

# 1994 GAY PRIDE PARADE WAS OBSCENE

[Bill Donohue](#)

*The Gay Pride Parade in New York City is this Sunday. It is worth recalling what happened thirty years ago when gays came from around the world to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Stonewall riot. Here is what we said.*

Two gay rights marches took place on June 26th. The legal march on First Avenue was festive and without incident. When the marchers passed in front of the Catholic Center on 55th St., there were no anti-Catholic gestures or catcalls. The same was not true of the illegal march on Fifth Avenue.

The demonstrators on Fifth Avenue were vulgar, both in word and in deed. In front of St. Patrick's Cathedral, they bellowed four letter words, pointed their middle finger at the Cathedral and laid down in the street. Amidst the vulgar chants were dozens of bare breasted women, as well as a dozen or more fully naked men and women. Some were dressed as cardinals, priests and nuns, while others wore satanic dress. Almost all showed some sign of disrespect as they passed the Cathedral, especially the contingents from Act Up and Pagans and Witches.

Dr. William A. Donohue, president of the Catholic League, had this to say about the event.

"What happened on Fifth Avenue on June 26th was in stark contrast to the respectful and legal demonstration on First Avenue. Those who marched on Fifth Avenue showed no respect for the law, engaged in the most vile anti-Catholic behavior and jeopardized the public safety of all New Yorkers. Led by Act Up, the gay radicals once again showed their anarchists' stripes by flaunting a court order not to march. As a result,

those who may have needed the services of an ambulance, fire truck or police car were unnecessarily placed at risk. But none of this seemed to matter, not even to those normally accustomed to editorializing about health and safety issues.

“The degree of anti-Catholic bigotry that was vented in front of St. Patrick’s Cathedral could not have been outdone by the Ku Klux Klan. Filled with hate, the demonstrators conducted themselves in a manner that gives new meaning to the term blasphemous. They also showed how very different they really are from all other protesters: only gay events inspire marchers to undress. And their mockery of the one institution that has done more to service AIDS patients than any other in the city of New York shows how irrational this segment of the gay population is.

“In addition to the vengeful Fifth Avenue protesters, criticism must also be made of Mayor Giuliani, Police Commissioner Bratton and the media. The mayor and police commissioner allowed a court order to be disobeyed, thus signaling a collapse of authority. The media failed to report the Catholic-bashing that took place outside of St. Patrick’s Cathedral. If the identical behavior had taken place outside an Orthodox Jewish synagogue, it is doubtful that the disrespect would have gone unreported.”

---

## **“The Eric Metaxas Radio Show”**

Bill Donohue discusses his new book: *Cultural Meltdown: The Secular Roots of Our Moral Crisis*, with Eric Metaxas. To watch, click [here](#).

---

# LOOK WHO'S A "DOMESTIC THREAT"?

*Bill Donohue sent the following letter to Department of Homeland Security Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas:*

June 25, 2024

Hon. Alejandro Mayorkas  
Secretary of Homeland Security  
Washington, D.C. 20528

Dear Secretary Mayorkas:

It was recently reported that internal files from the "Homeland Intelligence Experts Group" were made public, and although the Group is now defunct, the contents of the second batch of documents secured by America First Legal are disturbing. This advisory panel was under your watch, which explains why I am writing to you.

The Group included former CIA director John Brennan and former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper. They indicated that when seeking national security information, when all else fails the Department of Homeland Security should look for "indicators of extremists and terrorism."

"If you ask researchers to dive into indicators of extremists and terrorism, they might indicate being in the military or religious. This being identified as an indicator suggests we should be more worried about these. We need the space to talk about it honestly."

The Group then added a third indicator of domestic terrorism, saying, "Most of the Domestic Terrorism threat now comes from

supporters of the former president," meaning supporters of Donald Trump.

I know this group has since been disbanded, but the documents that were collected are extant. It is important that all documents pertaining to this issue be made public. What is your Department doing with these records? Have they been given over to some other committee or advisory group? Where is the evidence that being in the military, being religious and being a supporter of Donald Trump is a threat to national security?

I ask these questions because according to these criteria, I check all three boxes.

- On August 28, 1970 I was honorably discharged from the United States Air Force.
- On July 1, 1993 I began my tenure as president of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization.
- On February 13, 2016 Donald Trump tweeted, "Nice column [in Newsmax] by Bill Donohue, head of Catholic League. He's a blue collar New Yorker and gets it." In a second tweet, he said, "A very big thank you to Bill Donohue, head of The Catholic League, for the wonderful interview on CNN and article in Newsmax! Great insight."

This begs the question: Am I on a watch list? My family, friends and Catholic League members would like to know if I may be considered a domestic terrorist.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

cc: America First Legal

---

# The Eric Metaxas Radio Show

*Bill in the News (The Eric Metaxas Radio Show): Bill Donohue discusses his new book: Cultural Meltdown: The Secular Roots of Our Moral Crisis, with Eric Metaxas. To watch, click [here](#).*

---

## ATTACK ON CHIEFS' BUTKER; BIGOTRY IN PLAY

*This is the article that appeared in the June 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Harrison Butker, the phenomenal kicker for the Kansas City Chiefs, gave a commencement address at Benedictine College in Kansas on May 11 that espoused traditional Catholic values. The practicing Catholic was criticized by the NFL, slammed on social media and was the subject of a change.org petition.

The attack had three targets: Butker, Benedictine College and Catholicism. Make no mistake, the war on Butker was driven by anti-Catholicism.

Butker was condemned for his remarks about women, abortion, President Biden, Gay Pride Month, gender ideology, and the emasculation of men. Those who signed the petition didn't want to debate him—they wanted him fired. "We call upon the Kansas City Chiefs management to dismiss Harrison Butker immediately

for his inappropriate conduct.”

Bill Donohue responded by saying, “Spoken like true fascists. Moreover, they are plain dumb: they don’t know the difference between speech and conduct.”

Most of the vitriol aimed at Butker was about his comments praising moms who elect to work at home taking care of their children. He noted how blessed he is to have a wife who embraces “one of the most important titles of all: homemaker.”

Butker actually spoke for most moms.

In a Gallup poll released in 2019, 50 percent of women with children under age 18 said they would prefer to stay at home; 45 percent disagreed.

Butker spoke the truth about abortion, IVF, surrogacy and euthanasia, referring to them as stemming from “the pervasiveness of disorder.” But to those who like abortion, this was grounds to fire him.

Butker referenced Biden when he took him to task for making the sign of the cross during a pro-abortion rally. He was also right to call attention to the “deadly sins” associated with Pride month. His reference to “dangerous gender ideologies” was understated—we are dealing with a child abuse crisis.

Bigotry was the driving force behind these attacks. It was Butker’s unabashed defense of Catholic moral theology that set his critics off.

The Associated Press let the cat out of the bag. It unleashed a string of red flags about Benedictine College being “part of a constellation of conservative Catholic colleges that tout their adherence to church teachings and practice—part of a larger conservative movement in parts of the U.S. Catholic Church.”

This comes on the heels of an AP story sounding the alarms

about the growth of orthodox Catholicism.

We were happy to come to Butker's defense. We did so with greater effect than any other Catholic organization in the nation. We had a list of email subscribers contact Stephen D. Minnis, president of Benedictine College, to show their support for him and for Butker.

---

## NFL SIDES WITH BIGOTS

*This is the article that appeared in the June 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

The National Football League (NFL) sided with the anti-Catholic bigots in the Harrison Butker controversy. Speaking of the Kansas City football player, the NFL said, "His views are not those of the NFL as an organization." It cited its allegiance to inclusion.

Bill Donohue wrote a stinging letter to NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell. "So by stigmatizing Butker—in effect excluding him—for defending Catholic moral theology, you are flexing your inclusion muscles? Nice to know what you think about Catholicism—that is the real issue. Too bad you couldn't cite a single sentence that was objectionable."

Donohue then listed several instances where the NFL showed its duplicity, beginning with his letter to Goodell in 2011 about his decision to invite Madonna to perform at the 2012 Super Bowl. Donohue reminded Goodell that in 2004 it disinvited a rap singer from performing during the halftime of the Pro Bowl game because of his sexist lyrics.

Donohue drew a comparison with the NFL's handling of Madonna, citing her repeated mocking of "the heart and soul of Christianity: Jesus, Our Blessed Mother, the Eucharist and the Crucifixion." But none of that mattered.

Earlier this year the NFL gave a platform to an anti-Catholic organization, GLAAD, during the Super Bowl. This is the same group that heralded the decision of the Dodgers to honor the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, a viciously anti-Catholic group.

Goodell's phoniness is matched only by his tolerance for anti-Catholicism.

---

## OUR PAMPERED ELITES

*This is the article that appeared in the June 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

**William A. Donohue**

When I did the chapter on transgenderism for my upcoming book, *Cultural Meltdown*, I was struck by the fact that blacks are the least likely to believe in the fiction that the sexes are interchangeable. The biggest dopes are white people. Not just any white persons—those with post-graduate degrees are the dumbest.

Why are white well-educated people so stupid? To begin with, the ability to stay in school is not a good index of how bright someone is. Some of the brightest people I have ever met never went to college, and some of the biggest air heads I have ever met are college professors. This explains why I was



not surprised to learn that those with post-graduate degrees are the most likely to believe that we can change our sex.

Does education corrupt? Depending on the course of study, and who the professors are, it may. For example, it can corrupt our cognitive faculties when we put common sense aside and allow ideology to run riot. Add to this the tendency of those with alphabets after their name to look down on the masses—it gives them a mantle of moral superiority—and the scene is set to ride off a cliff. Here's a real-life example.

A recent Rasmussen poll asked respondents if they agreed with Disney official Karey Burke when she bragged how good it is for the company to have “many, many, many LGBTQIA characters.” Those who were the most likely to say this is appropriate for children under 12 were those in the highest income bracket—earning more than \$200,000 a year. They are among the most “well educated” in the country, having graduated from elite schools.

Are the rich morally corrupt? Some are. To be specific, they are more likely to be secularists, and this matters greatly: their distrust in God allows them to put their trust in themselves. And given their insular existence—they love gated communities, chauffeurs, and their own security—they can rest assured knowing that whatever the masses believe in is probably wrong.

Rich well-schooled young people have dominated the domestic news lately. From Berkeley to Columbia, they rioted, vandalized, burned American flags, camped out on campus property, attacked Jews, barricaded themselves in college offices, blocked traffic, assaulted the police and cheered for Hamas. According to the NYPD, most of those arrested at Columbia were students.

No one doubts, however, that outsiders played a key role, especially in organizing and strategizing how to win. Where

did they get their money and training? From well-schooled rich people, of course.

It was hardly a shocker to learn that George Soros was involved. He loves to create anarchy, and uses his Open Society Foundations to great effect. David Rockefeller is another big player. Susan and Nick Pritzker are awash with left-wing money (Nick is the uncle of J.B. Pritzker, the billionaire governor of Illinois).

One of the most generous donors to left-wing causes is the Tides Foundation. According to Capital Research Center, which does yeoman work tracking how the rich undermine America, "If the Left does it, Tides funds it." It is one of the masters of "dark money," funds that are hard to trace. It specializes in "pass-through funding," a mechanism that shuffles money to communist-inspired organizations such as the Working Family Party.

Not only has Soros lavishly funded Tides, so has the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Silicon Valley Community Foundation and K. Kellogg Foundation.

The Tides Foundation managed to grease two of the most pro-Hamas organizations responsible for the campus riots, Jewish Voice for Peace and IfNotNow. Another source of money for this crusade is Goldman Sachs, Wall Street's behemoth financial organization.

Here's how the game is played.

Goldman Sachs Philanthropy Fund funnels money to The People's Forum, a radical left-wing entity with ties to the Chinese Communist Party. It is backed by American businessman Neville Roy Singham. He uses Goldman Sachs' charity arm as a pass-through to The People's Forum. Though Goldman Sachs maintains it has no direct ties to this group, in a circuitous way it

does.

Singham is a filthy rich socialist whose father was Sri Lankan and mother was Cuban. He is proud that The People's Forum is "a movement incubator" of extremist causes.

The protesting students on our campuses have much in common with their well-heeled donors. The rich live a secure pristine lifestyle, unaffected by the consequences of their ideas. Meanwhile, their student stooges take over university buildings with impunity, having food delivered to them by Uber drivers.

All of them have much in common with Mao (Singham adores him). The Chinese monster may have identified with the oppressed, but in reality he managed to kill 77 million of them. He also lived large—he had 50 villas to live in.

The elites live a pampered existence. What they learned, and what they are teaching, in the colleges and universities is more often than not subversive of the very institutions they govern. They are as vindictive as they are irrational.

---

## BIDEN AND TRUMP ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

*This is the article that appeared in the June 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

**Bill Donohue**

In 1952, Congress designated the first Thursday in May as the

National Day of Prayer; this year it fell on May 2. Predictably, every president since has said something positive about religion on this day. To judge their sincerity, however, we need to look at the policies they initiated that touch on religious liberty.

The National Day of Prayer was meant to be a day when Americans “may turn to God in prayer and meditation.” When Trump gave his Proclamation marking this day on May 4, 2017, he mentioned God four times. When Biden first addressed this day on May 6, 2021, he never mentioned God.

This may seem like small pickings, but in fact it is suggestive of the religious liberty policies that each man issued. For example, we compared Trump’s religious liberty initiatives to the ones promoted by Biden. To read the entire report on this issue, click [here](#).

In his four years as president, Trump addressed religious liberty issues 117 times. From the beginning of his presidency in January 2021 to May 1, 2024, Biden addressed these matters 31 times.

Quantitative data are important, and on this score, Trump wins easily: 117-31. But qualitative analysis is also important: the content of the religious issues that they addressed matters greatly.

The Biden administration’s idea of religious liberty centers heavily on discrimination. Within this area of concern, much attention is given to instances of religious discrimination against minority religions. For example, Muslims, Sikhs, Tribal Nations, Buddhists, and Hindus are given more attention than offenses against pro-life Christians and attacks on Christian-run crisis pregnancy centers.

In many cases, religious liberty is not even a key element in the Biden administration’s outreach to religious groups: transportation, mental health, nutritious food, drug abuse,

suicide prevention, greeting refugee newcomers, “climate smart agriculture,” internet service—these and related matters—occupy the centerpiece of their concern.

One of the more striking aspects of the religious liberty issues pursued by the Biden team is their promulgation of new regulations aimed at curtailing the religious liberty protections afforded by the Trump administration. For instance, with regards to federally funded social services, Trump sought to make it easier for faith-based providers to compete for federal grants. Biden is making it harder.

The welfare reform law of 1996 that President Bill Clinton signed was the first presidential attempt to include faith-based social service organizations in federally funded initiatives. But it was President George W. Bush who institutionalized this effort. He launched the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

President Barack Obama did not end these faith-based programs but he neutered them so badly—secularizing them—that in 2010 I issued a news release titled, “Time To Close Faith-Based Programs.” In 2011, my statement said, “Shut Down Faith-Based Programs.”

In 2021, the Biden team said that the Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships would not “favor religious over secular organizations.” That was a polite way of saying that secular social service organizations would continue to be awarded preferential treatment, thus undercutting the *raison d’etre* of faith-based programs.

Since that time, Biden regulations have sought to ensure that faith-based programs will not be used for “explicitly religious purposes.” This beckons the state to police these initiatives, looking to see how “religious” they are, thus creating major First Amendment problems.

The Biden administration also allows a beneficiary to raise

religious objections if he feels uncomfortable with the operations of the program. This allows people of one faith who are seeking assistance from a provider of another faith to checkmate the provider's religious prerogatives. In other words, the mere presence of a religious symbol in a faith-based facility is sufficient grounds to nix it.

In essence, Biden's idea of faith-based programs is to gut their religious component, in effect secularizing them the way Obama did.

Trump expanded religious liberty—he did not contract it. Here are examples selected from ten different issues (some overlapping is unavoidable).

*Religious Liberty:* In 2017, Trump signed an Executive Order promoting free speech and religious liberty. The order made religious liberty an administrative priority and required all federal agencies to take action to protect it.

*Faith-Based Initiatives:* On May 8, 2018, Trump signed an Executive Order establishing a White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative. The order directed agencies that didn't already have such an operation to start one.

In 2020, nine federal agencies proposed rules leveling the playing field for faith-based organizations wishing to participate in grant programs or become a contractor. The rules eliminated two requirements placed on faith-based organizations that were not placed on secular organizations. The rules were finalized on December 19, 2020.

In 2020, the Trump administration announced that Covid relief legislation (the CARES Act) must include churches and religious non-profits in the Paycheck Protection Program. Thus did Trump ensure that these religious entities would not be discriminated against in receiving financial assistance due to pandemic restrictions.

*Conscience Rights:* On January 18, 2018, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) launched a new Conscience and Religious Freedom Division within the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). This new unit was established to enforce federal laws that protect conscience rights and religious freedom.

The next day, conscience rights were expanded again when HHS proposed a regulation implementing 25 laws that protect pro-life healthcare entities against discrimination by federal agencies—or state or local governments receiving federal funds. The issue in question was occasioned by attempts to force healthcare workers to participate in abortion, sterilization, and other morally objectionable procedures. The proposal was finalized in 2019.

*Abortion:* The HHS OCR issued a notice of violation to the University of Vermont Medical Center for forcing a nurse to participate in an abortion despite a conscience objection.

On January 24, 2020, Trump became the first sitting president to give remarks in person at the annual March for Life in Washington, D.C.

In 2020, Trump signed an Executive Order that reinforced existing protections for children born prematurely, with disabilities, or in medical distress, including infants who survive an abortion.

*Education:* In 2020, guidelines were issued ensuring that prayer in schools is properly protected and not unconstitutionally prohibited or curtailed.

*HHS Mandate:* In 2017, HHS issued two regulations to deal with Obama's "HHS Contraceptive Mandate" that violated conscience and religious liberty. The new norms exempted organizations with moral or religious objections to purchasing insurance that includes coverage of contraceptives and abortion-causing drugs and devices.

In 2020, the Trump team celebrated the win in the Supreme Court upholding the right of the Little Sisters of the Poor not to buy contraceptive and abortion services.

*Foster Care:* In 2019, HHS issued a rule removing burdensome requirements that all grantees, including faith-based ones, must accept same-sex marriages and profess gender identity as valid in order to be eligible to participate in grant programs. This included adoption and foster care facilities; some were previously shut down because of these draconian measures. The rules were finalized in 2021.

*Gays:* In 2017, the Trump administration filed an amicus brief with the Supreme Court defending the religious liberty of a baker who had been sued after he refused to inscribe a congratulatory message on a wedding cake for two homosexuals.

*Transgenderism:* In 2017, Trump rescinded Obama's dictum that required public schools to allow students who identify as transgender to use the bathrooms and showers of their choice, meaning boys could shower with girls.

*International Issues:* In 2019, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo announced a new global initiative, the International Religious Freedom Alliance. It was meant to provide a way for like-minded countries to work together to advance religious freedom.

On January 19, 2021, the last religious liberty issue addressed by Trump was to declare that China had committed genocide and crimes against humanity in its treatment of Uyghur Muslims.

The Republicans and Democrats used to be on opposite sides on these issues.

When it came to an issue like abortion, the Democrats in the 1960s were mostly opposed. It was the Republicans, led by the Rockefellers, who championed the abortion cause.



In the 1970s, Catholics were pushed out of senior posts in the Democratic Party. Some moved to the Republican Party, some chose to be independent, and many felt homeless. By the time Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, the Democrats were the party of abortion and the Republicans took up the pro-life cause. In short, the 1970s was the decade when the parties flipped sides on religious liberty and abortion.

Since the 1980s, the leadership in the Democratic Party has become increasingly intolerant of religious liberty. Thoroughly secularized, their passion for abortion rights is off-the-charts.

No one seriously believes that Trump is a man of deep faith. But his policies on religious liberty are a model of excellence. Biden, on the other hand, tries hard to convince the public that he is a “devout Catholic” yet his religious liberty rulings are unimpressive, and in some cases are subversive of this First Amendment right.

Four months after Biden assumed office in January 2021, his executive director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships met with leaders of six secular organizations, most of which had expressed virulent anti-Catholic statements for many years. Freedom From Religion Foundation, the American Humanist Association, American Atheists, Center for Inquiry, Ex-Muslims of North America and the Secular Coalition for America.

All of them are militantly secular and most are quite open about their contempt for religious liberty.

It would be one thing if White House staffers in domestic policy invited these representatives to discuss their concerns. But when an office of the administration that is expressly charged with promoting religious liberty extends the invitation, it would be like the Department of Education inviting the Flat Earth Society to engage them in

conversation.

As president of the Catholic League, I was invited to meet with representatives of the Clinton administration in the 1990s. This was after I got a call from a White House staffer who said he did not like what he was reading in *Catalyst*.

When George W. Bush was elected, I, along with a few other Catholics, was invited to meet with him in the White House. I even flew on Air Force One with Bush to Notre Dame when he gave the Commencement Address in 2001.

I never met with Obama, but I did interact with those under him, specifically with regards to an IRS inquiry that sought to intimidate the Catholic League. It failed miserably. Trump wrote a few nice things about me when he was campaigning, but I was not invited to meet with him. No one from the Biden administration has contacted me.

We are positioned right where we should be: we don't endorse candidates but we do address issues of interest to Catholics. It's going to be a rollicking summer and fall with the conventions and the election. Stay tuned.

---

## NORTHWESTERN UNIV. CROSSES THE LINE

*This is the article that appeared in the June 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

*The following letter by Bill Donohue to the president of Northwestern University explains why Catholics, as well as*

*Jews, are concerned about concessions granted by the school to pro-Hamas students.*

May 6, 2024

President Michael H. Schill  
Office of the President  
Northwestern University  
633 Clark Street  
Evanston, IL 60208-1100

Dear President Schill:

I am writing to you in my role as president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization. I am also a veteran, a former college professor, and former member of the board of directors of the National Association of Scholars.

It is one thing to learn that protesting students are insisting that Northwestern hire at least two Palestinian visiting professors, and offer scholarships for five Palestinian undergraduates; it is quite another to learn that their demands have been accepted.

The reason this matters to Catholics, as well as to Jews, is that it raises the specter of bringing hate-mongers to the campus. This is hardly a stretch given the open embrace of Hamas on the part of some of the protesters.

Let's face it—the protesters are looking for their ideological next of kin to fill these spots. They are not interested in bringing Middle Eastern scholars to the campus, especially those who might differ with their understanding of events. Their vision of history is the Hamas vision.

It is not a matter of debate what Hamas wants. The 1988 Covenant of the Islamic Resistance Movement, also known as the Hamas Covenant, is quite explicit. What it says about Christians explains why this is of particular interest to the

Catholic League.

Here is a selection from the Hamas Covenant that details its overall objective.

“There is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad.” It is very specific. “The Day of Judgement will not come until Moslems fight the Jews (killing the Jews), when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees.”

The Hamas Covenant also targets Christians. In a passage taken from the Koran, Muslims are advised how to deal with appeals for peace made by “the infidels.” The message is unambiguous. “But the Jews will not be pleased with thee, neither the Christians, until thou follow their religion.”

Accordingly, Muslims are told the only answer is to have Jews and Christians live under Sharia law. “Under the wing of Islam, it is possible for the followers of the three religions—Islam, Christianity and Judaism—to coexist in peace and quiet with each other. Peace and quiet would not be possible except under the wing of Islam.”

More recently, in 2022, Mahmoud al Zahar, a co-founder of Hamas, said, “We are not liberating our land alone. The entire 510 million square kilometers of planet Earth will come under [a system] where there is no injustice, no oppression, no Zionism, *no treacherous Christianity* (our italics).”

No one who endorses this rhetoric should be teaching on any college campus. Not for a moment would someone be permitted to promote the agenda of the Klan. And not for a moment should anyone have a place in academia who seeks to promote the agenda of the Hamas Covenant.

Complicating matters for Northwestern is its record on free speech.

The 2024 survey of free speech on campus conducted by College

Pulse and the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) gave Northwestern a "Poor" rating.

Indeed, it was listed near the bottom of colleges and universities on free speech measures: of the 254 that were studied, Northwestern ranked 242. Given this reality, how can we expect Christian and Jewish students to disagree with professors who adopt the Hamas worldview?

Giving into the demands of protesters has already created legal problems for Northwestern. It is being sued for violating the 1964 Civil Rights Act: offering almost \$2 million in scholarship funds, faculty positions, and student-organization space to Palestinian students and staff is not likely to pass muster in the courts. This is discrimination, pure and simple.

I implore you, and the Board of Trustees, to reconsider your stance. It is wrong morally and legally to capitulate to highly objectionable student demands. It also sends a message to current and future students that if they engage in civil discord they will be rewarded for doing so. At that point, the purpose of the university—the pursuit of truth—collapses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

cc: Peter M. Barris, Chair, Board of Trustees

Adam R. Karr, Vice Chair

Virginia M. Rometty, Vice Chair

Michael S. Shannon, Vice Chair

---

# PRO-HAMAS QUEERS CHIME IN

*This is the article that appeared in the June 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

No one knows exactly how many queers (the preferred word by the Associated Press for homosexuals) are pro-Hamas, but it is indisputable that some have joined the side of the terrorists. "Queers for Palestine" is only one such group.

Valley Families for Palestine recently held a Queer Storytime for Palestine event at the Northampton Center for the Arts in Massachusetts. It was intended for preschool through upper elementary students. Lil Miss Hot Mess read stories to the children, shouting, "Free Palestine."

The ironies abound. Lil Miss Hot Mess is a Jew who hates Jews. People like that are routinely murdered by Hamas. And they even kill their own. Mahmoud Ishtiwi, a Hamas commander, was tortured and killed by his fellow terrorists in 2016 after he allegedly had sex with another guy. In 2022, Ahmad Abu Marhia, a 25-year-old Palestinian, had his head chopped off because he was a queer.

It would be a mistake to think that Lil Miss Hot Mess is a total freak, though one can be forgiven for thinking that way. No, there is a link between political and sexual revolution that has deep intellectual roots. Bill Donohue discusses this in his upcoming book *Cultural Meltdown: The Secular Roots of Our Moral Crisis*; it will be published June 18.

Wilhelm Reich, the 20th century Austrian intellectual, was the most sexually crazed member of the Frankfurt School, and that was quite a feat. This was a school of thought that took hold in Germany in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and later moved to New York City, laying anchor at Columbia University. It is

a blend of Marx and Freud.

Reich is known as the “Father of the Sexual Revolution.” He worked hard to convince Catholic children to abandon their religion and put their faith in Communism. He insisted that there could be no political revolution without first witnessing a sexual revolution.

In the 1960s, radical feminist Shulamith Firestone was also influenced by Freud—they both vigorously opposed the incest taboo. Like Reich, she posited a direct link between a sexual revolution and a political revolution. In fact, she blamed the failure of the Russian Revolution on the failure to “eliminate the family and sexual repression.”

More recently, another radical feminist, Judith Butler, has argued that we need to get rid of the incest taboo because incest is not necessarily a traumatic act; what is traumatic is the stigmatization itself. She is another intellectual—she likes to be called “they”—who ties sexual revolution to political revolution. She actively promotes transgenderism and anarchy.

There is now a subset of Antifa called Trantifa, militant activists who confront parents who object to drag queen shows. They have a particular hatred of girls and women who resist their agenda.

What they want is what Reich, Firestone and Butler want—the destruction of the family and the overthrow of the political order. And they are prepared to use violence to further their cause.

This explains why some queers have joined the Hamas crusade. In their mind, there can be no true liberation until they are free from sexual and political norms. And for that, they blame our Judeo-Christian heritage. This explains why queers for Hamas has chimed in, irrational though they are on many fronts.