

# MARXIST MILLIONAIRES RUIN NYC PARADE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the controversy over this year's Puerto Rican Day Parade in New York City:

In the 1970s, I led a contingent of Catholic students from Spanish Harlem in the Puerto Rican Day Parade; I did so for several years. It was a fun event. What made it so great were the wonderful people who marched, as well as those who cheered along the parade route. That is why it is a disgrace this year to see the parade so thoroughly politicized, taken over by extremists.

The June 11 parade will honor a convicted felon, a thug who worked with terrorists, Oscar Lopez Rivera; he is being touted as National Freedom Hero. The most prominent persons supporting him are New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio and New York City Council Speaker Melissa-Mark Viverito, both Marxist millionaires.

Lopez Rivera was a co-founder of the FALN, a terrorist organization that seeks independence for Puerto Rico, a goal summarily rejected by the Puerto Rican people for decades. He was once in command of the Chicago group, arming the terrorists with dynamite, detonators, and guns. He was also trained in making bombs. Convicted of transportation of firearms with the intent to kill, as well as the transportation of explosives, he was sentenced in 1981 to 55 years in prison (another 15 were tacked on after he tried to escape from Leavenworth). President Obama commuted his sentence before leaving office (though he was not set free until two weeks ago).

Mayor de Blasio is either ignorant, or lying, when he contends

that Lopez Rivera has renounced violence. He never has. In 1999, when President Clinton offered to reduce his sentence, providing he renounce the use of violence, he refused. He said, "The whole thing of contrition, atonement, I have a problem with that."

When Lopez Rivera was released in January, he again refused to apologize for what the FALN did: it was involved in more than 100 bombings, killing at least six people and wounding at least 130 others. New York City was hit hard in 1975 when four were killed and scores were injured at Fraunces Tavern.

The FALN's stated goal is to lead "an armed and political struggle in accordance with the Marxist-Leninist principle" and to implement "the Stalinist ideological position...." This is what defines Lopez Rivera.

Many leaders in the Puerto Rican community have withdrawn from marching in the parade, but not Mayor de Blasio. This is a man who lied to his own children about where he and his wife honeymooned: he told them they went to Canada when, in fact, they went—illegally—to Castro's Cuba. Prior to that he raised money for the communists in Nicaragua. His seven-figure net worth makes him a Marxist millionaire.

The other Marxist millionaire, Mark-Viverito, is even more hard core than de Blasio. Three years ago, she was described by a Puerto Rican New York state senator as a person who "has never honored the American flag at any event." Moreover, he added, she knows nothing about the working class, availing herself of "free cars, free chauffeurs, free offices, a big salary, huge stipends," etc.

On May 17, Mark-Viverito traveled to Puerto Rico to celebrate the release of Lopez Rivera. She immediately secured for him the honorary position in the parade, an effort made possible by New York Attorney General Eric Schneiderman: the wealthy radical made sure that left-wing extremists took control of

the event.

Mark-Viverito hates capitalism but loves the bounty it affords her. In 1998, she signed documents on behalf of her family confirming a \$186 million sale of a hospital in Puerto Rico: her father had a stake in it, which redounded to her benefit. She wound up splitting \$6.7 million with her relatives from the capitalist venture.

The Marxist millionaire is not only filthy rich, she is dishonest. In 2014, she was in the news for failing to report \$92,600 in rental income from her East Harlem townhouse. She also managed to qualify for a city program designed to help the poor buy homes, paying no interest on a \$70,400 mortgage for her home. That same year it was disclosed that she owned four properties in Puerto Rico: two rental condos, a home worth \$500,000, and 7 acres of land worth \$250,000.

The Marxist millionaire could teach the Wall Street crowd a thing or two about capitalist investments, yet she pretends to be a member of the proletariat. To wit: She was arrested in 2011 for her illegal activities involved in Occupy Wall Street. "I was more than happy to participate in this action," she said.

Both de Blasio and Mark-Viverito stuck it to Irish Catholics for years by refusing to march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade. As they are wont to do, they lied: They said homosexuals were barred from marching in the parade, knowing full well that gays marched for decades in the parade (homosexuals were not allowed to march under their own banner, anymore than pro-life Catholics were).

It is obvious that the mayor and the city council speaker are more at home honoring a man who hates America and champions the terrorist cause than they are in associating with patriotic Irish Catholics. The Puerto Rican people deserve better. They have been morally fleeced by these Marxist

millionaires, two of the most dishonest and ideologically corrupt persons ever to hold public office in New York City.

---

## TRUDEAU ASKED TO APOLOGIZE TO VICTIMS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue notes that Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau has asked Pope Francis to apologize for Catholic mistreatment of indigenous children in schools run by the Catholic Church.

Accordingly, Donohue is asking Trudeau to apologize to all the victims of Canadian oppression. To read it click [here](#).

---

## MEDIA STILL HYPING POPE-TRUMP PHOTO

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the way the media are playing a photo of President Trump and Pope Francis:

In a classic example of Groupthink, the media and late night talk-show hosts are fixated on [one photo](#) of the pope and the president; the former looks dour and the latter is smiling. So what?

[Here](#) is a photo they are not flagging.

And just in case you missed it, [here](#) is a photo of Pope

Francis standing with President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry.

What do these photos mean? Nothing—nothing at all—unless you work for the mainstream media or need script for a monologue.

---

## **MEDIA SHRINKS ANALYZE POPE PHOTOS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the media are reacting to photos of the pope with U.S. presidents:

International Business Times (IBT) wins the award for the most partisan media outlet reporting on the meeting between President Trump and Pope Francis. It had much competition.

“This Photo Sums Up How the Pope Really Feels about Meeting Donald Trump.” That is the IBT headline to its story. To see the photo, click [here](#).

The news story that accompanies the photo says, “The contrast between Donald Trump and the Pope is nothing short of comical. As the president grins awkwardly next to Melania, Pope Francis looks—quite frankly—dejected.”

But if the pope was dejected by having to pose with Trump, he must have been at least as dejected appearing with President Obama and Secretary of State John Kerry. To see the photo, click [here](#).

In fairness, Obama does not appear to be grinning “awkwardly”—he just looks arrogant. And Kerry looks plain dumb. Plenty of comical stuff there.

Perhaps the shrinks at IBT can help us psychoanalyze the Obama-Kerry-Pope photo. Maybe they can also explain why not a single media outlet ever thought to cast the pope as dejected when he met the two Democrats.

Contact: Alan Press, IBT president: [a.press@ibt.com](mailto:a.press@ibt.com)

---

## MEDIA BIAS ON TRUMP-POPE CONTINUES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new example of media bias:

I recently issued a [news release](#) on the meeting between the president and the pope. In it I quoted from a source that purported to be the official Vatican statement. It noted “their joint commitment in favor of life, and freedom of worship and conscience.”

After my release was issued, I said to a colleague that it was odd to see the Vatican speaking about “freedom of worship” instead of “religious liberty.” I then checked the official Vatican website and found that “religious liberty” had indeed been the wording of the official statement. We have since corrected my initial remarks.

So who is misreporting this? The Associated Press, Politico and many other media outlets.

Does this matter? Yes. “Freedom of worship” is the term used by people such as President Obama and Hillary Clinton: they are conveying a privatized understanding of religious expression, one that relegates religious beliefs and practices

to houses of worship.

“Religious liberty” conveys a robust public expression of religion. That is the term preferred by the Catholic Church, as well as all of those who are truly religion-friendly.

The mainstream media know the difference. This was no mistake.

---

## MEDIA SPIN TRUMP-POPE MEETING

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the media are spinning the meeting between President Trump and Pope Francis:

The first news report I heard this morning on the meeting between the president and the pope was on radio: WCBS said reporters were taking note of the fact that President Trump smiled but Pope Francis did not. That must mean something, of course. But it does not—it means nothing. As even the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* acknowledged, the two were beaming when they shook hands. So what?

[When I met the pope, he had a winning grin when we shook hands, but looked serious for a group shot.](#) That’s the way he is. Imagine if the president wasn’t smiling and the pope was. Would that mean Trump had just been put in his place? What if neither was smiling? Would that mean they hate each other?

Other media outlets played the same game:

- “The president smiled broadly beside the pontiff, who appeared subdued and stone-faced before the 30-minute private conversation.” (NBC News)
- “They posed for photographs and then sat down at the papal desk, the pope unsmiling, as their private meeting

began.” (CBS News)

- “While Trump flashed a wide grin, the Pope offered only a modest smile—his demeanor, business like.” (CNN)

There was no breaking news story about the content of the meeting, but the Vatican did release a statement saying, “Satisfaction was expressed” by both the president and the pope on several issues, including “their joint commitment in favor of life, religious liberty and freedom of conscience.” Those are non-negotiable issues of paramount importance.

Most of the media were content to recycle the same discredited story about the president and the pope from 2016.

In February 2016, a reporter from Reuters misrepresented Trump’s position on illegal immigration to the pope. The Holy Father was told that Trump thinks it is okay to break up families when deporting illegal aliens. This is untrue.

In fact, Trump explicitly told Chuck Todd that he would never do that. After the media distorted what Trump said, the pope said *if* someone said he was *only* interested in building walls, that would not be Christian. He added that he would give him “the benefit of the doubt.” Trump was then told that the pope said he was not Christian, and he responded by saying that was “disgraceful.”

In other words, both men were misled about what the other said about him. The media continued to float these falsehoods today.

President Trump and Pope Francis disagree on climate change and immigration, but they have more in common on abortion, gay marriage, gender ideology, and religious liberty than what divides them. The real difference was between President Obama and Pope Francis—on these issues and others—though the media failed to report it.



---

# **“TRUMP EFFECT” EVIDENT IN THE STATES**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on state laws protecting unborn babies and affirming religious liberty:

Human rights legislation is quickening in the states: protections for the unborn are gaining across the nation. Similarly, there is a determined effort to secure religious liberty.

Progress against child abuse in the womb is so strong in Kentucky that it may become the first state not to have a single abortion clinic. Planned Parenthood efforts to house new abortion clinics have been stopped, and it is now illegal to kill children after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Requiring doctors to inform pregnant women of ultrasound details is also law.

On May 12, Tennessee made it illegal to end the life of an unborn baby beyond viability. The law is different from the more than 20 other states that ban abortion beyond viability: it actually requires doctors to assess viability beginning at 20 weeks.

Indiana has tightened its parental consent law by allowing a judge to inform an underage girl's parents that she wants to abort her child. Planned Parenthood and the ACLU are up in arms over this expansion of parental rights.

Lawmakers in Iowa passed a bill denying reimbursement to abortion clinics that rely on Medicaid; starting July 1, they can no longer expect to be refunded for such expenses. True health services—unrelated to killing—will still be refunded.

Catholics have sued St. Louis for disrespecting the religious liberty rights of employers and landlords opposed to abortion. The law mandates that all employers—including Catholic institutions—must respect the “reproductive health decisions” of its employees. In practice, this means that pro-abortion teachers could sue if denied a teaching job at a Catholic school.

The Texas legislature has passed a bill that respects the autonomy of foster care and adoption agencies that receive public monies. Radical homosexuals, as well as men and women who have undergone surgery to adopt the genitals of the opposite sex, are unhappy with this religious liberty legislation.

A lot of good things are happening. Is this the “Trump Effect”? If so, the pope should be very pleased when they meet.

---

## **CUNY SHOULD DISINVITE SARSOUR**

Bill Donohue has written a letter to CUNY Chancellor James B. Milliken asking him to disinvite terrorist sympathizer Linda Sarsour from giving the commencement address at the School of Public Health.

To read the letter, click [here](#).

---

# MORALLY CHALLENGED AMERICANS

Bill Donohue comments on two recent Gallup polls:

Two fascinating Gallup polls have been released this month on the subject of morality. I will address the sexual issues that were surveyed.

Americans believe the following are morally acceptable: birth control (91%); divorce (73%); sex between an unmarried man and woman (69%); gay or lesbian relations (63%); having a baby outside of marriage (62%); abortion (43%); sex between teenagers (36%); pornography (36%); polygamy (17%); extramarital affairs (9%). These findings were posted May 11.

These percentages were never higher for birth control, divorce, gay or lesbian relations, having a baby out of wedlock, pornography, and polygamy. The one piece of good news is on abortion: 49% say it is morally wrong.

Findings from May 22 show that 81% of the public says the state of moral values is "only fair" or "poor." Is the state of moral values getting worse? According to 77% of the public, the answer is yes.

"Even liberals," Gallup says, "who seemingly should be pleased with the growing number of Americans who agree with their point of view on the morality of prominent social issues, are more likely to say things are getting worse than getting better."

There are a number of things going on here that command our attention.

Americans are increasingly non-judgmental about sexual relations between consenting adults, but they are not happy with the state of moral values. This paradox suggests that more Americans are morally challenged than ever before.

To cite one issue, it is one thing to say that having a baby outside of marriage is morally acceptable, quite another to say it is a good thing. There's the rub: Most Americans know someone who is in that situation and don't want to appear condemnatory, but they also recognize that this is not a good condition to be in, either for the mother or the child.

We need to be mature about this. If we want more of something, we offer rewards and incentives; if we want less, we employ negative sanctions and stigmatize. This is a sociological truism.

For example, we don't have a problem stigmatizing smokers, and as a result fewer are smoking today than was true a half century ago when smoking was socially acceptable. We want to reduce out-of-wedlock births, but we don't want to stigmatize the mother or the child (the father usually escapes sanctions). The result is we have a higher rate of out-of-wedlock births than we did a half century ago when such a condition was socially unacceptable.

It is our immaturity that accounts for our morally challenged condition. As long as we reject the stick of stigma to curb conditions that we deplore, there will be little progress in stemming them.

Liberals are the most morally confused of any segment of the population. They are delighted that their "tolerant" views on sexuality have caught on with most Americans, but they are nonetheless unhappy with the state of moral values.

They want to have it both ways—more liberal attitudes on sexuality and less moral problems—but they cannot. Not until they connect the dots and realize that the attitudes which they promote engender the behaviors that they deplore, will progress be made. As usual, liberals get it wrong.

---

# NEW YORK TIMES SHOWS BIAS IN ABUSE REPORTING

Bill Donohue comments on the way the *New York Times* covers stories on the sexual abuse of minors:

Newspapers are expected to print news, but that was most certainly not the case today with the *New York Times*.

It ran a story of almost 800 words on the compensation program of the New York Archdiocese for victims of sexual abuse. There was nothing new in the article: The names of the six priests, who committed their offenses in the 1970s and 1980s, had already been made public. So what was the point? None of the priests are in ministry and five were booted.

It could be argued that the *New York Times* has an obligation to cover everything and anything about the sexual abuse of minors. But that is simply not true, and I will prove it.

Two days ago, the media reported on the arrest of the executive director of a Queens music school for children. Oliver Sohngen, the founder of the Long Island City Academy of Music, was charged with sex trafficking and attempted sex trafficking of girls 8 to 17. After he got a pimp to supply him with the 8-year-old, he dropped her off at Chuck E. Cheese's so her parents wouldn't think anything was wrong.

The following news outlets covered this story this week:

*Daily News*

*New York Post*

TimesLedger Newspapers

US Official News

Associated Press  
CBS News New York  
MailOnline (England)  
NBC News New York  
Pix11 New York  
States News Service  
US Federal News  
WABC News New York  
WFIN (Finlay, Ohio)

The *New York Times* did not cover this story.

Why did the *New York Times* run a story about sexual abuse in the Archdiocese of New York that took place a generation ago—containing not a single item of news—but failed to report on a breaking-news story about a public school official who was arrested for recently abusing little girls?

The bias is palpable. It is also indefensible.

Contact the public editor: [public@nytimes.com](mailto:public@nytimes.com)