his convictions.

Zionism is a movement that promotes Jewish self-determination in a homeland. There are millions of Catholics who, even if they do not identify themselves as Zionists, recognize the Jewish state of Israel. Prejean Boller apparently does not—she is more comfortable showing up at the Religious Liberty Commission wearing a Palestinian flag pin. So telling.

Prejean Boller asked a witness if we should censor 1 Thessalonians 2:15; it spoke about Jews who killed Christ. No, but that passage, like many biblical passages, needs to be put alongside other biblical references, as well as the teachings of the Catholic Church. Moreover, the quote she cited mentions, “The Jews who killed both the Lord Jesus and their own prophets.” It does not say “the Jews killed Christ.”

English warriors killed Catholics in Ireland, but no one blames all the English. Indian tribes killed each other, but no one says all Indians are killers. Rapists are typically men who rape women, but not all men are rapists. Careful scholars recognize these differences—they are not nuances. Prejean is not careful and she is certainly not a scholar.

Donohue’s good friend Ed Koch, the former mayor of New York, noted, “It should never be said that Christians were responsible for the Holocaust—Nazis were. Blaming Christians would be as unjustified as holding Jews accountable for the death of Jesus.” Well said.

Just before it was announced that Prejean was shown the gate, here is what we said.

“The Religious Liberty Commission should have nothing to do with those who are publicly undermining its mission, nor should it become a platform for those who want to exploit it as a vehicle to further their own agenda. Trump should kick Carrie Prejean Boller off immediately.”

Kudos to Dan Patrick for doing just that.

CAN BOYS CRASH GIRLS' SPORTS?

The U.S. Supreme Court heard oral arguments in January on whether boys can compete in girls' sports. The very idea that this has to occupy the time of the high court is testimony to the sexual confusion that is widespread not only in America, but in western civilization; the rest of the world is a lot smarter. Adding to the confusion is the Supreme Court itself.

In 2020, Justice Neil Gorsuch wrote the majority opinion in *Bostock v. Clayton County*. He held that Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits employees from being fired on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, even though the law only addressed sex. "An individual's homosexuality or transgender status is not relevant to employment decisions," he said.

Justice Samuel Alito wrote a dissent in *Bostock*, joined by Justice Clarence Thomas. He did not take kindly to Gorsuch's dismissive comments. "The Court's brusque refusal to consider the consequences of its reasoning is irresponsible." Indeed, he said, "Before issuing today's radical decision, the Court should have given some thought to where its decision would lead." He got specific.

"The Court may wish to avoid this subject, but it is a matter of concern to many people who are reticent about disrobing or using toilet facilities in the presence of individuals whom they regard as members of the opposite sex. For some, this may simply be a question of modesty, but for others, there is more at stake. For women who have been victimized by sexual assault or abuse, the experience of seeing an unclothed person with

the anatomy of a male in a confined and sensitive location such as a bathroom or locker room can cause serious psychological harm.”

Again, the fact that such a commonsensical understanding of human nature has to be articulated before the United States Supreme Court shows how ideologically corrupt we have become. It is not the ordinary American who is the problem—it is elite decision makers.

CHRISTIANITY IN THE CROSSHAIRS

Bill Donohue

Bill Donohue, *Christianity in the Crosshairs: Ruling Class and Radicals Find a Common Enemy* (TAN Books, 2026)

The average Joe spends his time at work, and with his family and friends. He may vote, but politics is not his passion. He basically wants to be left alone. But the ruling class—the decision makers who run our institutions—won’t let him. They are interested in getting him to do what they think is in his best interest. They don’t need to consult him, and that is because they know better.

Radical intellectuals and activists are just as arrogant, and just as intrusive. They entertain grandiose plans about socially engineering society, and they have all sets of plans on how to steer the average Joe. Just like the ruling class, they feel confident in making decisions for him.

What unites the ruling class and radicals is power. They lust

for it. Why? Their goal is to control the average Joe, getting him to dance to their every beat. But he is not easy to control, and that is because his primary allegiances are to his family and religion. If they can pry him away from the grip of his family and religion, there is a good chance he will find a sense of community with them. Then they can proceed to implement their vision of the good society.

Standing in their way, more than any other factor, is the Catholic Church. It is committed to the family and traditional moral values. It is not alone in doing so, but it is the big fish: if it can be weakened, other traditional institutions will follow suit.

It used to be that the ruling class and radicals stood in opposition to each other, but something new has been happening. There has been an alignment of large sectors of the ruling class and radicals. They may still clash, but more often than not they have joined hands. There is one big wrinkle—the success of Donald Trump. It is clear that he has punctured the ruling class bubble (which explains why many hate him). But there are still large sectors of elite decision makers who have broken bread with radical thinkers and activists. They have Christianity in the crosshairs.

The ruling class has almost nothing in common with the average Joe. They are wealthy, well educated and are mostly secularists who devalue, if not disparage, Christianity. President Ronald Reagan knew them well. In a famous speech he gave branding the Soviet Union the “evil empire,” he quoted from C.S. Lewis’s *Screwtape Letters*. Lewis warned that the greatest evil in the world was being done by the “quiet men,” the clean-cut men who run our institutions.

Yes, it is the “quiet men” who run our institutions that we need to guard against, many of whom have adopted the radical agenda. What they seek was best said by Bill Ivey, a ruling class member who advised Hillary Clinton’s presidential

campaign in 2016. Speaking of elite Democrats, he said, “we’ve all been quite content to demean government, drop civics and in general conspire to produce an unaware and compliant citizenry.”

That is their goal—to establish a “compliant citizenry.” To achieve this goal they rely on “soft totalitarianism.” Unlike the violence that is practiced by the architects of “hard totalitarianism” (Hitler, Stalin and Mao), they seek to seduce and coax the average Joe to do what they want him to do. Pope Saint John Paul II warned about this development, saying the elites want a subservient population.

Thought control has long been the goal of radicals, and in more recent times members of the ruling class have adopted this goal as well. It has its roots in Communist thought and practice. Pope Francis referred to it as “polite persecution.” In doing so he was following the Catholic tradition of respecting conscience rights. Here are a few examples of this phenomenon.

When a Christian baker is sued for not making a wedding cake for two men (no one was refused service because he was a homosexual), and is then told by the attorney for the men that he needs to “correct the errors” of his “thinking,” we are talking about thought control. When presidential candidates, celebrities and media elites recommend that Trump voters need to be “deprogrammed,” we are talking about thought control.

Behavioral control is another goal of the ruling class-radical cause. It was on grand display during Covid. Elites and radicals alike said Covid was “a gift,” a grand opportunity to exercise control of the masses. Their quest to lockdown our institutions was a dream come true.

The lockdowns fell unusually hard on churches, particularly Catholic churches. In one city after another, people could go to Costco and casinos, but not Catholic churches. Catholics

had to practice social distancing, but Black Lives Matter protesters were excused. The average Joe had to wear a mask, but Democratic politicians showed up at events without one. They didn't wear one because they knew it was a farce.

The Catholic Church has steadfastly made support for the family a priority, but this goal has never been embraced by left-wing radicals. Indeed, even before Marx, they have sought to destroy it. Typically, they go after the authority exercised by the father. They do this by promoting libertinism and alternatives to the traditional family.

Libertinism means license, or freedom without limits. That's a surefire way to crush the family. Encouraging promiscuity weakens the bond between the spouses, and therefore undermines the family. Similarly, encouraging cohabitation and gay marriage undermines the family. Add to this the LGBTQ agenda—which denies there are two sexes and supports males competing against females in sports—and the chances of crippling the family are enhanced.

It is not just left-wing radical intellectuals and activists who are promoting the mad idea that the sexes are interchangeable, and that boy athletes can shower with girl athletes, many politicians, educators and medical professionals are on board, as well as their friends in the media. Many in the ruling class are on the side of radicals.

Do children belong to their parents or someone else? The very question is offensive, but it is constantly being asked by ruling class elitists and radical pundits. From federal government workers to local school board members, the notion that children are not the special province of their parents is being questioned and indeed rejected.

It has always been the goal of radicals to raise children communally and thereby deny parents their exclusive right to raise their own children as they see fit. This reflects the

need for thought control and behavioral control. Some activists have gone public with the idea that children should not be allowed to accept the values of their parents—they must be taught values that undermine them.

Population control has long been the interest of the ruling class. The Rockefellers pioneered birth control, abortion and eugenics, furthering the ambitions of radical thinkers and their allies. To accomplish their end, the activists whom they fund make a living out of lying about their work, fabricating data and exploiting the masses.

Radicals despise religion, in general, harboring a special hatred for Christians. They know that as long as the average Joe lays anchor with his religion, he is not likely to bow to their secular appeals. In some instances, radical activists resort to violence, as in firebombing crisis pregnancy centers. Appeals have also been made by educators and celebrities to shoot Trump supporters.

Their allies in the ruling class are more careful, preferring to unleash the FBI to spy on ordinary Catholics. School officials resort to discriminating against Catholics in hiring, and at the college level they harass those who are vocal about their religion.

Smearing Christians is a useful tool in their armor. The vulgar attacks on Mother Teresa are a case in point. A more subtle way of winning is to condemn those who put religious symbols on public property, even to the point of suing them. Gay radicals have been particularly vicious, invading churches, interrupting Mass and harassing the clergy and parishioners.

Intimidating Catholics in senior positions is a tactic favored by radical members of the ruling class. When Catholics are nominated to serve on the federal bench, they are badgered by senators and opinion-makers about the propriety of having

those with “deeply held convictions” from serving in the judiciary. Those with “deeply held *secular* convictions” are never questioned. Protesting in front of the homes of Catholic members of the Supreme Court, which is illegal, is another way of intimidating them.

Calling patriotic Americans “Christian nationalists” is a way of smearing them. There are plenty of professors and radical activists who never tire of making bogus claims about wild-eyed Christians trying to impose a theocracy. This is a scare tactic: by inventing a bogeyman, they hope to frighten the masses, hoping to turn them away from Christianity. It is all so cynical.

Radicals and ruling class members are not above invoking stealth tactics to win. One way to disable Christianity is to float a hoax—disseminate a false story about Christians that will ruin their reputation and weaken their moral voice. For example, many lies have been told about Pope Pius XII, saying he did nothing to help Jews during the Holocaust. More recently, books and movies based on total lies about the Catholic Church have been released to accomplish the same objective.

When the public is told that the Catholic Church in Ireland created mass graves for unwanted children housed by nuns, many believe it. But it is simply a lie and the facts are not in dispute. Yet some in the media continue to give voice to these libelous claims.

Infiltrating the Catholic Church is another strategy to disable the Church. In the past, Communist operatives succeeded in placing secret agents in the Church, and under the Biden administration the FBI spied on traditional Catholics.

Another way to undermine the Church is to fund dissident Catholic organizations. The goal is to sow doubt and confusion

in Catholic quarters, and with the public in general, about Church teachings on controversial moral issues. In some instances, the ruling class has actually created organizations with a Catholic name to undermine Catholicism.

There are good members of the ruling class and there are good intellectuals, professors and activist Americans who seek to make our society better. But there are way too many on the other side, elitists, writers and activists who are working overtime to hurt our country. They have chosen to disable the family and religion because if they succeed in doing so they will be well on their way to securing victory.

The Catholic Church is the most influential institution in America defending traditional moral values. While it has experienced many troubles, some of its own making, it remains our best hope for the future. The current crop of young clergymen is encouraging, and with renewed leadership in Rome, the stage is set to combat the forces that seek to dominate us.

The ruling class and radicals want us to despair. Let's make sure they fail.

MAMDANI LIKES ANTI-RELIGIOUS BIGOTS

New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani likes to hire anti-Jewish and anti-Catholic bigots. This is incontestable: see our website for the proof.

Everyone on the list was either on his transition team or served in an advisory capacity. Some are now working in his

administration.

Many hate Israel and are trying to weaken its economy through their BDS efforts (Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions). Some have defended Al Qaeda terrorists while others have organized pro-Hamas demonstrations. Anti-Semitic comments abound. Anti-Catholic remarks have also been voiced, and one hire organized an obscene demonstration during Mass at St. Patrick's Cathedral.

None of this is surprising. Mamdani hates Israel and blames it—not Hamas—for the Hamas massacre of Jews in Israel on October 7, 2023. Anyone who harbors that much hostility to Jews obviously wants to surround himself with people just like himself. Moreover, his decision to reward a vile anti-Catholic organizer tells us that he wants people like that working for him, not practicing Catholics.

Spellcheck does not recognize the word Mamdani, offering as a substitute the word "Madman." Looks like it is a lot smarter than the people who voted for him.