

PAM BONDI TARGETS MEDICAL PROFESSION

[Bill Donohue](#)

U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi is zeroing in on the medical profession's role in providing services to sexually confused minors. She will focus on "the medical community's fraud and exploitation of parents and children who have fallen prey to radical gender ideology." She said the Department of Justice (DOJ) will not sit back and allow doctors who are "motivated by ideology, profits, or both [to] exploit and mutilate our children."

Bondi is not making a talking point—she means business. She is putting "medical practitioners, hospitals, and clinics on notice" that they will be held accountable for engaging in sex-reassignment surgeries of children. She is also instructing her lawyers to draft legislation that will allow "children and the parents of children whose healthy body parts have been damaged by medical professionals through chemical and surgical mutilation" to take action against them.

What motivated Bondi to act were reports that the Biden-Harris administration aided and abetted the suffering of children by the medical profession, all in the name of providing "gender affirming care." There is nothing noble about sexually reconstructing children. It is a monstrous act done for politics or cash.

The American Medical Association (AMA) is a disgrace. The elites who run it know that sex is binary yet they pretend it is not. It is so far gone that it opposes designating sex on birth certificates as male or female, as if there is some legitimate third choice.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) is just as

irresponsible. It not only agrees with the AMA, it does not allow doctors to set up a booth at its annual conference challenging its flawed transgender position.

According to the medical watchdog, Do No Harm, between 2019-2023, approximately 14,000 children underwent sex-change operations. This was supported by both the AMA and the APA.

Attorney General Bondi is right to go after the medical schools as well. Here's a quick look at the elite ones.

Harvard Medical School houses Mass General, the oldest and largest medical school in the country. It specializes in gender-affirming care. It is so specialized that it even offers vocal feminization and masculinization services. They just don't get it: If there is no such thing as a biological man or woman, why are they tinkering with kids' vocal cords to make them sound like a man or a woman? Are they that ideologically drunk that they don't see how this undercuts their position?

Boston Children's Hospital is also affiliated with Harvard Medical School. It is the first pediatric and adolescent transgender health program in the nation, providing "Gender Multispecialty Services" such as "menstrual suppression" and "dilation therapy and care of neovaginas." This is really sick. They are boasting about manipulating the bodies of women to stop their normal cycle of menstruation, and they are also bragging about creating new vaginas for men who hate their bodies.

Johns Hopkins Medicine runs the Emerge Gender and Sexuality Clinic for Children, Adolescents and Young Adults. It starts playing with the bodies of individuals "between the ages of 5 and 25 years." In other words, when Johnny is still on his tricycle, he is a prime candidate for these exploitative doctors. They even provide "penile construction" for little girls who want to become a boy.

Stanford Medicine not only makes new vaginas for the guys, it removes the ovaries from the gals. In doing so, it works “hand-in-hand” with the Stanford LGBTQ+ Health Program. Did they forget the “I”? At least they didn’t forget the +, which covers them.

The Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania offers “facial feminization and facial masculinization surgeries.” Again, these savants are giving away the store—every time they say one’s sex is subjective, they offer proof that it isn’t. Do they teach logic at any of these schools? They sure don’t teach ethics.

Attorney General Pam Bondi should hold all of these predators responsible. They are preying on individuals who suffer from serious mental issues. They are not only injurious to their health, they are anti-science. Bondi should declare a mental health emergency and shut these Frankenstein facilities down ASAP.

NEW YORK TIMES MALIGNS IRISH NUNS AGAIN

Bill Donohue

In 2013, I published a monograph, “[Myths of the Magdalene Laundries](#),” that debunked the myths about the rotten living conditions in homes for unwed mothers run by Irish nuns from the mid-eighteenth to the late nineteenth century.

In 2014, I published another monograph, “[Ireland’s ‘Mass Grave’ Hysteria](#),” that debunked the myths about a mass grave containing the remains of nearly 800 children that were

alleged to have been found outside a former home run by nuns in Tuam [pronounced Chewum] near Galway.

On May 6, 2025, the *New York Times* published a front-page story that repeats all the falsehoods that were previously told about the homes and the “mass grave.” Ironically, one of the persons who showed the mass grave story to be a hoax was a *New York Times* reporter. They really ought to read their own newspaper before publishing another story on the same subject.

Even the title of Ali Watkins’ article, “75 Years of Longing for a Child Taken From Her,” is bunk. The baby was dead on arrival. Furthermore, no one “took” the baby from Chrissie Tully—she was in a jam and had to give the baby up.

When Tully was a teenager, she got pregnant out-of-wedlock and her “family disowned her.” A priest took her to St. Mary’s Mother and Baby Home in Tuam. As Watkins says, “for some like Ms. Tully, there was nowhere else to go.” Not exactly. There was always the street. She made the right choice.

Watkins bemoans the fact that Tully’s boy, whom she named Michael, “was taken away” from her and “never held him or saw his face.” But she went to the home because she could not care for her baby—that’s why the homes exist—and because he died at birth, she never had a chance to see him. At the time, she thought the nuns were lying, but she doggedly pursued this issue for decades, and finally obtained the hospital paperwork. It read, “Stillborn.” This settles it. She was never lied to.

Right on cue, Watkins tells readers about the homes being “one of Ireland’s enduring moral stains,” where “forced labor for young mothers, high infant mortality rates, pervasive shame and emotional abuse” occurred. The facilities, known as the “Magdalene Homes,” were established in England in 1758 and in Ireland in 1765. Similar homes existed until the 1960s.

Unlike today, where there is no shame for girls who get

pregnant out-of-wedlock, there was back then. Of course, the young girls were required to work—it would have been unethical not to demand that they contribute to their livelihood. Infant mortality rates were common all over Europe during those days—the homes had no monopoly on that.

Watkins just doesn't get it. She contends that the homes were horrid, yet she admits that Tully returned to the same Tuam home after she got pregnant again! Why would she do that? Was she a masochist? Or was she being prudent? It was obviously the latter—she admitted that the father was “not the marrying type.”

Moreover, Watkins is apparently unaware that the McAleese Report on the Magdalene Laundries, a government study published in 2013, found that the women were not abused and that the conditions were not “prison like,” as critics have contended. In fact, they were relatively good.

Regarding the mass graves hoax, Watkins writes, “In 2017, a mass unmarked grave was discovered in a septic tank at St. Mary's, which was shut down in 1961. Within it were the bodies of at least 796 children.”

This is simply wrong. The allegation that a “mass grave” was found was first made in 2014, not three years later. That is when a “local historian,” Catherine Corless, made this claim (she is actually a typist who has no academic credentials). What Watkins is referring to is the 2017 statement on this subject made by the Mother and Baby Commission. [What she failed to say is that it made no mention of a mass grave.](#)

There never was a “mass grave.” As I previously detailed, Douglas Dalby, a *New York Times* reporter, quoted what Barry Sweeney said (he is one of the sources who testified about what he found when he was 10 years old). “People are making out we saw a mass grave. But we can only say what we seen [sic]: maybe 15 to 20 small skeletons.”

The septic tank story is also bogus. Dr. Finbar McCormick, who teaches at the School of Geography, Archeology and Palaeoecology at Queens University in Belfast, said the so-called septic tank was “more likely to be a shaft burial vault.” He said that “Many maternal hospitals in Ireland had a communal burial place for stillborn children or those who died soon after birth. These were sometimes in a nearby graveyard but more often in a special area within the grounds of a hospital.”

It does not speak well for the *New York Times* to peddle such trash.

Contact the newspaper's executive editor, Joseph Kahn: joekahn@nytimes.com

Catholic leaders respond to President Trump over AI image of himself as pope

Bill in the News (Catholic News Agency): In a news release, Bill Donohue, the president of the Catholic League, called the image “dumb, but not bigoted.”

“What Trump did was silly, but it was hardly an expression of bigotry,” Donohue said. “We deal with real cases of anti-Catholicism at the Catholic League, not junior-league pranks.” [READ MORE HERE](#)

TRUMP POSING AS POPE WAS DUMB, NOT BIGOTED

Bill Donohue

When I learned of President Trump posting an AI-generated image of himself dressed as the pope, I told a CBS reporter that it was dumb, but not bigoted. Here's why.

What Trump did was analogous to what Whoopi Goldberg did in playing a nun in "Sister Act." While I have criticized her for some comments she has made about priests, I have never criticized her for "Sister Act."

There are Halloween costumes of nuns that are playful, but not malicious. I never address them. But I have objected to some that are vulgar. There is a difference. Context matters, and to some extent so does intent.

"Saturday Night Live" had good fun with Trump's "pope" stunt, and that is all fine and good. On the other hand, it is bizarre to see left-wing Democrats like Bill Kristol getting exercised about Trump, but they never open their mouth when egregious examples of Catholic bashing occur. Just recently, Bill Maher mocked the Eucharist, the heart of Catholicism, and Trump's critics said nothing.

We don't play favorites at the Catholic League. I recently wrote a letter to the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Ethics Committee asking for a House censure of Republican Rep. Marjorie Taylor Greene. She noted that on April 21 there were "major shifts in global leadership. Evil is being defeated by the hand of God." As *Newsweek* reported, that was the day Pope Francis died and Klaus Schwab resigned from the World Economic

Forum.

As I said to the House Ethics Committee leaders, “It is obvious that Greene’s remark about God defeating ‘evil’ was aimed at the Holy Father. How can we be sure? In 2022, I asked the Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Ethics Committee to sanction Greene for saying, ‘Satan’s controlling the church.’ In short, she has a history of slandering Catholics.”

We are working with the staff of U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi, supplying them with documents that offer proof of anti-Christian bias stemming from the federal government. We are dealing with serious matters, e.g., legislation that would force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgery.

What Trump did was silly, but it was hardly an expression of bigotry. We deal with real cases of anti-Catholicism at the Catholic League, not junior league pranks.

FRANCIS’ LEGACY: THE GOOD, THE BAD, AND THE UGLY | BILL DONOHUE

Conor Gallagher, CEO of TAN Books (Saint Benedict Press), recently interviewed Bill Donohue at their headquarters in Charlotte, North Carolina. It was a wide-ranging and thought-provoking conversation about the legacy of Pope Francis, the rise of the Latin Mass, and what lies ahead for the Catholic Church.

Bill Donohue doesn’t hold back—offering decades of insight on:

- The media's misquotes and manipulation of Pope Francis
- Internal contradictions in Vatican policy
- The future challenges the next pope will face
- Why the Latin Mass is making a comeback

If you're a serious Catholic or care about the future of the Church, this is a must-watch episode.

To watch click, [here](#).

"The Conor Gallagher Show"

Conor Gallagher, CEO of TAN Books (Saint Benedict Press), recently interviewed Bill Donohue at their headquarters in Charlotte, North Carolina. It was a wide-ranging and thought-provoking conversation about the legacy of Pope Francis, the rise of the Latin Mass, and what lies ahead for the Catholic Church. To watch, click [here](#).

DAVID HOROWITZ, R.I.P.

[Bill Donohue](#)

David Horowitz, the former radical turned conservative, died April 29 after battling cancer. He was 86. He was a good friend, a brilliant speaker and writer, and a man of tremendous courage.

David was born and raised in Queens. To this day, when I take the Long Island Rail Road leaving Manhattan, passing into

Queens, I look out the window and see the sign for Skillman Avenue. I think of David—that is where he grew up, in Long Island City.

His parents were diehard communists, and raised him as a “Red Diaper Baby.” Their indoctrination paid off, at least initially. In the 1960s and 1970s, he was a leader of the New Left, stoking anti-Americanism. He befriended Huey Newton, founder of the Black Panther Party, but later split with them once he learned they were involved in the death of a friend of his, Betty Van Patter.

David, and his friend, Peter Collier, founded *Ramparts*, a radical magazine that cheered for a communist victory in Vietnam. But as he watched what the communists did in Vietnam, his enthusiasm for Marxism soured. The final straw came in the late 1970s when Pol Pot murdered two-in-five of his fellow Cambodians. This shook him intellectually.

Then came the election of Ronald Reagan. This further triggered the reset: David became a rabid pro-American conservative. In 1987, he held a “Second Thoughts Conference” in Washington D.C. This is where he, and other ex-New Left activists, explained why they had had “Second Thoughts” about their political philosophy. Communist genocide has a way of shaking honest people up.

In the early 1990s, he and Peter founded *Heterodoxy*, a brilliant monthly that broke new grounds. Later in the decade, the David Horowitz Freedom Center was launched, and with it the influential publication, *FrontPage* magazine.

Peter had made such a turnaround that he called me at the Catholic League in the late 1990s to congratulate me on my work. More important, he said he made his way back to Catholicism.

It was about that time when David asked me to speak at a conference in Los Angeles that would assess the cultural

impact that Hollywood was having. I was scheduled to be there anyway—Jeffrey Katzenberg invited me to review his yet-to-be released movie, *Prince of Egypt* (which I applauded), so I agreed.

It was an enormous room—full of actors, producers and directors—and virtually all of the speakers put a positive face on Hollywood. Until I spoke. After I finished with my remarks, the man sitting next to me on the platform turned to me and said, “They are going to have to get extra security to escort you out of here.”

What did I say that upset the elites? I told them they were a bunch of phonies. One after another, I said, you came to the microphone to tell us that you don’t allow your children to watch the television shows that you make. No, you said, your children watch Nickelodeon. I asked, “So whose children are your shows good for?” They knew exactly what I meant. The room was dead silent. But David loved it.

David was fond of saying that many conservatives don’t get it. They are so nice. The problem with that is they seriously underestimate how vicious the Left is. They need to toughen up. They don’t understand how driven and malicious radicals are.

In more recent years, David wrote a blurb for one my books, and I endorsed one of his. He was always honest and full of energy.

As he grew intellectually, David, who was Jewish, became a staunch advocate of Christianity. He saw the cultural rot that militant secularism wrought, concluding that an ascendant Christianity was badly needed.

Not surprisingly, the Left turned on him, hating his slide to conservatism. But he didn’t care—all he cared about was telling the truth.

America has lost a great one. I was honored to have known David Horowitz as a friend. May he rest in peace.

MAHER MOCKS EUCHARIST

[Michael P. McDonald](#)

While most people treated the news of the passing of Pope Francis with somberness and dignity, notorious Catholic-basher Bill Maher could not keep himself from making crude and irreverent comments. On the April 25 episode of “Real Time,” the bigoted HBO host used the eve of the papal funeral to insult a central tenet of the Catholic faith, the Eucharist.

On Friday, Maher began talking about Pope Francis with some of the clichéd lines about priests that we have seen far too often from him. He seems to think it is the pinnacle of wit to say that “the outpouring of grief” for the pope has led to priests asking altar boys to “just hold me.”

Continuing this theme, later while Maher was trying to explain why conservatives had disagreements with Pope Francis, he ran through a litany of things that supposedly conservatives found infuriating about the late-Holy Father. One thing that supposedly got the goat of conservatives, according to Maher, was Pope Francis’ “child sex ring took the focus off Hillary’s child sex ring.”

What really stood out on Maher’s list were his loutish remarks about the Eucharist. Maher went on to say that another thing that Pope Francis did to raise the ire of conservatives was that he advocated for “men eating another man’s body.” At that exact moment, on screen appeared an image of Pope Francis consecrating the Eucharist.

To take a sacrament and a core pillar of Catholicism and turn it into some sort of sick, sexualized “joke” is grotesque, but to provide such an insult at the moment 1.4 billion Catholics around the world are commemorating the death of Pope Francis is beyond the pale.

Maher is an irreverent bigot who has not been funny in years. As his star continues to diminish, he is forced to rely on mean-spirited attacks to get cheap chuckles from the handful of people who still find him interesting.

Contact Maher's director of media relations:
Ashley.Mokma@wbd.com

MISSION CREEP IN LEFT-WING ORGANIZATIONS

Bill Donohue

What happens when an organization achieves its goal? It either folds or it develops a new one. The March of Dimes was founded to cure polio, and when the Salk vaccine proved effective, those who worked there could have declared victory and packed up their bags and left. But they didn't. Instead, they chose a new mission: combating birth defects and infant mortality.

When it comes to civil rights organizations, this situation is much trickier.

Prejudice and discrimination exist in many quarters of America. People are still treated unfairly on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, sex, age, disability, and the like, but in almost every instance there has been much progress. A

related, though separate, issue is the perception of progress. It is entirely possible for people of one demographic group or another to feel they are still treated unfairly when objective measures prove otherwise.

The progress made by minorities and women—in every aspect of society—is undeniably impressive. So much so that organizations founded to protect their civil rights have often experienced mission creep. Flush with money, they find themselves treading into new territories, seeking to address the latest civil rights issue. It helps enormously when big bucks are involved.

A case in point is the discovery of LGBT rights by organizations that were never founded—even remotely—to deal with this issue. But the fact that they are spending so much more time addressing the gay and transgender agenda is a sign that they have made tremendous progress in achieving their original goal. But they will never admit it. Victim advocates need victims.

For a majority of these groups, their shift to LGBT issues began in the late 2000s and early 2010s. At this point, the issue of gay rights, particularly marriage equality, was beginning to become a major civil rights issue. Soon the issue of transgender rights took center stage.

The following organizations have drifted into the LGBT arena. They are listed chronological in terms of when they embraced gay and transgender rights.

NAACP Legal Defense Fund

Year founded: 1940

Original mission: To secure laws that advance racial equality.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 1990s.

Actions taken: Starting in 1996, it filed amicus briefs in cases that affected the rights of lesbians and gay men. It later fought for marriage equality.

Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights

Year founded: 1950

Original mission: The Conference's original mission was "grounded in commitment to social justice and the firm conviction that the struggle for civil rights would be won not by one group, but through coalition." It focused mostly on civil rights for African Americans.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 2003

Actions taken: Its first foray defending LGBT rights came in 2003 when it applauded the Supreme Court's decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*, which offered new rights for gays and lesbians.

NAACP

Year founded: 1909

Original mission: To fight for racial equality.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 2008

Actions taken: In 2008 the NAACP's California state chapter opposed the state's Proposition 8. It later defended marriage equality.

National Urban League

Year founded: 1910

Original mission: To fight for racial equality.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 2009

Actions taken: Its first goal was to fight for the

Hate Crimes Prevention Act.

ADL

Year founded: 1913

Original mission: To combat anti-Semitism.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 2010

Actions taken: It filed an amicus brief in a marriage equality case.

National Women's Law Center

Year founded: 1972

Original mission: To fight for the rights of women.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 2012

Actions taken: In October 2012, it released a fact sheet on Title IX protections for LGBT and gender non-conforming students. It later became more active in combating discrimination.

The Ruth Bader Ginsburg Center for Liberty at the ACLU

Year founded: In 1972, Ruth Bader Ginsburg founded the Women's Rights Project at the ACLU. In 2010, the Center for Liberty, which included the Women's Rights Project, was established. In 2020, the Center was renamed the Ruth Bader Ginsburg Center for Liberty.

Original mission: To fight for women's rights, principally abortion rights. It has since taken up the cause of gay and transgender people.

First mention of LGBT advocacy: 2015

Actions taken: To fight for passage of the Equality Act.

It is one thing for sister organizations to form coalitions; it is quite another when they engage in mission creep. But when there isn't enough work for employees to do, they must find new avenues to explore. Add to this the lure of foundation money, and the temptation is irresistible.

One more thing. Notice none of these left-wing civil rights organizations ever experience mission creep by taking up the cause of anti-Catholicism. That is not a civil rights issue that exercises them.

POPE FRANCIS AND THE POOR

Bill Donohue

Here's a thought experiment.

There are two teachers. One is known for his compassion for struggling students, but he is not a gifted teacher, and as a result his students do poorly in school. The other is known as lacking in compassion, but he is a gifted teacher, and as a result his students do well in school.

There are two doctors. One is known for his compassionate bedside manners, but he is not a gifted doctor, and as a result his patients suffer. The other lacks bedside manners, but is regarded as a gifted doctor, and as a result his patients thrive.

Ideally, we would all like to be served by compassionate and competent teachers and doctors, but when given the choices afforded by the thought experiment, who would really choose the compassionate yet incompetent teacher or doctor over their insensitive yet competent counterparts?

No one doubts that Pope Francis showed great compassion for the poor. Indeed, that is one of the most heralded aspects of his legacy. But his harsh criticisms of capitalism, and his affinity for socialism, must be taken into account.

It is undeniably true that capitalism has done more to induce upward social mobility and alleviate poverty than any economic system in history. It is also undeniably true that socialism has proven to be the greatest generator of poverty in the world.

In capitalist countries, the leaders may talk more about economic efficiency than the interests of the poor, yet their free market policies invariably prove beneficial to them. The leaders in socialist countries talk a great deal about the interests of the poor, yet their statist policies invariably prove harmful to the poor.

In short, rhetoric means little in the end if the policies that are pursued result in failure.

When Mao took over in 1949, he dressed like a peasant and talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, he owned 50 villas, and devastated the economy with his socialist policies.

When Fidel Castro, an affluent lawyer, took over in Cuba in 1959, he dressed down and talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, he lived the high life and devastated the economy with his socialist policies.

When the Sandinistas took over in Nicaragua in 1979, they donned fatigues and talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, they live in palaces and have devastated the economy with their socialist policies.

When Nicolás Maduro took over in Venezuela in 2019, he talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, he is living a luxurious lifestyle and has devastated the economy

with his socialist policies.

Pope Francis meant well in showing compassion for the poor. But his understanding of economics was not his strong suit, and the economic policies he championed did more to punish the poor than help them. On that score, the next pope has to do better.