

MET MUSEUM OF ART BOWS TO MUSLIMS

The Catholic League supports the accommodation of religion, whether it be in public or private venues. But we find it bizarre, if not troubling, when venues not known to accommodate religious expression decide to do so by singling out one religion. This is what the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City has done. The religion it is singling out is Islam.

On the first floor, in Room 961 of the Robert Lehman Collection, in between paintings of the Virgin Mary with baby Jesus, there is a standup sign that reads as follows:

For the month
of Ramadan
we invite you
to use this space
for prayer and
reflection

All are welcome

We have a hard time imagining the Met welcoming Catholics. But if they did, we have a suggestion. Why not erect the following sign? For the 40 days
of Lent,
we invite you
to use this space
for prayer and
reflection

All are welcome

What makes the Muslim-only policy even more inexplicable is how out-of-character it is. While the Met has long featured

religious iconography, it also has a reputation of promoting raunch.

In October 2023, the Great Hall of the Met displayed gay bondage and sado-masochistic imagery. It used obscenities, and slogans such as, “May you fill yourself with lust,” to describe what the *New York Post* said were “images of seemingly naked males with their genitals blurred out and men standing over other men who appear to be wearing dog collars.”

One woman who spotted this “artistic creation” said, “I saw a wasteland ‘Mad Max’ scenario with people dressed in S&M gear and others who looked as if they were fornicating with the earth.” She said a portrayal of women was so sick that “It looked Satanic and demonic to me.”

Leaving aside the Met’s fondness for gay sexual expression, why does it feel obliged to welcome Muslims during Ramadan but not Catholics during Lent? Is this its idea of multiculturalism? We have long known that this ideology has less to do with paying tribute to religious and ethnic groups outside our Judeo-Christian heritage than it does in devaluing it.

The Met’s elite must feel very good about themselves. Their goal, no doubt, is to showcase their commitment to inclusion and diversity. But bowing to Muslims, by excluding Catholics, shows how morally bankrupt their commitment really is.

MUSLIM WOMAN QUILTS TRUMP’S

RELIGION PANEL

Sameerah Munshi quit President Trump's Religious Liberty Commission on March 13. She cited "two deeply troubling developments: the official removal of Carrie Prejean Boller for her deeply held beliefs about Palestine and the federal government's illegal war against Iran, undertaken without clear constitutional or congressional authorization."

The Council on American-Islamic Relations, (CAIR), rushed to defend both women, saying they were the ones who "actually stand up for religious liberty." They commended Munshi for her courage and said it was "unconscionable" that the White House would remove Prejean for her remarks on "Israel's genocide in Gaza."

On February 11, the Catholic League called for the Religious Liberty Commission to oust Prejean Boller; minutes later it did. We did so for reasons that both Munshi and CAIR refuse to acknowledge.

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

It just wasn't just this remark that got Prejean Boller into hot water. She blamed Jews for killing Christ, again without qualification, and was known to show up at meetings wearing a Palestinian flag pin. In other words, she is an activist, not someone sincerely committed to religious liberty.

Munshi's comment about the "illegal" war against Iran makes her sound sophomoric. There have been five wars declared by Congress in American history: War of 1812, Mexican-American

War, Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. There is nothing illegal about U.S. operations in Iran.

We are delighted that both of these women are no longer on the panel. How they got by those doing the vetting remains a problem. For example, Munshi flashed “Free Palestine” on her social media platforms, and did so after October 7, 2023. That is when 1200 innocent Jewish men, women and children were slaughtered by Hamas. That should have been a red flag, but apparently it wasn't.

MODERN MAN'S MONSTROUS FALL

Kyle Nazareth

George J. Marlin, *Modern Monsters: Political Ideologues and Their War Against the Catholic Church* (St. Augustine's Press)

The Council of Trent, which refuted and condemned the errors of the Reformation, defined original sin as “the death of the soul.” George J. Marlin's *Modern Monsters: Political Ideologues and Their War Against the Catholic Church* is the story of that death's modern resurrection. His thesis is that ideology is a fake religion: a rigid, abstract formula that promises worldly perfection by placing humanity in control of its destiny and nature. While faith looks beyond the finite world to a higher reality, ideology turns inward, making man the measure of all things, and politics the tool of salvation.

Across thirteen chapters, Marlin traces how this project was carried out by a succession of thinkers – from Martin Luther and Niccolo Machiavelli through the utilitarians to G.W.F Hegel and the totalitarians – each adding a new layer to the ideological tower of terror. Each chapter systematically

surveys an ideology's core beliefs, its consequences for society, its incompatibility with Church teachings, and its targeting of the Church as the principal obstacle to its vision. The result is a comprehensive philosophical history of the West over the past five centuries, told from the Catholic perspective.

Marlin documents how each thinker explicitly rejected Aristotle and St. Thomas Aquinas. Read together, a deeper pattern emerges. The modern monsters' war on the Church is, at its root, a war on her intellectual heritage: Aristo-Thomism. This great synthesis of Aristotelian philosophy and Thomistic theology harmonized faith and reason into a unified vision of truth.

To introduce a few of Marlin's modern monsters:

Martin Luther: "Patient zero" in the rebellion against the Catholic Church. Luther's Reformation challenged Church authority and the supernatural law by championing salvation through faith alone, personal interpretation of Scripture, and individual spiritual sovereignty. This privatized religion, justified the divine right of kings, catalyzed the decline of Christendom, and gave rise to the secular liberal state and religious pluralism.

Luther was a nominalist, meaning he denied the existence of objective, universal truths. Consequently, he rejected the three pillars of natural law: man's free will and moral agency, nature's rational and observable order, and nature's inherent purpose. To Luther, reason was pagan, logic had no place in theology, and the mind was a "whore." He despised Aristotle, whom he called "the destroyer of godly doctrine," and wanted his philosophy destroyed; he called St. Thomas' theology "dung" and branded him a heretic. Luther fired the opening shot in the war against the union of faith and reason.

Marlin shows that Luther was not merely a religious reformer

but the architect of a new movement, creating the template for every subsequent ideologue. He quotes political theorist Dante Germino: "Luther prefigures the age of ideologies."

Niccolò Machiavelli: Marlin casts Machiavelli as the first fully modern political ideologue. A Renaissance thinker, Machiavelli believed not in God, but in power and chance. He completely liberated politics from Christian morality, denied the objectivity of truth, and replaced virtue with pragmatism: no "should," no "good," or "bad," only what works.

Where Luther attacked the Aristo-Thomist tradition from within theology, Machiavelli attacked it from without. Marlin writes that Machiavelli's explicit goal was "the liberation of man from the moral order taught by St. Thomas Aquinas." Luther severed the Church's spiritual authority from public life; Machiavelli went further, completely subordinating spiritual power to worldly power, creating the secular state, and making political glory the new highest good.

René Descartes: Descartes is the first of many Enlightenment thinkers that Marlin profiles. The father of modern philosophy, Descartes was a rationalist, meaning he held that knowledge comes from reason alone, making the individual mind, not God, the new foundation for knowledge. His "Cartesian revolution" shifted Western philosophy away from asking *what* something is (Aristo-Thomist metaphysics) to asking *how* we know (epistemology).

As a pivotal figure in the Scientific Revolution and the inventor of analytic geometry, Descartes sought to explain all of reality through mathematical formulas and the scientific method. Mathematical reason replaced theology as the supreme science. Marlin observes that Cartesianism is the moment the human mind formally declared its independence from God, and philosophy appointed itself the replacement.

John Locke, David Hume, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill:

Locke was the father of liberalism and British empiricism, meaning he rooted knowledge in sense experience rather than Aristo-Thomist metaphysics. He also grounded individual rights in his own conception of God and natural law. Locke limited the state to protecting life, liberty, and property rather than guiding citizens toward the common good. Hume radicalized Locke's empiricism and demoted morality into mere feelings. Bentham and Mill reduced morality to a pleasure-pain calculus. Mill's non-harm principle, justifying coercion only to prevent harm to others, sidelined the common good in favor of individual preference. Their liberalism inflated mankind into its own supreme being, delegitimizing the Church's moral authority. Prioritizing individual preference over the common good paved the way for statism.

G.W.F. Hegel: Hegel is notoriously convoluted and nonsensical, so Marlin accurately characterizes him as a modernist heretic. Like his predecessors, Hegel rejected Aristo-Thomist metaphysics, but took the rebellion even further. He collapsed God into creation and put reality in a constant state of flux, a worldview closer to pantheism and Eastern mysticism than to Christianity.

Hegel's philosophy didn't merely reject the Church and natural law; it replaced them entirely. Hegel deified the state, calling it God on earth marching through history. The state became the source of rights, morality, and the final arbiter of truth. Hegel attributed these ideas to Protestantism. Marlin shows that the logical conclusions of this absolutization of the state are the communist and fascist experiments of the twentieth century.

Overall, Marlin's project is ambitious, tracing over five centuries of ideological rebellion. He sticks the landing remarkably well, making dense philosophy accessible and turning what could be a dry chronology into a vivid indictment of modernity's monsters. Marlin's strength lies in his willingness to let major Catholic thinkers and ideologues

speak in their own words. This gives the work a cumulative authority that a single voice could not achieve. His own prose shines brightly, artfully weaving insightful observations and historical anecdotes into a unified narrative greater than the sum of its parts.

Marlin's narrative makes clear that these modern ideologies are not discrete historical episodes, but successive waves of a single continuous movement. The collective evidence points toward a larger conclusion that the book never quite states outright: since the late Middle Ages, European history's revolt against the Catholic Church has been prosecuted specifically through the systematic dismantling of her intellectual heritage; the integration of faith and reason achieved by St. Thomas upon Aristotle's foundation.

The Reformation and Enlightenment are two sides of the same coin, different in their premises, yet united in their rebellion. Both struck at the same target: natural law, the ground where faith and reason meet. The Reformation toppled natural law's pillars from within Christianity – Luther's idea of original sin denied man's free will and moral agency, scripture alone and faith alone denied that human reason could understand nature, and his nominalism denied that creation had an inherent purpose. The Enlightenment did the same from outside Christianity by rejecting objective morality, advancing skepticism about knowledge beyond reason or the senses, and adopting the idea that reality is only material. Both framed faith and reason as mutually exclusive. These two halves of modernism converged in subjectivism and relativism, making man a law unto himself. From this emerged the totalitarian dictatorships of the twentieth century and today's radical leftist politics.

Pope Benedict XVI, in his Regensburg Address, gave this crisis a name: "dehellenization," the gradual severance of Christianity from Greek thought. But to understand what was severed, we must understand what was built.

From Christianity's very beginning, God formed a union between Greek reason and biblical faith, Athens and Jerusalem, that mutually enriched each other. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, European Christians recovered the Greek philosopher Aristotle's key works from the Muslim world. Catholics recognize Aristotle was a "righteous pagan," whose natural reason reached out to God and readied the world to receive the Gospels. In his honor, a stained glass window in New York City's St. Vincent Ferrer Catholic Church depicts Aristotle with a laurel wreath that doubles as a green halo.

St. Thomas recognized Aristotle's genius, referring to him simply as "the Philosopher." He drew on much of Aristotle's philosophy to support his theology, "baptizing" Aristotle in the Catholic understanding. In doing so, St. Thomas achieved the perfect synthesis between faith and reason. He showed that natural reason can lead to faith's preambles: that God exists, there are laws of nature, and there is goodness, justice, and the common good. But only divine revelation can unveil faith's mysteries: the Trinity, Resurrection, and real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Though distinct in kind, these truths are one in origin, for God is the author of all truth.

The Church has affirmed St. Thomas' synthesis at the highest levels. At the Council of Trent, his *Summa Theologica* was placed on the high altar, second only to Sacred Scripture. In *Aeterni Patris*, Pope Leo XIII declared that reason, borne to its height by St. Thomas, can scarcely rise higher. In *Fides et Ratio*, St. John Paul II wrote that in St. Thomas' thinking, "the demands of reason and the power of faith found the most elevated synthesis ever attained by human thought." The Catechism of the Catholic Church echoes St. Thomas: "There can never be any real discrepancy between faith and reason, since the same God who reveals mysteries and infuses faith has bestowed the light of reason on the human mind. God cannot deny himself, nor can truth ever contradict truth."

This is the Church's intellectual heritage that every modern

monster set out to destroy, which Marlin so painstakingly documents. So far, they are winning. Faith and reason are divorced, both fragmented and impoverished. Faith is seen as sentimental, irrational, and impotent. Reason, though capable of extraordinary technological feats, falters on the deepest questions: the meaning of life, death, man, and God. Humanity may have left the Garden of Eden, but we carried the apple with us, taking repeated bites ever since.

Modern Monsters is a comprehensive guide that Catholics must read to understand how we arrived at this cultural and spiritual moment. To reconcile what the monsters have divorced and restore the union of faith and reason, Catholics must once again study and teach the timeless and sound doctrine of St. Thomas in their personal lives, families, parishes, and universities so that they may defend the Deposit of Faith from another five centuries of chimerical attacks.

Kyle Nazareth is Director of Research at the Catholic League.

CONSERVATIVES ADOPT TRANS LANGUAGE

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 (Tumbler 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.

POST OFFICE MISHAP?

A few months ago Bill Donohue wrote a letter to Kash Patel, the director of the FBI, about anti-Christian acts of violence. He copied Sen. Josh Hawley, Sen. Chuck Grassley and Rep. Jim Jordan. The letter was returned to our office, with a stamp that said it was refused. Really?

We have been in contact with the FBI a lot over the past few years. Under the Biden administration, the FBI was spying on Catholics, and we demanded answers. We have also been in contact with the FBI over reports of anti-Christian bigotry. We never had a problem mailing our correspondence, reports, etc. Until now.

Curiously, the letter that was returned was seriously damaged, but it was not of the ordinary sort, e.g., a tear on the top or bottom that may have occurred as a mishap when going through a machine. No, this was a large hole in the middle of the envelope, right where the name and address was printed. In other words, it was a cut-out, suggesting it was tampered with.

We also sent the letter electronically to the FBI, so they received it. But the problem remains. Our envelope lists our logo, name and address, so it's obvious who sent it. We suspect foul play but we can't prove it. Thought you'd like to know.

MEDIA BIAS MARKS STORY OF TRANS KILLERS

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 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 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?

DOJ ACKNOWLEDGES REPORT

In the last edition of *Catalyst*, we said we contacted the Department of Justice, urging it to prosecute those who invaded Cities Church in St. Paul, Minnesota in January. We received word from the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ that our report “will receive appropriate consideration.”

While it is important to know we are taken seriously, it also matters to the DOJ that organizations like the Catholic League are there to help.

“DEVOUT CATHOLIC”

Ed Martin is an attorney and a Trump appointee who has done some very good work over the years, but he got himself into a pickle with Georgetown University after he raised questions about its diversity and inclusion policies. The school went after him for allegedly overstepping his boundaries. This is interesting, but it is not the reason we are mentioning it.

There was a news story by CBS News that struck us as pure Catholic-baiting. Here is the tweet that Bill Donohue did on this issue.

CBS News reports today that attorney Ed Martin, a Trump appointee, is the subject of an ethics investigation concerning his handling of an incident at Georgetown University. It was noted by reporter Sarah N. Lynch that Martin is “a devout Catholic.” We don’t recall CBS talking

about “devout Methodists,” “devout Jews,” or “devout Muslims.” Nor does CBS talk about “devout secularists.” Just “devout Catholics.” So telling.

We would also like to know how CBS measures devoutness!

ST. PAT'S NYC PARADE STILL BANS PRO-LIFERS

Eleven years after the first gay group marched in New York City's St. Patrick's Day Parade, pro-life Catholics are still not allowed to march. The elites who run the parade are once again showing how little respect they have for the parade's origins, which are rooted in Catholicism.

From 1762 to today, no homosexuals were ever barred from marching in the St. Patrick's Day Parade. Beginning in the early 1990s, it was gays who *falsely claimed victim status* because they were not allowed to march *under their own banner*. Neither were any other demographic or ideological group, including pro-life Catholics. This explains why from the mid-1990s to the mid-2010s, Bill Donohue went on radio and TV saying the parade was no more anti-gay than it was anti-pro-life (he had been asked by parade officials to be their unofficial spokesman). That all changed in 2015.

In the late summer of 2014, Donohue was asked by parade organizers if he would object if a gay group were allowed to march under its own banner in 2015. It was their parade, he said, but he had his integrity to protect: If gays can march under their own banner, then pro-life Catholics must be treated the same way. Donohue was told by John Fitzsimons, a lawyer whom he considered to be a friend, not to worry—they

would be included as well.

Fitzsimons lied. In short order, John Lahey, president of Quinnipiac University and vice chairman of the parade committee, announced that OUT@NBCUniversal, a group of gay NBC employees, would be marching (the chairman of the parade, John Dunleavy, a retired transit worker, was pushed aside by the elite sharks on the committee).

Lahey said other gay groups could also apply. More important, he said that no pro-life groups would be marching. Having been double-crossed, Donohue pulled the Catholic League contingent from marching; we had been doing so for two decades.

So how did OUT@NBCUniversal get a monopoly on marching, when other gay groups wanted in? The NBC group never had to apply—it was selected. All the others were denied. The NBC group was chosen because another member of the parade ruling class, Francis X. Comerford, was the chief revenue officer at NBC and NBC televised the parade; he was also a former grand marshal of the parade. He made sure he got his boys to march, and no one else.

Why, after all these years, are pro-life Catholics not allowed to march under their own banner? John Aidan Byrne is the head of Irish Pro-Life USA. For the last decade he has petitioned the organizers of the St. Patrick's Day Parade in New York City to allow his group to march under their own banner, but he has been summarily denied. He did so again recently. One parade organizer told him, "Ask City Hall."

This is a deceitful dodge. City Hall does not run the parade. As the Supreme Court said in 1995, in a unanimous decision, this is a private parade and the organizers set their own rules. End of story. Or at least it should be. The only reason it is not the end of the story is because parade elites see no PR bounce from letting pro-life Catholics march. But they will lay down with gays, and in doing so they get what they really

want—the applause of secular elites, whom they emulate.

In other words, although the parade celebrates its Irish Catholic origins, the potentates who run it want to neuter its Catholic roots. This explains why they don't want pro-life groups to march, but are fine with gay groups. They know, as well as everyone else, that no religion has stood more consistently for the rights of the unborn than Catholicism. That's why they distance themselves from pro-life Catholics—it invites secular elites to think they are like them. And that is not something they can stomach.

MAMDANI RIPS OFF ST. PATRICK'S DAY

New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani made an 11th-hour decision to march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade, an event he previously eschewed for political reasons. But he couldn't resist bringing his politics to bear at a breakfast he hosted at Gracie Mansion, kicking off the St. Patrick's Day festivities.

Mamdani's obsession with demonizing Israel was on full display. He whined about the "deafening silence from so many" about the "genocide" in Palestine. Thus did he hijack St. Patrick's Day celebrations by turning them into a radical Muslim rant.

He fooled no one by inviting the former president of Ireland, Mary Robinson, to be there. She is a hard-core leftist who not only sides with the enemies of Israel, she sides with the enemies of the Catholic Church on matters sexual.

Mamdani is a master of the politics of victimization. He delighted his left-wing Irish friends by saying, "The story of the Irish, both in Ireland and in New York City, is at one time a story of oppression, of subjugation, and of discrimination."

This is the mentality of the Left—they see oppression everywhere. But this is *our* day, not his, and it is a joyful one. His interest in exploiting our day for his own political capital is sickening.