

“Catholics in the Crosshairs”

Bill in the News (Catholic Connection): Bill discusses his new book, Christianity in the Crosshairs: Ruling Class and Radicals Find a Common Enemy. To listen, click [here](#).

NON-ACCOUNTABILITY DEFINES OUR CULTURE

[Bill Donohue](#)

Many children enjoy testing adults, whether at home or in school; they like to see what they can get away with. If there are few consequences for acting out, it's a sure bet they will continue. Adults are no different: when criminals are not held accountable—when they are caught and released—they have no reason not to offend again.

This was apparent when President Biden intentionally allowed 15-20 million illegal aliens to crash our borders. They kept on coming because the Biden administration all but invited them to break the law. There were no consequences for their behavior.

Minneapolis was recently in a state of crisis. It is a “sanctuary city,” the effect of which allows local law enforcement not to cooperate with ICE agents seeking to deport illegal aliens, two-thirds of whom have a criminal record. Left-wing agitators capitalized on this state of lawlessness by obstructing federal agents from doing their job, putting them and their doxxed families in harms way. There are no

consequences for their behavior.

Not long ago, during the “Summer of Love” in Portland, portions of neighborhoods were seized by domestic terrorists, creating so-called autonomous zones. There were no consequences for their behavior. In New York City, thugs shoved innocent persons into subway tracks, and they did so repeatedly. There were no consequences for their behavior.

Occasionally, there are attempts to rein in this culture of non-accountability, but it is hard to put the toothpaste back in the tube.

In 2023, New York Assemblyman Zohran Mamdani, now Mayor of New York City, lobbied for free bus fare along certain routes. A pilot program was launched, one in each of the five boroughs, for low-income people. When they discontinued the program a year later, half the riders still refused to pay. Why should they? There were no consequences for their behavior.

Mamdani plans to reinstitute the program, but not right now. Reportedly, he is upset that currently more than half of all bus riders refuse to pay—sometimes whole groups barge in without paying. They are not acting irrationally: they are just getting a jump on his upcoming no-fare policy. There are no consequences for their behavior.

Under the Biden administration, there was a moratorium on student debt. Under Trump, they have reversed this rule, but it is too late. Fully three-in-four with student debt refuse to pay. Why should they? There are no consequences for their behavior.

The student debt crisis was started by President Obama with his signature ObamaCare legislation, the Affordable Care Act of 2010. He wanted to cut out the “middleman,” meaning the banks which were underwriting the loans; the government would now provide loans directly to students. Not only did this gambit not save money, rapacious colleges saw an opportunity

to bleed students and hiked tuition to record highs, knowing Uncle Sam would come to their rescue when they defaulted. Student debt skyrocketed. There were no consequences for their behavior.

Many other examples could be made, but the point is the same. A country that does not hold its citizens responsible for their behavior cannot survive, not if it covets liberty. Civility depends on citizens who internalize proper codes of conduct, and when the elites who govern no longer insist that these strictures be observed, they threaten the social order.

This should be common sense. Unfortunately, we need to relearn why it is important to abide by elementary rules of civility. But this will come to naught unless those in positions of authority hold everyone accountable. A norm, or a law, that is not enforced, is virtually useless.

NOTRE DAME'S PROBLEM IS NOT UNIQUE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The University of Notre Dame is not only one of America's best institutions of higher education, it is also seen, for the most part, as an authentically Catholic institution.

That is why it was so disconcerting to read that a professor, Susan Ostermann, was named director of the Liu Institute for Asia and Asian Studies. She is not someone who happens to be "pro-choice"—she is a pro-abortion zealot.

Any person who falsely claims that the pro-life movement has

“its roots in white supremacy and racism,” and condemns crisis pregnancy centers as “anti-abortion propaganda sites,” belongs working at Planned Parenthood, not Notre Dame. Planned Parenthood, of course, was founded by a bona fide white supremacist, Margaret Sanger.

Ostermann didn't get the job by mistake. She got it with the approval of the president, Fr. Robert Dowd, provost John McGreevy and the dean of the Keough School of Global Affairs, Mary Gallagher. Dowd claims he was “blindsided” by the appointment. That's strange. Did he not know that his predecessor, Fr. John Jenkins, publicly rebuked Ostermann for championing the pro-abortion cause? Surely McGreevy and Gallagher must have known.

The good news is that the blowback was ferocious and ultimately forced Ostermann to go back to the classroom. Led by the brilliant historian, Fr. Bill Miscamble, and the courageous Bishop of Fort Wayne-South Bend, Kevin Rhoades, the case was made to reject her appointment. Some twenty bishops, including Archbishop Paul Coakley, president of the bishops' conference, joined the fight, as did many students and alumni; those who have been given awards at Notre Dame also registered their objections. So it ended well. But problems remain, and Notre Dame is not unique among Catholic schools.

I taught at a nominally Catholic college for 16 years, and witnessed firsthand how uncommitted many administrators and faculty are to the teachings of the Catholic Church. In fact, some were openly hostile to Catholicism, and this included the nun who ran the school. But La Roche College in Pittsburgh (now a university) is not atypical.

Georgetown University, a premier Catholic institution, has two pro-abortion student clubs on campus. Moreover, student government officials have sought to punish students who accept the Church's teachings on marriage. It also employs a professor who justifies rape and slavery, provided the rapists

and slavemasters are Muslim.

Thankfully, Notre Dame is not like Georgetown. But its central problem is still extant. There are two main reasons why a pro-abortion extremist came close to being promoted: one is ideological and the other is a matter of identity.

While it is oversimplified to say there are social justice Catholics and pro-life Catholics, there is more than a measure of truth to it. Catholic teachings on the poor, the needy, the rejected, and immigrants are seen as being in the liberal camp; those that stress abortion, euthanasia, marriage, the family and sexuality are seen as being in the conservative camp. Both are expressions of Catholicism.

It has become abundantly clear that social justice Catholics are soft on abortion. That's being kind. Quite frankly, many of them—indeed most—do not regard abortion as “intrinsically evil,” which is the way the Church defines it. They see it as unfortunate. The Church also says racism is “intrinsically evil.” On that they agree. In short, racism upsets them infinitely more than abortion.

Are there Catholics in the conservative camp who are soft on racism? No doubt there are, but in my experience there are far fewer of them than there are liberal Catholics who are soft on abortion.

The other problem is not ideological; it is matter of identity. Unfortunately, many Catholic professors and administrators are uneasy being identified as Catholic in higher education circles. To be exact, they have a deep-seated need to win the affirmation of secular elites. At bottom, they are not comfortable in their Catholic skin.

They know the way secular elites look at Catholics of a more traditional stripe, and they are scared to death of being thrown in with them. In other words, their reluctance to defend conservative moral teachings—even when they don't

disagree with them—is done to win the blessings of secular elites, in and out of education. That’s how insecure they are about their Catholic identity.

Christian Smith, a Notre Dame sociologist, recently wrote an article in *First Things* explaining why he left the school. He says the Catholic identity problem is due to three things, one of which is a strong desire to secure “mainstream acceptance by ‘peer institutions’: Duke, Northwestern, Vanderbilt, Washington University in St. Louis, Emory, Rice, Stanford, NYU, and the like.” He says “Notre Dame desperately wants to belong to this club.” Regrettably, this leads many to low ball their Catholicism.

Notre Dame will be challenged again, and it will come from within. But as long as it has enough faculty, students and alumni who are vigilant—and there is no question about that—it will never lose its reputation as a truly great Catholic institution of higher learning.

NYC HOUSES OF WORSHIP NEED PROTECTION

[Bill Donohue](#)

Houses of worship need enhanced protection these days from anti-religious bigots. In recent times, virtually every major religion has had some of their houses of worship vandalized or invaded. Moreover, congregants have been subjected to taunts and threats. At stake is the First Amendment right to freely practice our religion.

While this is a nation-wide problem, it is a pressing concern

to New Yorkers. Jews, in particular, have been targeted more than any religious group. What happened last November was despicable. Two hundred protesters showed up outside Manhattan's Park East Synagogue holding vile anti-Jewish signs. They also yelled vicious comments at Jews going to synagogue, taunting them ferociously. This was totally unprovoked and totally indefensible.

Fortunately, the New York City Council elected a Speaker in January who is standing up against these bullies. Julie Menin is leading the fight against attacks on all houses of worship. I [wrote to her today](#) expressing our support for her efforts, requesting we play an active role. She is being sent [recent news releases](#) I have written on this subject.

Included in this batch are statements I have made about Mayor Zohran Mamdani. As you can see, his religious messaging is very troubling, and his penchant for hiring religious bigots is just as ominous. This does not bode well for the future, which is why the Catholic League supports Speaker Menin's call for legislation that would provide greater protection for houses of worship.

The First Amendment means nothing unless it is enforced. That means that those who seek to undermine religious liberty must be defeated. The Catholic League is delighted to join the fight.

WHO ARE THESE LGBTQ+ PEOPLE ANYWAY?

[Bill Donohue](#)

They really are different. They are not like the rest of us. A recent Gallup poll sheds some light on this phenomenon.

In 2012, only 3.5 percent of Americans identified as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender or something else (they must be the + people). Today the figure is 9 percent. Most of these people, 5 percent, say they are bisexual; the fewest are transgender (they appear to be bottoming out). Demographically, they are an interesting bunch.

Gallup found that young people, women, Democrats and city residents were the most likely to be LGBTQ+ (there was no significant difference on the basis of race and ethnicity). That's true, though it is incomplete. Other variables should have been probed.

The older the person is, the more likely he is straight. This is true across the board for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender people. Overall, 23.0 percent of 18-29 year-olds identify as belonging to one of these four subgroups, but only 2.3 percent of seniors do (those 65+). This stands to reason given that traditional moral values have been sliding for decades, eclipsed by radical individualism.

Women are more likely than men to belong to one of these subgroups. What the researchers did not report is that girls are the biggest users of social media, and this explains why they are also the most likely to identify as a trans person. Social media can be a debilitating force, one that preys on the emotionally vulnerable.

Gallup says that Democrats are more likely to be LGBTQ+, and that is because they are the most supportive of their status. True. But why? Democrats, much more than Republicans, favor big government, but that has nothing to do with being straight or not. Something is missing. That something is religion and education.

Gallup, as well as other pollsters, has consistently found

that Democrats are by far the most secular segment of the population: they are much more likely to be agnostic, atheist or have no religious affiliation. We know from a mountain of data that these people are the least likely to support traditional moral values.

Those with graduate degrees—especially those with post-graduate degrees—tend to be secularists, and are thus given to prize autonomy over traditional moral values. They are disproportionately urban dwellers, and have always been more inclined than rural folks to reject religion and a traditional understanding of sexuality; nothing has changed. The diversity that city life affords may generate a “live and let live” attitude, but beware of popping the champagne: like any value, its extreme manifestations have a corrupting effect.

California is home to the “live and let live” population, and this helps to explain why the young people who live there are 40 percent more likely to identify as transgender than the national average. The greater the tolerance, the greater the number who experiment, and with that comes all the negative consequences associated with this mentally challenging condition. Not something that deserves our applause.

In other words, it is not surprising that farm boys who go to church are not likely to show up at an LGBTQ+ event. Indeed, just imagining what this would look like boggles the mind—guys with straw hats, overalls and a Bible dancing around with a Pride flag!

Nope. That’s for the deracinated, the ones who think they can follow their own moral compass and live happily ever after. Good luck with that.

ENDING THE ABA'S INCLUSION TRAP

[Kyle Nazareth](#)

In January, [Texas](#) and [Florida](#) took bold steps that could reshape legal education nationwide by ending the American Bar Association's (ABA) role as the sole gatekeeper for bar admission. These decisions mark the beginning of the end for the ABA's monopoly and expose a deeper problem: the organization's [accreditation standards](#), particularly its aggressive push for "diversity, equity, and inclusion" (DEI), and hostility toward religious institutions.

For decades, the ABA dominated legal education, setting standards that nearly every state required for bar eligibility. The ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar enforced seemingly neutral requirements on faculty qualifications, bar passage rates, and curriculum. Yet beneath the [appearance of neutrality](#), the ABA has increasingly imposed progressive mandates on law schools while [threatening](#) the schools' accreditation. For example, Standard 206, though suspended since early 2025 and extended through August 2026, originally required law schools to demonstrate "concrete action" toward diversity in student bodies, faculties, and staff with respect to race, ethnicity, and gender.

Critics, including [21 Republican state attorneys general](#) and the [Trump administration](#), argued that this DEI standard violated civil rights laws and the U.S. Supreme Court's 2023 ruling in [Students for Fair Admissions v. Harvard](#). U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi [urged](#) the ABA to drop the standard entirely, warning that even vague "commitment to diversity" language could expose state bars to legal liability and jeopardize the ABA's federally recognized accreditor status.

The ABA's DEI initiatives have gone beyond accreditation, sometimes resulting in overt discrimination. In 2024, following complaints, the ABA revised its Judicial Clerkship Program to remove [race-based quotas](#). Separately, in early 2025, after conservative advocacy groups [urged the EEOC](#) to investigate further alleged race-based preferences, the ABA [broadened eligibility criteria](#) for its Diversity Clerkship Program.

In February 2025, Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Chair Andrew Ferguson restricted FTC political appointees from holding ABA leadership roles or participating in ABA activities in an official capacity, citing the organization's [history of partisan advocacy](#), including biased judicial-nominee ratings and amicus briefs on affirmative action, transgender ideology, capital punishment, and abortion. And in 2024, the ABA adopted [Resolution 503](#) opposing state government requirements to display the Ten Commandments in public schools, citing the historical constitutional canard of "separation of church and state."

The ABA also has a pattern of conflict with religious law schools. In August 2025, the organization [found](#) St. Thomas University College of Law in Miami out of compliance with the nondiscrimination Standard 205(c), likely because the school declined to fund an LGBTQ student group's [Pride Parade trip](#), citing its Catholic mission. Though subsection (c) explicitly protects religiously affiliated schools' ability to align policies with their faith, the ABA treated fidelity to Church teaching as a violation of equality. Florida Attorney General James Uthmeier [defended](#) the Catholic law school, condemning the move as "discriminatory" and anti-religious, vowing to protect state schools from such overreach. Consequently, on December 5, 2025, the ABA backed off, issuing a [public notice](#) concluding that St. Thomas University College of Law was in full compliance.

Similar clashes have occurred before. Brigham Young

University's J. Reuben Clark Law School [faced complaints](#) about the school's alleged practice of expelling students who left the Mormon faith or were in homosexual relationships. The ABA investigated but ultimately [closed the investigation](#) without action. Regent University School of Law had a prolonged accreditation struggle in the late 1980s and early 1990s, with ABA accreditors questioning a required [faculty statement of faith](#) and [tenure policies](#) as threats to academic freedom. Only after considerable adjustments did it gain full accreditation.

These cases reveal inclusion's irony: the ABA promotes inclusion while punishing schools holding traditional religious beliefs on sexuality and morality. Secular schools can enforce progressive norms, but faith-based schools risk losing accreditation for refusing to host activities at odds with their doctrine. This is coercion, not neutrality.

Texas and Florida's move away from the ABA favors ideologically neutral criteria, affordability, and open debate. Governor Ron DeSantis said Florida's choice ends the ABA's "[highly partisan](#)" gatekeeping. States like Ohio and Tennessee may soon follow.

The Catholic League applauds these steps. When one group controls accreditation in the name of inclusion, it ends up excluding dissent, religious liberty, and varied academic approaches. Ending the ABA's dominance advances true pluralism, allowing law schools to thrive without sacrificing their mission.

MEDIA BIAS MARKS STORY OF

TRANS KILLERS

Bill Donohue

Major media outlets, with rare exception, are engaged in a massive cover-up of the identity of transgender shooters in Canada and Rhode Island. They don't want the public to conclude the obvious: those who falsely claim to be of the opposite sex are mentally impaired and a disproportionate number are increasingly violent. What happened in both venues is disturbing enough without lying about the identity of the killers.

On February 10, 2026 Jesse Van Rootselaar, an 18-year-old man who falsely claimed to be a woman, entered the Tumbler Ridge Secondary School in Tumbler Ridge, Canada and opened fire on students and teachers. The shooter killed seven people, including six students, injuring dozens more before committing suicide.

On February 16, Robert Dorgan, a 56-year-old man who falsely claimed to be a woman, opened fire at a high school hockey game in Pawtucket, Rhode Island. He shot and killed one of his sons, as well as the mother of his children, and critically shot his other two sons and a family friend. He then fatally shot himself. It was later revealed that he went through gender reassignment surgery and was described as having a narcissistic-personality disorder.

If it were not for sexual identity politics, every media outlet would (a) identify the killers are transgender and (b) identify them as male. Not only did the media, overall, merit an "F" on these measures, many were inconsistent with how they depicted the two incidents.

TV

ABC mentioned the Canadian shooter was transgender and

referred to him as "she." It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter's name change and did not use any pronouns to describe him.

CBS said the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "she." It also mentioned that the Rhode Island shooter was transgender but referred to him as "he."

NBC reported the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "they." It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter name change and referred to him as a man.

PBS said the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "she." It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter's name change, and referred to him as "he."

CNN reported the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "she." It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "he."

MSNOW did not mention the Canadian shooter was transgender, and did not use any pronouns to describe the Rhode Island shooter.

Fox News mentioned the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to the Rhode Island shooter as "he."

Newspapers

New York Times mentioned the Canadian shooter was transgender, and did not use a pronoun to refer to the Rhode Island shooter.

Washington Post did not mention the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "she." It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter was transgender, and did not use pronouns to refer to him.

Los Angeles Times did not mention the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as "she." It said the Rhode

Island shooter was transgender, and did not use pronouns to refer to him.

USA Today mentioned the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as “she.” It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter was transgender, and referred to him as “he.”

Chicago Tribune did not mention the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as “she.” It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter was transgender, and did not use pronouns to refer to him.

Associated Press did not mention the Canadian shooter was transgender, and referred to him as “she.” It mentioned the Rhode Island shooter was transgender, and did not use pronouns to refer to him.

Here are some observations to ponder.

NBC is so illiterate, and ideologically bankrupt, that they falsely referred to a man as “they”? To top it off, NBC actually apologized for calling a Swedish skier who is a biological woman but falsely claims to be a man as “she.” But she is a “she”!

Notice the way the same media outlets that falsely referred to the Canadian shooter as “she,” invariably referred to the Rhode Island shooter—correctly—as “he.”

Which begs the question: Are the Canadian people so far gone that the media dare not accurately tell them that a man who identifies as a female is in fact a male?

Just as bad, have the media no uniform standards, inventing different ways to describe the same phenomenon?

Are they that corrupt?

Conservative Media Embrace Transgender Language

[Michael P. McDonald](#)

The AP Style Guide sets the tone for both print and electronic media, even conservative outlets are impacted. Consider what the AP Style Guide has to say on the matter of transgender ideology. It commands writers to only use preferred pronouns and makes allowance for the use of the singular “they.” The guide promotes the unscientific notions “sex assigned at birth” and “nonbinary/gender fluid” people. Indeed, the AP Style Guide appears to be ripped right out of the manifesto of the most militant trans activist.

While Fox News and the *New York Post* have reputations of representing right of center perspectives, in recent years both outlets have quietly embraced the woke left’s distortion of the English language and rejection of the laws of biology in the name of transgenderism. Both have used, and continue to use, the approved language of transgenderism in their reporting, making them virtually indistinguishable from their competitors in the mainstream media.

For instance, on January 13, 2026, both Fox News and the *New York Post* featured stories about the Supreme Court examining the ability of the states to protect girls’ sports from boys. Both outlets refer to the male athletes involved in the legal challenge with feminine pronouns.

In other instances, both outlets take pains to avoid pronouns altogether and continually refer to the individuals by their last names. While this at least solves the pronoun problem, the articles are inevitably framed around “transgender women”

but never once is it acknowledged that this is a man who falsely claims to be a woman. This appears to be both outlets' preferred strategy when dealing with high profile figures such as Congressman Sarah McBride (DE-D), the only member of Congress that openly claims a transgender status. Although on August 2, 2025, *New York Post* used female pronouns to refer to McBride.

With that said, there have been some efforts to reflect biological realities and respect the rules of grammar. However, the only time either Fox News or the *New York Post* observes these is when reporting on individuals who claim a transgender status that have committed serious crimes. Though this appears to be a more recent development.

For instance, in 2022 both outlets covered the case of Demetrius "Demi" Minor, who killed his foster father stabbing him 27 times. Minor claimed to be a woman and was incarcerated in New Jersey's only female prison. During his time in the women's prison, Minor had sex with two female inmates who became pregnant.

Of course, if you read the article posted on Fox's website on July 17, 2022, you may not have realized this was about a man in a women's prison. The headline reads, "NJ transgender woman transferred from women's only prison after impregnating 2 inmates, report says." The sanity, not to mention the rules of the English language, rapidly deteriorates from there. When describing how Minor was moved to a new facility, the article reads that he "is the only woman" confined there.

The *New York Post* was not any better in its coverage. In an article that ran on August 5, 2022, this line appeared: "she had impregnated two other inmates." This is a complete bastardization of English.

But, beginning in 2023, following the horrific attack on the Covenant Christian School in Nashville, in which a woman who

falsely claimed to be a man killed six people including three young children, both outlets have used the correct pronouns for people who claim a transgender status involved in violent crimes. In the cases of Audrey Hale (Covenant Christian School, March 27, 2023), Robert “Robin” Westman (Annunciation Catholic School, August 27, 2025), Jesse Van Rootselaar (Tumble Ridge, British Columbia, February 10, 2026), and Robert “Roberta Esposito” Dorgan (Pawtucket, RI, February 16, 2026) both outlets accurately reflected biological reality in their coverage.

It would appear that the only time Fox News and the *New York Post* deviate from the transgender convictions of their counterparts in the mainstream media is when the subject has committed a truly gruesome act and no one in their right mind will rush to ensure you are using his preferred pronouns. This is hardly a principled stand in defense of reason and common sense.

“Larry Jarvik Show”

Bill Donohue discusses his new book, *Christianity in the Crosshairs: Ruling Class and Radicals Find a Common Enemy*, with Laurence Jarvik. To watch, click [here](#).

BID TO DISCRIMINATE FAILS;

QUICK VICTORY

The attempt to discriminate against Christians at a cooperative apartment complex in Westchester County, New York failed. Those who run the cooperative allowed the display of a menorah in the common area, but not a nativity scene. They failed because we intervened.

What makes this story so bizarre is that the same issue took place last Christmas, and in the same building in Larchmont, New York! The only difference is that the building management company is new and the resident who complained is new. But the facts are the same.

Bill Donohue wrote to the new Property Manager company, recounting the story from last year. He said the display of a menorah was "commendable." But he hastened to add, "What is not commendable is the refusal to display a nativity scene. Indeed, it is illegal."

Donohue's letter was dated December 10 and we gave them until December 15 to either display the nativity scene, along with the menorah, or take down the menorah. The letter was emailed to them in the morning of December 10 (and sent in the overnight mail) and that very afternoon they removed the menorah, and a Christmas tree.

They could have settled this issue by simply displaying the crèche, but their idea of neutrality was to ban both the menorah and the manger scene. We prefer the tolerant alternative; they prefer the intolerant option.

"The menorah, like the crèche," Donohue wrote, "is a religious symbol; the Christmas tree is a secular symbol. This is not my opinion—this is the interpretation afforded by the U.S. Supreme Court. So you can either allow all religious symbols to be displayed, or you can deny both of them: You cannot chose one and deny the other."

Ironically, it was last year's confrontation with a different management group that ran this cooperative that led us to contact over 2,000 Homeowner Associations (HOA) in November, alerting them to the religious rights of their residents. We never thought we would have to swing into action again to stop discrimination against Christians in the same cooperative.

The Fair Housing Act of 1968 makes it clear that if one religious symbol is displayed in a common area, others must also be allowed. Supreme Court decisions on the display of religious symbols on public property are also accommodating. This is a serious religious liberty issue.

It is a sad commentary on the co-op board of this property that they thought they could get away with their bigoted stunt two years in a row. But their determination to discriminate was met with our equally determined decision to stop them.