

SECULARISTS ARE GAMING THE COURTS

There is nothing new about die-hard secularists trying to game the courts. They typically like to say that their newly found group qualifies as a religion and is therefore entitled to the same First Amendment protections afforded Christians and members of other recognized religions.

However, there is something novel about Hoosier Jews for Choice arguing that their religious beliefs demand that their adherents have a religious right to abort their baby. This invocation is occasioned by a restrictive abortion law in Indiana.

Hoosier Jews for Choice says that its Jewish members champion abortion rights and bodily autonomy, and, most important, they argue that their religious beliefs require access to abortion. They say that “under Jewish law and religious doctrine, life does not begin at conception and a fetus is considered a physical part of a woman’s body, not having a life of its own or independent rights.”

Leaving aside the overriding biological issue, the most salient legal matter before the court is whether this entity is truly a religious organization. Of secondary importance is whether this belief is an accurate reflection of Jewish convictions.

Is abortion access a Jewish value? Yes, according to the Women’s Rabbinic Network it is. But don’t tell that to Agudath Israel of America and other Orthodox Jewish groups. They opposed *Roe v. Wade* and are staunchly pro-life. Even those religious Jews who allow that abortion is acceptable under certain circumstances maintain that abortion is never something to celebrate. Indeed, they say that saving lives is

what guides Jews, not ending it.

If Hoosier Jews for Choice qualifies as a religion, and its women must have access to abortion, what if it claimed that the parents of newborns should have the right to kill their kids until their offspring are 28 days old? That's what Princeton professor Peter Singer believes. While he is a Jewish atheist, there is no reason why Hoosier Jews for Choice couldn't reach the same conclusion, invoking religious reasons for infanticide.

This begs the question: What is the legal definition of religion? It has already been decided by the Supreme Court that Secular Humanism is not a religion. Moreover, declarations of a religion can be made by anyone, but are they legally valid?

According to the District Court of Colorado, for a belief system to qualify as a religion, it must possess five characteristics: (a) it must address ultimate ideas (b) it must contain metaphysical beliefs (c) it must prescribe a particular moral or ethical system (d) it must involve comprehensive beliefs and (e) it must be accompanied by accoutrements of religion. Fortunately, this is not a legal bar that is easy to clear.

Regarding the latter, this would require such factors as having (a) a founder (b) seminal writings (c) designated gathering places (d) keepers of knowledge (e) ceremonies and rituals (f) an organized structure (g) holidays (h) dietary rules (i) prescribed religious clothing and (j) opportunities for propagation. These strictures alone would screen out many fraudsters. Hopefully, they nix Hoosier Jews for Choice.

What makes this case so rich is that the ACLU brought it to the Indiana courts. It has typically sought to restrict religious rights, not expand them. It was founded in 1920 by an atheist, Roger Baldwin, and it never listed religious

liberty as one of its original ten goals, though it did list freedom of speech, assembly and the press.

In short, the ACLU is a dishonest broker trying to game the courts, while seeking to deny the right of unborn babies to live. That they are wrapping their case in religious garb makes it all the more depraved.

MIRANDA DEVINE BEATS AI

We deal with issues all the time that require multiple rounds of fact checking. That's because there are so many bogus comments, stories, reports and studies that have surfaced that it makes us skeptical. There is no substitute for doing your own homework.

The latest "arbiter" of truth is AI. From our perspective, AI is a useful tool, but it is no more dispositive than any other resource. This is particularly true when it is generating interpretative responses, or making normative judgments about persons or events.

Here is one example where AI did not fare well. We sought to evaluate a comment recently made by Miranda Devine, a columnist for the *New York Post*.

In her April 2 column, Devine wrote the following:

"When a black cop, Michael Byrd, shot dead an unarmed white woman, Iraq war veteran Ashli Babbitt, on January 6, 2021 during the Capitol riot, Democrats conspired to hide his identity, pay him secret bonuses, and ensure he suffered no consequences."

Asking Google AI to evaluate the veracity of Devine's

statement generated this response: “The claim is largely false or misleading, mixing verified facts with unsupported conspiracy allegations.” The response also notes “there is no evidence of a partisan conspiracy to hide his identity or provide secret bonuses.”

The AI response offers these points as evidence for its claims:

“Shooting Fact: U.S. Capitol Police Lt. Michael Byrd shot and killed Air Force veteran Ashli Babbitt on January 6, 2021, as she attempted to climb through a broken window near the Speaker’s Lobby while lawmakers were being evacuated.

“No Consequences/Clearance: The U.S. Department of Justice (April 2021) and the Capitol Police Office of Professional Responsibility (August 2021) concluded the shooting was lawful, within department policy, and did not violate criminal law. Byrd was not disciplined and was later promoted to captain.

“Hidden Identity & Threats: Byrd’s identity was not ‘hidden’ by Democrats, but rather withheld for months by Capitol Police due to ‘numerous credible and specific threats’ against him and his family after his name was leaked on right-wing websites.

“Secret Bonuses: While Byrd has been praised by his department, claims of ‘secret bonuses’ to reward the shooting are largely unsupported or misinterpret standard department retention or security actions.

“Pardon Claim: Claims that Joe Biden granted a ‘secret pardon’ to Byrd are false; Reuters reports that Byrd’s name does not appear on any official pardon lists.”

We investigated Google’s AI statement and found it wanting.

“Shooting Fact:”

This is an accurate summary.

“No Consequences/Clearance:”

As AI notes, Byrd was investigated by Capitol Police and the Justice Department for the shooting. Both investigations cleared him of wrongdoing. But as Judicial Watch president Tom Fitton points out, in most officer involved shootings the cop is usually investigated by a grand jury. In this instance, Byrd faced no such scrutiny. Rather, he was investigated by his own agency and the Justice Department. This may be defensible, but it is in stark contrast to how Black Lives Matter offenses are handled. Grand juries are typically demanded to ensure there is no cover-up. Apparently, AI cannot make this connection.

“Hidden Identity & Threats:”

AI tries to make a technical distinction between the Capitol Police and Congress. Yes, technically the Capitol Police withheld Byrd’s identity. However, as the attorney for the Babbitt family, Terrell Roberts, claimed, “The U.S. Congress wants to protect this man. He’s got friends in high places, and they want to protect him.” AI did not seem to believe this information was worthy of consideration.

“Secret Bonuses:”

It was later disclosed that Byrd received a \$37,000 retention bonus, and that he received help accessing funds for officers wounded in the line of duty. But this was not well reported, and indeed it was kept under wraps for some time. The chairman of the Capitol Police Union complained that the bonuses were above what other officers received. This prompted the union boss to call on Capitol Police to either give everyone else the same bonus that Byrd received or force him to repay the excess amount.

“Pardon Claim:”

This is a red herring. Devine never said he received a pardon. Thus, no correction was needed. AI could just as well have told us that Byrd was suspended for leaving his loaded firearm in a public restroom in the Capitol, or that he was disciplined for shooting at a moving car while he was off-duty. In other words, AI not only makes a false comment, it makes no mention of relevant facts.

In the showdown between Miranda Devine and AI, she wins going away.

MARIAN MIRACLES MARK MEMORIAL DAY

[Bill Donohue](#)

It defies rational explanation, but then again not everything worth believing passes the rational smell test. We're not talking about magic; we're talking about miracles. Magic involves tricks. Miracles do not—they involve divine inspiration, which is beyond ordinary comprehension.

Memorial Day is defined by one AI platform as “a time for remembrances and reflection, often marked by stories of miraculous events and divine interventions.” Not bad for a robot.

It is worth nothing this Memorial Day two recent news stories which are believable to Catholics, if not to those whose only God is science (yet some inexplicably insist there are 59 different genders). The stories speak to death and destruction.

In March, John Petrovich was doing his Saturday morning run in a Pittsburgh neighborhood when he passed a house where there was an ambulance in the driveway. As was his wont, he made the Sign of the Cross and said a "Hail Mary."

Several days later he ran by the same house and a woman at the edge of the driveway waved to him and asked him to stop. She thanked him for saving her life. He was puzzled and asked how this happened.

She said that when he first ran by her house, she felt she was dying, but before she landed in a hospital bed "she got a vision of Jesus who came to her, and said, 'It's okay. Everything is going to be fine. You're going to be fine because this person prayed for you.'" She continued, saying, "On the palm of his hand was your face—on Jesus' hand. And I thought, 'I have to thank you for saving my life.'" He was speechless.

On May 10, there was a big fire at Mother of Christ Specialist Hospital in the Diocese of Enugu; it is named after the Nigerian town. Just about everything was lost for good. The reception area, administrative offices, the doctor's lounge, etc. were leveled. Computers, printers, scanners and documents were all destroyed, as were televisions, refrigerators and furniture of all sorts. But not everything was decimated.

A prized statue of Our Blessed Mother, one that was passed from one department to another for devotional practices every three months, survived intact amid the flames.

One of the nuns, Maria, was struck by what happened. Her own office was also spared. "No smell of smoke, no flame, nothing. I started shouting, crying, and singing because I realized this was a great miracle." She said this incident had a great effect on Protestants, not just Catholics in the area. She concluded, "Those who did not believe in the intercession of Mary should know that she is still interceding for us."

Memorial Day honors those who gave their lives to protect our freedom. For Catholics, we also have some miraculous events to ponder.

TRUMP IS RIGHT ABOUT RELIGION AND CRIME

[Bill Donohue](#)

President Trump ignited his critics again, such as Huff Post, when he opined on May 19, “When you have religion, you have less crime. It’s like, ‘Gee, I want to go to heaven, so I’m not going to do this or that.’ Who knows?”

His observation about religion and crime is accurate: there is a mountain of evidence that shows an inverse relationship between religious ideas and practices (religiosity) and crime, meaning the more religious the person is the less likely he is to engage in crime. Trump’s attempt to explain why falls short, but he is on the right track.

My own sociological research on this issue, as evidenced in [*The Catholic Advantage: How Health, Happiness and Heaven Await the Faithful*](#), found that the Three “B’s,” beliefs, bonds and boundaries, are positively related to the Three “H’s,” health, happiness and heaven.

With regard to crime, those who hold to religious beliefs, have strong bonds and recognize behavioral boundaries, are much less likely to participate in criminal behavior than those who are non-believers, have tenuous bonds with others and fail to observe boundaries.

Duke University psychiatrist Harold G. Koenig is coauthor of the most respected work in the field, *Handbook of Religion and Health*. His team looked at the research and found that in 91 percent of the studies, there was an inverse relationship between religiosity and delinquency or crime. In a research study released after this project, 100 percent of the studies found a significant difference between religious students and those who were not religious.

We have known of the connection between religion and crime since at least the late nineteenth century when French sociologist Emile Durkheim noted that the strong bonds that religious-minded people form act as a social control mechanism, leading to fewer criminal acts. Moreover, the norms and values associated with religiosity ensure greater compliance with standards of civility.

Durkheim's thesis has been put to empirical tests by sociologists such as Travis Hirshi and Michael Gottfredson. They found that social control, which religion abets, accounts for less crime. To put it differently, those who have weak ties to social groups are left isolated and are therefore more likely to disregard the rights of others. Lacking moral rules, they allow their base appetites to rule.

Beliefs matter but if they are not accompanied by practice—by attending religious services—their influence is significantly lower. That is because, as University of Texas at San Antonio sociologist John Bartkowski found, those who attend religious services exhibit better social control and social skills.

Critics of Trump's observation on the relationship between religion and crime know nothing of the sociological research in this field. If they were not reflexively anti-Trump, they would not make comments that make them look patently stupid.

ARE DEMOCRATS PHOBIC ABOUT RELIGION? NO, IT'S WORSE

[Bill Donohue](#)

A new Pew Research Center survey, "How Americans Feel About Religion's Influence in Government and Public Life," reveals that Republicans and Democrats seriously disagree on the public role of religion. What the survey does not disclose is why. Before addressing this issue, it is important to recognize areas of general agreement.

Most Americans (8-in-10) think churches should not endorse political candidates, and most (54 percent) think government should enforce separation of church and state (only 13 percent want government to *stop* separation of church and state). Despite media reports to the contrary, only 10 percent of Americans have a positive view of "Christian nationalism" (6-in-10 never heard of it).

Is religion's influence gaining or losing influence in America life? The poll found that 37 percent say it is gaining while 61 percent say it is losing. But is it a good thing or a bad thing that 37 percent say it is gaining influence? This matters because this figure is the highest share since 2002.

More than half of Americans (55 percent) have a positive view of religion's influence on American life; the rest are split between those who are neutral and those who are negative. Republicans and Democrats vary considerably: 7-in-10 of the former believe religion has a positive impact while less than 4-in-10 of the latter agree.

Similarly, 7-in-10 Republicans think the Bible should have a

great deal, or some, influence on U.S. laws, as compared to only 3-in-10 Democrats. Had respondents been asked if the Bible should have a great deal of influence on American society, as opposed to its laws, the figure would likely be higher.

It is no secret that Republicans believe that the teachings that mark our Judeo-Christian heritage, e.g., the Ten Commandments, are a positive guide to the good life. Why don't Democrats? Why are they skittish on the question of religion? To be blunt, are they phobic?

The issue of phobia deserves to be raised because we constantly hear about the nefarious influence of "Islamophobia." New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani, and many academics, never tire of rolling out this canard. Now if some Americans are wary of the effects of Islam on American society, it is because of the illiberal beliefs and practices of many of its adherents.

What is behind the Democrats negative view of religion, which in America largely means Christianity? Fears of a Christian theocracy may be prevalent among some Democrats, but this concern is not supported by any survey data. So what is it that is bugging them?

If there is one thing that liberals prize (most Democrats are liberals), it is autonomy. "It's my body," "I have my own moral compass," and the like, reflect this value. Accordingly, the regard "Thy Shalt Not" to be violative of their precious embrace of autonomy. Worse still, they reckon, is the fact that the author of these three dreaded words is God. The match has been lit.

A close cousin to autonomy is narcissism, and at the collective level, namely society, it manifests itself as nihilism. That is not a prescription for the good society.

This condition may not be true of all Democrats, but it is

true of too many of them. A hostility to Christianity, properly understood, is not in anyone's interest. Unfortunately, that explains what's driving so many Democrats these days—it is less a phobia than it is an animus.

DO DEMOCRATS NEED DEPROGRAMMING?

[Bill Donohue](#)

There is something seriously wrong with a large swath of self-identified Democrats. If the nutty things they believe were true of others, calls for deprogramming would be everywhere. But the only ones pleading for deprogramming are contemporary Democrats (they are not at all like the Democrats of old).

In October 2021, failed presidential candidate Hillary Clinton said the time had come for a “formal deprogramming” of what she called President Trump’s “cult members.” Two years earlier, “Today” show host Katie Couric rhetorically asked, “How are we going to really almost deprogram these people who have signed up for the cult of Trump?”

In 2020, failed Trump White House communications director Anthony Scaramucci raised the same issue. A few days later, failed CNN host Don Lemon said “a lot” of Trump voters “need to be deprogrammed right now, before they cast their next ballot.” Former Secretary of Labor Robert Reich said the same year, “When this nightmare is over, we need a Truth and Reconciliation Committee.” He was outdone by David Atkins, a prominent California Democrat, who wondered aloud “how ‘do’ you deprogram 75 million people?”

Senator Bernie Sanders insisted, “we need to send all the Republicans to the reeducation camps.” Eugene Robinson, an African American columnist for the *Washington Post*, said, “There are millions of Americans, almost all white, almost all Republicans, who somehow need to be deprogrammed.” Michael Beller, an attorney for PBS set his sights on kids, imploring Homeland Security to take the children of Republican voters away. “And then we’ll put them in reeducation camps.” He was subsequently fired.

Deprogramming is a staple of totalitarian regimes, perfected by Mao. Given their contempt for conscience rights, it is not surprising that some Democrats want it as part of their arsenal. Ironically, they would make for exemplary candidates.

A recent survey found that 1 in 3 Democrats believe that the attempted assassination of President Trump at the White House correspondents’ dinner was staged (the figure for Republicans was 1 in 8). Similarly, the attempted assassination of Trump in Butler, Pennsylvania was regarded as a staged event by 42 percent of Democrats (as compared to 7 percent of Republicans).

It would be wrong to write off this insanity to Trump Derangement Syndrome. It’s much deeper than that. Consider the following views that are popular with many Democrats.

- Our sex is not determined by our father—it is assigned at birth
- Men can get pregnant
- Tampons belong in the boys’ restroom at school
- Unborn babies are not human
- It is possible to have two mommies
- It is not easy to decide what a woman is
- Race is a social construct
- All economic disparities are unjust
- White people are inherently racist
- Blacks cannot be racist

- We need to defund the police
- We need to abolish bail
- We need to abolish prisons

Irrationality reigns supreme with those who prioritize feelings over reason. It is also dangerous. It literally plays into the hands of those who, like Hitler, say there are no objective truths.

Deprogramming, for political reasons, is not a viable option in a free society. Indeed, it needs to be condemned. Lucky for many of today's Democrats that more don't agree with their tactics; otherwise, they would be forced fed their own medicine.

TRUMP'S RELIGIOUS LIBERTY PANEL UNDER ATTACK

[Bill Donohue](#)

Ever since President Trump announced on May 1, 2025 that he wanted a Religious Liberty Commission to make recommendations on how to protect our most important freedom, critics have tried to discredit it. The same is true of the Task Force to Eradicate Anti-Christian Bias; it was created on February 6, 2025, under the aegis of the Department of Justice (DOJ).

The final report of the Religious Liberty Commission will soon be published, but already it is coming under attack, especially by the Associated Press (AP) and the Interfaith Alliance.

On May 9, AP reporter Peter Smith ran a news story on the Commission that teed it up for critics; he did the same thing

on May 1 in his story on the Task Force. He listed a series of comments by members of the panel, as well as reported instances of restrictions on religious liberty, followed by remarks from critics. His reporting deserves closer scrutiny.

One of the Commission's members has called for a Presidential Medal of Freedom for "a baker who refused to create a wedding cake for a same-sex couple."

That's right, Jack Phillips, who never denied selling a cake to homosexuals, refused to personally make a "wedding" cake for two men, citing his Christian objections. He won in the U.S. Supreme Court in 2018 but was bullied and badgered by vindictive gay activists and lawyers who sued him in a civil lawsuit. The case bounced around the courts until he finally won again. His courage was exemplary.

Amish parents in New York asserted their First Amendment right to religious liberty when the state denied them a religious exemption allowing them not to have their children vaccinated. Yet the law allows for medical exemptions. Parental rights are also at stake.

Catholic nuns in Westchester, New York are being told they have to call those who falsely claim to be of the opposite sex "they," and to allow them to use the same room in their care facilities as those of the opposite sex.

The AP reporter notes that "progressive" critics of the Task Force to Eradicate Anti-Christian Bias claim that accusations against the Biden administration lack documentation. This is false. The Catholic League alone turned over a wealth of documents, and I met personally with one of the DOJ attorneys, offering more information.

It is also noted that one of the members of the panel, Carrie Prejean Boller, was ousted. True. The former Miss California and convert to Catholicism claimed, without evidence, that her critical remarks of Israel were representative of what

Catholics think; the Palestinian flag pin that she liked to wear was another expression of her partisanship.

The AP story mentions that some who testified before the panel argued that workplace regulations conflicted with their religious beliefs. Yes, when a nurse is forced by the University of Vermont Medical Center to perform an abortion, despite her religious convictions, that is a serious problem.

A Catholic woman was fired by Blue Cross Blue Shield for refusing the Covid vaccine; she won her court case in 2024. Other instances involve an Hispanic woman who was told to remove a crucifix from her desk at school, and students in Michigan who were told they could not sing a Christian song at a talent show.

The AP piece says the Commission is being sued by the Interfaith Alliance for not having diverse members and viewpoints. That's a keeper. The Interfaith Alliance is one of the least diverse religious associations in the nation: its idea of religious liberty is so narrow as to make it hostile to any honest interpretation of it. To include those of their ilk on this panel would be to sabotage it.

President Trump's policies on religious liberty are in stark contrast to that of his predecessor. He is expanding this foundational freedom while Biden contracted it. The problem his critics have has less to do with him than it does the plain meaning of the First Amendment.

WHY MENTAL HEALTH IS NOT

GETTING BETTER

[Bill Donohue](#)

If ever there were a decided secular bias that is evident in our culture, it's the way elites continue to address mental health and wellbeing. They just don't get it.

Read the personal advice column in a newspaper or magazine, and you will quickly learn how to guard against loneliness and depression, and how to ensure happiness. Most of it is bunk. Having written a book on this subject, *The Catholic Advantage: How Health, Happiness and Heaven Await the Faithful*, there are no secrets about what works. It can be explained in one word—bonds. Personal bonds, and bonds with God. But don't look for the "expert therapists" to mention this.

In New York City there is a Center for Wellbeing & Happiness. It is located on the lower east side, serving "Black, Indigenous [and] People of Color." Apparently, no white people need apply, although they have to pay for it (it is taxpayer funded).

Got some head issues? Here's how they are fixing them.

Currently, this center is offering classes on "Fitness & Motion" that "invites you to activate and move with your whole body!" They have a "Tai Chi" class that "promotes healthy bone-density and blood circulation through low-impact conditioning." There are two different "Yoga" classes that "allow us to harness the healing power of our own bodies throughout all stages of life," and that "improve the flow of energy in the body." Lots of movement to these tricks.

"Arts & Creativity" teaches "the beautiful art of Batik." What's that? "Wax Resistance." What's that? Don't ask. There's a "Community Knitting Group" that is taught by "Maureen, the Knitting Mama," so that should work to settle you down.

“Nutrition & Environment” focuses on—you guessed it—food. One of the classes is “Rooted in ancestral wisdom & earth-based rituals,” emphasizing “gentle movement, storytelling, winter herbs, meditation and soul-warming foods.” If that doesn’t make you feel good, nothing will.

According to a recent Echelon Poll, 65 percent of Americans believe that our mental health is “getting much/a little worse.” How could it not if the cure is self-indulgence. But don’t expect “Maureen, the Knitting Mama,” to agree.

A Gallup survey published this spring found that 19.1 percent of adults suffer from depression, which is near the highest Gallup ever recorded. Approximately 30 percent of Americans have been treated for depression in their lifetime, which is up by 10 points since 2015. Young people are among those who suffer the most. Loneliness is driving the depression, and it is not going to be alleviated by yoga or winter herbs.

Another survey, released around the same time as the Gallup one, was published by the Institute for Family Studies. It researched happiness. Again, young people scored poorly, but not all of them: unmarried young adults did the worst. Not only are married adults happier than unmarried adults—of all ages—those who attend religious services are the happiest.

Bonds. Married people can bond with each other. Religious people can bond with God. Whom do single people bond with? Whom do non-believers bond with? Moreover, bonds have nothing to do with “the flow of energy in the body.”

Catholic League staffers found that New Hampshire, Vermont and Oregon are the three most secular states. They have at least two things in common: they are almost all white (88, 91 and 72 percent, respectively), and they have among the highest rates of age-adjusted depression rates (all over 25 percent). That won’t be fixed by learning about “Wax Resistance.”

If the ruling class wasn’t so opposed to acknowledging the

positive role that religion plays in mental health and wellbeing, they would not hesitate to embrace it. The science cannot be disputed, even by those who make money teaching how to become more self-absorbed.

Bottom line: The key to mental health and wellbeing does not lie with you. It lies with others, and with God. "Soul-warming foods" may be pleasurable, but they are not a tonic to what ails the lonely and the depressed.

MOTHER'S DAY FOUNDER WAS QUITE A GAL

[Bill Donohue](#)

The founder of Mother's Day was one for the books. The day she founded she later sought to abolish, largely because she disapproved of the way families came to celebrate their mothers.

In 1914, President Woodrow Woodrow signed a bill that made the second Sunday in May as Mother's Day. The person who successfully pushed for this special day was Anna Jarvis. She drew inspiration from her mother, Ann Reeves Jarvis, who thought it would be a good idea to have a national holiday that commemorated the sacrifices that mothers made for their children.

Anna was deeply conflicted. She hated the commercialism that capitalism generated, though she liked being bankrolled by capitalists. She certainly had no problem asking capitalists to fund her enterprise—she cozied up to John Wanamaker, founder of one of the nation's first department stores, and

H.J. Heinz, the famous Pittsburgh entrepreneur. They laid out the cash she needed to fund her crusade to make Mother's Day a national holiday.

Anna, who had no children, was aghast at how a market economy celebrated Mother's Day. An ungrateful cad, she slammed Wanamaker and Heinz, blaming them for the way Americans honored their moms.

She ripped into children who bought Mother's Day cards, lecturing them for being "too lazy" to write their own. How hypocritical it was, she said, to give your mom a box of candy and "then eat most of it yourself." She hated FTD flowers so much that she literally sued Florist Telegraph Delivery. She also bashed the Post Office for making a Mother's Day stamp. She even condemned Eleanor Roosevelt for using Mother's Day to help charitable causes.

If you are getting the impression that Anna had gone nuts, you're right (if you didn't get that impression, you're probably a socialist). In 1943, she started a petition drive hoping to collect signatures calling for the abolition of Mother's Day. Penniless, she did not succeed, and in 1948 she was committed to Philadelphia's Marshall Square Sanitarium.

The Catholic League hopes you give your mom a Hallmark Mother's Day card, a box of chocolates, and flowers. Just don't eat all the candy.

ANTI-ISRAEL MOB THREATENS NYC

JEWS

Bill Donohue

On May 5, a mob of 100 anti-Israel protesters showed up outside the same Manhattan synagogue that 200 of them descended upon last November. Many of the radical Muslims hid their faces, wearing scarves and masks. As Jews entered the synagogue, they shouted, and carried signs, saying, “from the river to the sea,” “long live the intifada,” “stop the sale of stolen land,” and “Israel should not exist.”

New York City Mayor Zohran Mamdani could not unequivocally condemn the “protesters.” He allowed that Jews had a right to attend synagogue, but he objected to them going to an event where they could buy property in Israel, noting that some of the real estate that was for sale was in the West Bank.

Mamdani’s comment about the West Bank is a ruse. He objects to any sale of land in Israel and that is because he does not recognize its right to even exist. According to the mayor, Israel, which is recognized under international law, has no right to exist “as a Jewish state.”

Why not? He says he is against any state with a “hierarchy of citizenship on the basis of religion.” That’s rich coming from a radical Muslim who never cites this as an objection to Muslim-majority nations that impose sharia law. What could be more hierarchal and objectionable than a legal system that categorically denies elementary human rights?

Mamdani brags that opposition to Israel is “central to my identity.” It sure is. That explains why, after the unprovoked slaughter of 1,200 innocent Jews on October 7, 2023, he could not bring himself to condemn it. But he did take the opportunity to accuse Israel of apartheid.

By contrast, Julie Menin, Speaker of the New York City

Council, said the mob was guilty of fueling “the flames of antisemitism.” She succeeded in getting a law passed (yet to go into effect) restricting protesters outside houses of worship. Mamdani opposed it, but then reluctantly accepted its fate knowing that Menin had secured a veto-proof majority. The Catholic League endorsed it.

Perversely, Mamdani declares New York City to be a “sanctuary city” that welcomes and protects illegal aliens—they are free to avail themselves of the full panoply of city services—but when it comes to a real sanctuary, e.g., a house of worship, his enthusiasm wanes.

Contrary to the conventional wisdom, and to what Mamdani believes, the First Amendment does not protect the right to assemble. It protects “the right of the people *peaceably* to assemble.” Those who threaten Jews by trying to break through police barricades (one of the cops was hospitalized at the incident) are not assembling peacefully. Were it not for the police, these thugs would have assaulted innocent Jews.

When Catholic churches are torched and invaded, the Catholic League never fails to condemn them, demanding accountability for the guilty. It makes no difference which house of worship is targeted, we condemn all such behavior. And unlike Mamdani, we do so without equivocation.

Contact his deputy communications director, Lekha Sunder:
Lsunder@cityhall.nyc.gov