

BODILY INTEGRITY ECLIPSES ABORTION RIGHTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how abortion rights are now seen as secondary to bodily integrity:

The push for abortion-on-demand, [a goal that is increasingly rejected by most Americans](#), has long been a staple of pro-abortion activists. But that right no longer defines this movement. Instead, it is just one of a constellation of sexual rights. The latest document that proves this point was recently released, "[Blueprint for Sexual and Reproductive Health, Rights and Justice](#)."

Notice how sexual issues are listed before reproductive matters: the former encompasses a wide range of sexual expressions; the latter focuses mostly on abortion. Some news reports say that the document has been signed by dozens of abortion groups, but that is not completely accurate. In fact, the mission of the organizations that endorsed the "Blueprint" ranges from the promotion of atheism (e.g., American Atheists) to the promotion of sexual pleasure (e.g., The Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health).

"We hold true that in order for people to be free and equal they must be able to exercise complete autonomy over their bodies." That's quite a leap from the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness enshrined in the Declaration of Independence. The differences are startling. First and foremost, the pansexual organizations do not believe in the right to life. Second, their understanding of liberty is one of pure license. Third, they reject both the right to *pursue* happiness and *happiness* itself: they *demand* the right to *pleasure*.

All individuals, the document says, are entitled to "have

their bodily integrity, privacy, and personal autonomy respected,” and to “freely decide their own sexuality.” They also insist on “safe and pleasurable experiences.” This would presumably exclude lethal sex acts, but given this extremist vision of sexual freedom, it is doubtful it does. The “Blueprint” does not say what remedies are available to those who are unable to achieve sexual pleasure. Nor does it say who is to blame.

The Center for Sexual Pleasure and Health provides a window into the minds of these people. It lists as one of its values the belief that “everyone should be able to consensually explore and express their sexual identities (which include sexual orientations, sexual behaviors, gender identities, relationship styles, and sexual preferences).”

This may sound redundant, but not to those who wrote it, they were just being inclusive. By the way, this organization is also dedicated to the rights of prostitutes, as well as a “nuanced understanding of BDSM, kinks, and fetishes.” It does not say what a nuanced understanding of sexual slavery is.

I decided to see just how far these people have drifted from a traditional understanding of sexuality. I was not surprised by the results. I took a tally of the number of times certain words or terms appeared in the text of this 116-page document. Here are the results.

Gender: 112

Transgender: 44

Nonbinary: 8

Gender nonconforming: 6

Gay: 7

Homosexual: 0

Men who have sex with men: 2

Heterosexual: 0

Mother: 1

Father: 0

Grandmother: 0

Grandfather: 0

What unites these groups is a contempt for marriage and the family (properly understood), our Judeo-Christian heritage, and religious liberty. The document not only attacks conscience rights, it targets Catholic hospitals.

Those who think this kind of madness is of no great consequence are mistaken. These activists have already worked their way into the schools. Tortured souls that they are, they know what they are doing. They need to be exposed, confronted, and defeated.

COMMISSION ON UNALIENABLE RIGHTS MUCH NEEDED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the State Department's Commission on Unalienable Rights:

One of the best gifts to emerge from the Trump administration is the creation of the State Department's Commission on Unalienable Rights. It is a tribute to Secretary of State Mike Pompeo that he appointed his mentor at Harvard Law School, Mary Ann Glendon, to chair the commission.

Left-wing legal groups, which think they own the subject of human rights, are apoplectic at the very thought of such a commission. A coalition of 430 left-wing organizations have asked Pompeo to dismantle this human rights commission. Their arguments are so weak as to be embarrassing.

"We object to the Commission's stated purpose," the letter

says, without ever stating what that purpose is. The stated purpose is two sentences long. "The Commission will provide the Secretary of State advice and recommendations concerning international human rights matters. The Commission will provide fresh thinking about human rights discourse where such discourse has departed from our nation's founding principles of natural law and natural rights."

It is the second sentence that clearly bothers the critics. "Fresh thinking" about human rights is surely a worry to those stuck in neutral. To be sure, change can be painful, but to those who do not regard intellectual maturation to be a problem, it can yield many benefits.

Natural law and natural rights are the bedrock of our freedoms. Enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, they give homage to the Creator, the proper author of unalienable rights.

Appeals to natural law are what allowed for the dismantling of slavery. Similarly, Nazis accused at Nuremburg could not have been convicted by appealing to the positive, or government generated, law. The Nazis maintained, quite properly, that they were simply following orders. It took the invocation of natural law to convict them. The court held that the Nazis knew in their heart that the intentional killing of innocent persons was wrong.

Critics of the Commission say it "lacks ideological diversity." This is risible: the coalition is comprised of the most ideologically pure organizations in the nation.

Here are just a few: American Atheists, the ACLU, Amnesty International, the ADL, Freedom From Religion Foundation, NARAL Pro-Choice, and the Open Society Foundations (run by George Soros). It also includes such stellar groups as the Sex Workers Project at the Urban Justice Center, a pro-prostitution entity funded by Soros.

Take the last one. No wonder the coalition is upset: no student of natural law and natural rights considers prostitution to be an unalienable right. Indeed, the right to trade one's body on the street is one of those invented "ad hoc" rights.

The distinction between "unalienable rights" and "ad hoc" rights is what upsets the coalition. Pompeo drew the distinction when he announced the formation of the Commission. "The proliferation of rights not only causes tensions between rights claims," he wrote in the *Wall Street Journal*, "it 'blurs' distinctions between universal, God-given rights and ad hoc state-based rights, threatening to erode the very basis of our liberal democracy."

Pompeo learned a lot from Glendon. In her masterful book, *Rights Talk*, published in 1991, she said that the "rights-bearer as a lone autonomous individual" is closely tied to the tendency to see rights as absolute. That vision is exemplified by the ACLU (which I detailed in *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union* and *Twilight of Liberty: The Legacy of the ACLU*). It entails such fanciful rights as dwarf tossing, mud wrestling, and the sale and distribution of child pornography.

Among the critics of the Commission are some Catholic figures. They are lead by Miguel Diaz, Marianne Duddy-Burke, Mary E. Hunt, and Father Bryan Massingale. That's quite a quartet.

Diaz was the U.S. Ambassador to the Holy See under Obama (a post held earlier by Glendon under George W. Bush). He was also a tireless champion of Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services who tried to force Catholic non-profits to pay for abortions. Sebelius was most known for her work supporting Dr. George—"the Killer"—Tiller, the infamous partial-birth abortion operative.

Duddy-Burke is executive director of DignityUSA, a pro-

homosexual “Catholic” group that rejects the Church’s teachings on sexuality.

Hunt is most known for rejecting the Church’s teachings on ordination and for accusing the Church of bigotry.

Massingale is a Milwaukee priest and Fordham professor who opposes religious liberty and rushes to the defense of gays who oppose Church teachings on homosexuality.

Ideological diversity, anyone?

What is driving the coalition of critics is their unanimous support for the rights of gay and transgender activists and their dismissive, if not contemptuous, posture towards religious liberty. Whenever there is a conflict between gay rights and the First Amendment right to religious liberty, they side with the former against the latter.

In short, their interpretation of human rights has nothing to do with the principles and tenets of the Founders. Their vision is one of radical individualism and radical egalitarianism, two of the most pernicious ideological strands in American society.

Good luck to Mike Pompeo and Mary Ann Glendon. They are two of the most brilliant and dedicated Americans in public life today.

AMERICA MAGAZINE DEFENDS COMMUNISM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article posted on the front page of the website of *America* magazine, a

Jesuit publication:

"Communist ideology is very similar to Christianity." That is what Vladimir Putin said last year in defense of Soviet communism. Agreeing with Putin is a contributor to *America*, the influential Jesuit magazine, Dean Dettloff. A more prominent Jesuit, Pope Francis, disagrees: When asked about his economic views in 2013, he flatly said, "The Marxist ideology is wrong."

Dettloff's article, "[The Catholic Case for Communism](#)," is the most spirited defense of communism to appear in some time. That it is published by a prominent Catholic magazine (it is featured on its website) makes it all the more astonishing.

There are many things that Dettloff says that are worthy of a robust reply, but there is one paragraph, in particular, that deserves a rebuttal.

"Communism in its socio-political expression has at times caused great human and ecological suffering. Any good communist is quick to admit as much, not least because communism is an unfinished project that depends on the recognition of its real and tragic mistakes.

"Communism "has at times caused great human and ecological suffering"? It just doesn't get more innocent than this.

R.J. Rummel is a professor emeritus at the University of Hawaii at Manoa; he is one of the world's most noted experts on democide, or what may be called megamurder.

Regarding the megamurders committed by communist regimes, [the death toll is staggering](#). Under the Soviet Union, Rummel says 61 million people were killed; Stalin was responsible for killing 43 million of them. Under Mao, Rummel puts the number at 77 million. Proportionately, Pol Pot beats everyone: between April 1975 and December 1978, he killed 2 million Cambodians out of a population of 7 million.

Attempts by Dettloff to romanticize American communists fail miserably. In fact, they gave Hitler their blessings.

In 2014, Ronald Radosh, a well-known student of communism, wrote a splendid [review of a book by Stephen H. Norwood, *Antisemitism and the American Far-Left*](#), published by Cambridge University Press. What he said is no longer controversial.

“With the infamous Nazi-Soviet Pact that began in August of 1939 and lasted until Germany invaded the Soviet Union in June of 1941, American Communists quickly became open supporters of Hitler and showed little concern for the fate of Europe’s Jewry. At home, they quickly attacked all Jewish groups, including trade unions that fought against Hitler’s fierce war on the Jews. As Norwood writes, the American Communists ‘clearly favored Nazi Germany over Britain.’”

Dettloff writes that “any good communist is quick to admit” the great human suffering that communism has engendered, noting that they acknowledge its “mistakes.” He is wrong on both counts.

Eric Hobsbawm was one of the most significant English historians of the 20th century. He was a Marxist who refused to associate with anyone but intellectuals, viewing ordinary middle-class people with contempt. In 1994, he was asked a hypothetical question by an author: if communism had achieved its aims in Russia and China, but at the cost of 15-20 million people—as opposed to the well over 100 million it actually resulted in—would you have supported it? [He answered with one word: “Yes.”](#)

Mao put into practice the communism that Hobsbawm heralded. In 1957 he told the Russians, “We are prepared to sacrifice 300 million Chinese for the victory of world revolution.” [He told his comrades](#), “Working like this, with all these projects, half of China may well have to die.” By contrast, Mao had at least 50 villas and was immensely wealthy.

The communists made no “mistakes.” That is a myth. There is a direct line between Marxist ideology and genocide. As Solzhenitsyn said, Stalin did not pervert Marxism—he perfected it. Rummel, following Lord Acton’s observation that “power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely,” opined, “Power kills and absolute Power kills absolutely.”

To those who understand human nature, none of this is surprising. To those who don’t, it is a mystery.

CUOMO BANS CAT DECLAWING

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a bill signed yesterday by New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo:

The same governor who pushed for a bill that allows doctors not to attend to the health of a child after he or she has survived an abortion signed a bill yesterday banning the declawing of cats; New York is the first state to do so.

Andrew Cuomo has no stomach for cat declawing. He called it “a cruel and painful procedure,” one that is positively “inhumane,” yet there is no record of him ever speaking that way about abortions at any stage of pregnancy. Nor has he ever branded infanticide an “archaic practice,” though that is exactly what he called cat declawing.

Cuomo had better stay put in his job. Were he to seek office outside New York he would be in for a wake-up call: Most Americans are much more repulsed by dismembering a human baby in utero—to say nothing of sanctioning infanticide—than they are cat declawing. The man’s ethical priorities are appalling. It makes one wonder what religion he belongs to.

Contact: Press.Office@exec.ny.gov

HOLLYWOOD NORMALIZES ABORTION

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Hollywood's new take on abortion:

Hollywood has always been a champion of abortion rights—through term—but what has changed is its succumbing to pressure from pro-abortion activists: They want Tinseltown to put a happy face on this lethal procedure. A story by Cara Buckley in the July 22nd edition of the *New York Times* offers all the evidence one needs to draw this conclusion.

Hollywood agents, celebrities and producers were recently invited to a “diversity summit” to hear a pitch from an abortion attorney on the need to normalize abortion on television. Such tactics are working: There are more TV shows putting a positive spin on women who have had an abortion than ever before. They feel “powerful” about their decision to “terminate” (and we all know what that word means).

The push to turn the killing of unborn babies into an ordinary medical procedure, one that is akin to having an ulcer removed, is coming at a time when more Americans are opposed to abortion-on-demand.

A Gallup poll released on June 11, 2018 found that a majority of Americans, 53%, said abortion should be legal in only a few circumstances (35%) or in no circumstances (18%). And virtually every poll ever taken shows that a majority of the public is opposed to abortion after the first trimester.

The effort to make abortion seem pedestrian taps into the

narcissism of our culture.

For example, on the website, shoutyourabortion.com, the testimony of many women who have had a positive abortion experience reeks of self-absorption. In one article, “I Want to Have a Baby but I Wasn’t Ready,” the woman dropped the word “I” 26 times in a piece of approximately 270 words. She made sure the reader knew it was all about her own wants and needs, and no one else’s.

When it comes to sex, libertine style, Hollywood is the champ. Just as it has normalized homosexuality, and is attempting to normalize those who are unhappy with their sex, it is now bent on normalizing abortion. But pictures don’t lie, and that is something the propagandists for abortion are not likely to overcome.

TEXAS DEFENDS RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Catholic league president Bill Donohue comments on a new law in Texas:

Texas Gov. Greg Abbott has struck a blow for religious freedom, signing into law the “Save Chick-fil-A” bill. That this law was even necessary demonstrates the level of contempt among radical activists for religious tolerance and freedom of speech .

The bill was a response to the intolerance of the San Antonio City Council, which last March banned Chick-fil-A from a vending contract at the city airport because of what it termed the food chain’s “legacy of anti-LGBT behavior.”

And what was that “behavior”? In 2012, Chick-fil-A president Dan Cathy said the company supported “the biblical definition of the family unit.” That’s it. No discrimination was alleged, against employees or customers. Cathy just had the unforgiveable temerity to hold views that the LGBT extremists don’t like; and worse yet, to express his views; and worst of all, to contribute to organizations that agree with his views.

The LGBT extremists and their supporters have been targeting Chick-fil-A ever since. But their efforts have been a dismal failure. As even the *Washington Post* acknowledges today, “Amid boycotts and pushback from LGBTQ groups, Chick-fil-A has grown into the nation’s third-largest restaurant chain, according to Nation’s Restaurant News. It’s \$10.46 billion in U.S. sales trails only McDonald’s and Starbucks.” Clearly, the American people have no tolerance for the heavy-handed tactics of the LGBTQ radicals.

Neither, thankfully, do the people of Texas and their state government.

In June, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton rightly condemned the San Antonio City Council for “the religious bigotry that animated its decision.” Now Gov. Abbot and the Texas legislature have rectified this injustice.

They are to be commended.

GIVING UP ON THE POOR

Bill Donohue

The greatest enemy of the poor are those who champion their cause. It sounds counterintuitive. How can this be? Because

most of those who lead the charge against poverty have no personal stake in their cause.

Unlike Mother Teresa, who made it clear that helping the poor must begin with those who carry their banner, most of the professional champions of the poor believe that writing a check—with other people's money—will solve the problem. It rarely does.

To be sure, the aged, the disabled, and the infirm benefit from a safety net. Similarly, as the late Daniel Patrick Moynihan observed, social security did more to alleviate poverty among the elderly than any other factor. But when the subject switches to able-bodied men and women, the check-writing approach fails. Indeed, it typically makes matters worse by fostering dependency.

There is a ton of empirical evidence to back up this observation. Yet in many influential quarters, all the data in the world mean nothing. Ideology wins every time. The latest gambit to catch fire is called Universal Basic Income, a scheme that many Democrats running for president are inclined to support. Each candidate is outdoing the other by promising to provide more goodies than Santa Claus ever did, funding their gambits by playing Robin Hood.

Offering a guaranteed annual income is not a new idea, but the latest incarnation is novel: credit the Silicon Valley with giving birth to it. Those who live there are overwhelmingly wealthy and overwhelmingly burdened with guilt. Every one of them became rich through hard work and ingenuity, but they are convinced that those at the bottom of the income scale do not possess these attributes. Which is why they want to send them a check.

Forget about the racist assumptions—the successful ones are either white or Asian and the ones at the bottom are mostly black or Hispanic—the fact remains that these schemes are

bound to fail.

Mark Zuckerberg, the founder of Facebook, is leading the cause for a universal income. He broached this idea while speaking to Harvard graduates in 2017. His net worth exceeds \$55 billion, meaning that his stash is bigger than the GDP of over 100 nations.

Zuckerberg and his rich left-wing friends in the Silicon Valley have endorsed a policy that would give a monthly stipend to those who live in Stockton, California, 80 miles away. The plan is to make Stockton the first city in the nation to participate in a test of the Universal Basic Income policy. It will begin by selecting 100 people, each of whom will receive \$500 a month for 18 months. It will begin next year; they hope to make it available to everyone citywide.

They haven't determined who the lucky first 100 people will be, but they'll figure it out. The goal is to see to it that none of the 300,000 residents live in poverty. Not sure how they will keep illegal aliens from moving to Stockton—there is no talk of a wall (not yet anyway)—but again, the rich boys will figure it out.

The good news for the recipients is that there are no conditions on how the money is to be spent. They can spend their money on food and shelter or on booze and heroin. Everything goes. No questions asked.

Chicago is the first big city to give serious consideration to Universal Basic Income. A bill was introduced last year that would give \$500 a month to 1,000 Chicago families. Following the Stockton model, they can spend their money on anything they want. The politicians are still studying this issue. If it passes, let's hope Chicagoans don't buy any more guns.

No one has given the idea of Universal Basic Income a lift more than Barack Obama. When he spoke in Johannesburg, South Africa last year, at an event honoring Nelson Mandela, he

endorsed the initiative. "It's not just money a job provides," he said, "it provides dignity and structure and a sense of place and a sense of purpose."

Yes, a job can do all that. But the Universal Basic Income policy does not require anyone to work. The effect of giving a handout to able-bodied persons who are not in the labor market is fundamentally different from giving social security to retirees who paid into the fund for decades.

Alaska has had something like this program for a long time. Rich with oil money, it has provided a universal income to virtually everyone for decades. The few economic studies done on this initiative indicate that it has not had any noticeable effect on overall employment (though part-time rates have spiked). What has not been studied is the effect on able-bodied persons at the bottom of the income scale who are not working.

Alaska, of course, is not typical. It has tens of billions of oil money to play with, and since the program is not aimed at the poor, the effect on the middle class is similar to the effect of social security on seniors, which is negligible. These people have their dignity precisely because they have earned the money they live off of, something which is not true of many in the lower class.

Obama may mean well, but what he is promoting is likely to retard the upward mobility chances of the poor. He has a proven track record of doing just that. To wit: African Americans are doing much better economically under President Trump's growth-oriented approach than they did under Obama's redistributive policies.

"I'm surprised how much money I've got," Obama told the South African audience. So are many Americans—his net worth is over \$40 million. He added that he would have no problem paying "a little more in taxes" to pay for Universal Basic Income.

Again, it's the multimillionaires (and multibillionaires) who sponsor such programs. They know full well that the effect of new taxes on them has almost a zero effect as compared to the burden levied on the middle class who must pay the lion's share of this pipedream.

As usual, little attention is being given to the unintended consequences of a Universal Basic Income policy. Why shouldn't the recipients receive \$1500 a month, instead of \$500? What will the proponents say when the recipients demand a raise? What will the sponsors say to those not selected to participate in their scheme?

What effect will the program have on those who should be working, but have now elected not to? How will it affect hard-working persons living just above the poverty line knowing that their taxes are going to some who prefer to hang out on the corner rather than seek a job? How will they feel when they learn that the cash allotment is being spent on drugs, not groceries? What will happen if the program goes bust? Are the proponents ready for the riots?

Universal Basic Income is the latest expression of what social scientist Charles Murray once called our "custodial democracy." He meant by that the tendency of government to essentially take custodial responsibility for the welfare of the poor. In the end, it does more to foster paternalism than anything else.

Pope Benedict XVI, in his magisterial encyclical, *Caritas in Veritate*, said that subsidiarity—the Catholic principle which teaches that those closest to the problem are best suited to fix it—is the "most effective antidote against any form of all-encompassing welfare state." He expressly called upon us to practice solidarity with the poor, but to do so in ways that do not promote paternalism.

The most effective way to help the poor is to strengthen their

families. The family, not the state, is the greatest determinant of upward mobility. Unfortunately, decades of welfare policies, especially from the mid-1960s to the mid-1990s, helped to cripple inner-city minority families, the results of which are still with us.

It is not good enough to have good intentions—results matter. Low unemployment rates garnered through tax-incentive programs for corporations mean much more in the end than the most well-intentioned welfare programs that wind up disabling the needy. But the champions of the poor, most of whom made a fortune through the market economy, say that their route to success cannot work for the poor. They are as wrong as they are condescending.

From my own work with the disadvantaged in Spanish Harlem, I saw first-hand how core education principles—sticking to the basics, offering structure, demanding discipline, and assigning homework—paid off. My students did well because much was demanded of them. When we lower the bar of expectations for the poor, we lower their prospects for success.

What accounts for success? One way to find out is by studying Asians. Why are they a success?

Asians do well in school, and well in the workforce, for one very basic reason: they are extremely disciplined. Impulse control is not a problem for them—their two parent families have seen to that—and that alone is an incredibly important variable accounting for academic excellence. When intact families are a rarity, so is impulse control, and so is success.

Catholic schools cannot make up for all the damage done to children in poor one-parent families, but they do a better job than their counterparts. A new study published by the Thomas B. Fordham Institute, conducted by a professor and one of his doctoral students at the University of California-Santa

Barbara, sheds light on why.

“First, students in Catholic schools are less likely to act out or be disruptive than those in other private or public schools. Second, students in Catholic schools exhibit more self-control than those in other private and public schools. Third, regardless of demographics, students in Catholic schools exhibit more self-discipline than students in other private schools.”

Regarding the role that religion plays, the researchers concluded, “Don’t underestimate the power of religion to positively influence a child’s behavior. But in the absence of that, schools can adopt courses or programs that might foster self-discipline.”

All of this takes work. Impulse control does not come naturally to children, yet without it, success—in any field—is elusive. No one needs to have it instilled in them more than kids who live in poverty and crime-ridden neighborhoods. Once the value of self-discipline is inculcated, progress can be made.

This is what the champions of the poor should be concentrating on, not giveaway programs. But they are too hostile to traditionalism to speak to the virtue of self-control. That would be moralistic. And they are too opposed to religion, especially Catholicism, to promote school choice initiatives. So they fall back on their check-writing schemes.

Mother Teresa said that helping the poor should be an act of love, and that love should cost: it should cost those who work with the poor to enhance the condition of the needy. Universal Basic Income does none of this. It is nothing but another cheap trick played by some very rich Americans who harbor a patronizing attitude toward the poor. They are the poor’s greatest enemy.

NESSSEL'S CATHOLIC FIXATION

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel's continued targeting of the Catholic Church:

Since well before her election as Michigan's attorney general last November, Dana Nessel has rarely missed an opportunity to demonstrate her animus toward Catholics and the Church. She dismissed Catholics and others who disagreed with her on same-sex marriage or on faith-based foster care and adoption services as "a radical fringe" and "hate mongers."

Upon taking office, Nessel launched a state investigation into the sexual abuse of minors—by Catholic clergy. She has continued on that narrow course, despite our bringing to her attention Michigan's demonstrably poor record of combating sexual abuse of students in the state's public schools. Under a list of "Initiatives" on her website, the first item is "Catholic Church Clergy Abuse." There is no listing of public school sexual abuse. Nessel snidely urged residents, when contacted by abuse investigators, to "ask to see their badge and not their rosary."

In recent months, Nessel has announced charges of sexual abuse against six priests. Not widely reported was that all but one are very old cases, dating to the last century—two from more than 20 years ago, two from more than 30 years ago, and one from the 1970s—more than 40 years ago. And the only case that is more current did not involve the abuse of a minor.

Contrast this with the much more current, and ongoing, problem in Michigan's public schools. In 2016 *USA Today*, in a 50-state analysis, gave Michigan a grade of "F" for its failure to

adequately address the crisis of sexual abuse in its public schools. Last February, we helpfully provided a list of recent sexual abuse cases. They included these, just in 2019:

- In February, the male coach of the girls' basketball team at New Haven High School was charged with engaging in sexual relations with a 17-year-old girl. The incidents allegedly occurred in January and February of this year.
- In January, it was revealed that a male teacher at Whittemore-Prescott Area Schools admitted to sexually abusing 15 boys. He then committed suicide.
- A former female Rochester High School teacher was charged in January on six counts of third-degree criminal sexual conduct. She is accused of engaging in sexual acts with two male students under the age of 18.
- A male teacher at K.E.C. Oakleigh, a Grand Rapids Public School, was charged in January with possession of child pornography and using a computer to commit a crime. He sought to have sex with a 13-year-old girl.
- A female special education teacher at Thunder Bay Junior High, an Alpena Public School, was charged in January in connection with numerous sexual assaults against one of her students. She allegedly assaulted the boy more than 100 times, beginning when he was 11-years-old.
- In January, the principal at Kingsley Middle School was arraigned on two counts of second degree criminal sexual conduct. He is accused of groping the genitals of an 8 or 9 year old boy; he is also accused of inappropriately touching another boy of the same age; and two older boys were told to "whip out" their genitals so he could judge whose was bigger.

Since then, several new cases have made the news:

- In April, a parent of a student at Ann Arbor Community High School filed a Title IX complaint, alleging that Ann Arbor Public Schools mishandled at least a dozen

cases of sexual misconduct. While the mother subsequently retracted that complaint, acknowledging inaccuracies, she said she planned to rewrite it and submit it to the Office of Civil Rights. And she said several families had reached out to her, asking to testify before the Office of Civil Rights regarding the handling of their own daughters' cases.

- In April, a teacher and former football coach at Davison High School in Genesee County, was arrested on accusations of filming a naked 14-year-old girl, without her knowledge, at a tanning salon.
- The Hanover-Horton school district faced criticism for allowing a football coach to continue coaching and teaching while an investigation into allegations of sexual abuse was ongoing. In June, a woman came forward to accuse the coach of having abused her two decades earlier when she was a student and he was a teacher at Hanover-Horton High School.

Yet still, Attorney General Nessel's investigative instincts are not aroused by the ongoing problem of sexual abuse in Michigan's public schools. Only when the alleged victimizers are Catholic priests—even if the cases are decades old—does Nessel spring into action.

Clearly, this is not about protecting children. It's about vilifying the Catholic Church.

Contact communications director Kelly Rossman-McKinney: rossmanmckinney@mi.gov

PELOSI'S CATHOLICISM

SELECTIVE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a tweet from Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi:

Nancy Pelosi loves to flaunt her Catholicism when it can be used to advance her political or ideological agenda. So it was when she used last Sunday's Gospel reading, about the Good Samaritan, to chide President Trump on his immigration policy.

"It should be a sign to us," Pelosi tweeted, "that today's Catholic Gospel reading is the Good Samaritan, where Jesus teaches us to love our neighbors as ourselves and treat them with mercy. Trump's ICE raids today," she continued, "tear families apart—the opposite of mercy."

Yet Pelosi is very selective in her application of this reading, and of Catholic teaching in general, to public policy issues. When it comes to protecting unborn children from the violence of abortion, she does not "love our neighbors as ourselves and treat them with mercy." Instead, she fully embraces her party's support for unrestricted abortion, through all nine months of pregnancy—a policy that tears babies apart, the very opposite of mercy.

Pelosi has it backwards. She seeks to appropriate Catholic teaching to support her party's current stance on immigration, an issue which admits of different prudential policy judgments within Catholic social teaching. But she rejects the Church's definitive teaching that abortion is "intrinsically evil"; and she will not invoke that teaching to support legal protections for unborn human life.

APA IS HAVING A MENTAL BREAKDOWN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the APA's endorsement of sexual libertinism:

It is becoming ever more clear that those who run the American Psychological Association (APA) are suffering from a mental breakdown. It is now promoting "relationship anarchy," as well as other dysfunctional behaviors. To the APA, about the only deviant sexual behavior that is left in American society is what most of us would call normal heterosexual monogamous unions.

Its descent is traceable to 1975 when it decided to support the position of the American Psychiatric Association declaring that homosexuality was not a mental illness. That determination, which was reached in 1973, was not based on any new scientific empirical evidence; rather, it was made following years of bullying by radical gay activists.

The APA is on a tear. Earlier this year it made a strong political statement attacking men [read: heterosexual men]. It opined that a pernicious "masculine ideology" has overtaken society and must be rooted out. What are the contents of this ideology? "Anti-femininity," which is to say the normal male tendency not to identify with effeminate men. It also includes such dangerous attributes as "achievement." Evidently, it does not see the sexism in this statement (it implies that women are not achievement oriented).

The latest APA endorsement of polygamy and swinging (and my favorite, the all-inclusive "relationship anarchy") was announced this month as part of the APA's "Non-Monogamy Task

Force” program; it says it is promoting “inclusivity.” It has not yet endorsed bestiality (which is no doubt a tribute to the animal rights folks), but who knows what lies beyond the bend? That may be next. Isn’t that what “inclusivity” is all about?

Ten years ago a book was released by three psychologists, Nicholas Cummings, William O’Donohue, and Janet Cummings, titled *Psychology’s War on Religion*. I contributed the chapter, “The War on Catholicism.”

I quoted Freud as saying “my real enemy” is “the Roman Catholic Church.” I also detailed Jung’s pathological hatred of the Catholic Church. Many other wizards in the field who shared the same bias were discussed as well. Make no mistake about it, there is a direct line between this kind of thinking and the APA’s embrace of “relationship anarchy.”

Let’s face it, the APA leadership is actively pushing the radical gay agenda, the goal of which is to eradicate the cultural basis of Western civilization, namely the Judeo-Christian ethos. Their ideology is so entrenched that they are unable to see the psychological and social damage that is done to everyone, *especially women and children*, when a sexual ethic based on restraint is destroyed. And have they not learned of the body count attributed to lethal sex practices?

The APA is not a scientific body—it is an activist organization in service to sexual libertinism.