

# CYNICISM GROWING OVER COVID EDICTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why people are ignoring Covid-19 health warnings:

Ideally, the public should follow the advice of public health experts in times of a pandemic. They should also listen to news reports, and abide by what their elected officials have to say. Court decisions also merit respect. But when doctors, journalists, politicians and judges act inconsistently, evincing a political bias, cynicism is not only predictable, it is warranted.

On July 29, President Trump and his supporters gathered in Midland, Texas for an event. Most wore masks and practiced social distancing, but some did not. Dr. William Schaffner, a professor at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine, was upset with the few who ignored the advice of experts. "Why are they in that large group? They shouldn't be gathering in groups."

Schaffner should have been asked why some are not cooperating. Instead, he called them names, saying they were "dumb."

A more rational response to what is going on was given two months ago by William A. Jacobson, a Cornell University professor. "The riots have ripped the mask off the mainstream media politicized coronavirus hysteria. When it was politically convenient, the media shamed and attacked people who wanted to reopen their stores or even gather at the beach. Now that rioters and looters are gathering in large numbers, the media no longer cares about social distancing, because the media sympathizes with them."

Politicians also sympathize with the protesters. New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy was unhappy with store owners for

protesting his shutdown decree, however he said it was entirely legitimate to protest racism. He said it was “one thing to protest what day nail salons are opening, and it’s another to come out in peaceful protest.” In other words, if he likes the cause of the protest, people can take to the streets without following social distancing guidelines.

Murphy was outdone by New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio. He was asked why he was cracking down on religious gatherings while allowing anti-racism protesters the right to disregard social distancing norms. “We’re in the middle of a national crisis, a deep-seated national crisis. There is no comparison.” Again, it is not mass gatherings that matter, it is what the masses are gathering for that matters.

When asked if the spike in coronavirus cases following the protests was related to those who took to the streets, the mayor said, “I would be surprised if that’s what’s causing it.” He cited no evidence for his conviction. In any event, he instructed the contact-tracing task force not to ask those who tested positive for the virus if they recently attended a Black Lives Matter protest. But it was okay to ask if someone recently attended a church service.

Judges are looking just as bad. The U.S. Supreme Court recently said it was okay for Nevada to allow crowds to gather in the casinos but not the churches. Justice Neil Gorsuch called out the duplicity saying, “there is no world in which the Constitution permits Nevada to favor Caesars Palace over Calvary Chapel.”

Many in the media want the protests to continue, but not church gatherings. No one likes this outcome better than *New York Times* legal correspondent Linda Greenhouse. She loved the Supreme Court 5-4 decision, going into a fury over the dissenters. She accused them of engaging in a “religious crusade,” decrying what she said was “the ferocity of the main dissenting opinion.” After reading her boilerplate commentary,

it seems plain that she would not raise an eyebrow if the churches were ordered to shut down indefinitely.

Portland has been ravaged by left-wing activists for over two months. Obviously, social distancing does not apply to them. Oregonlive likes it that way. It ran a lengthy piece expressing great concern for outdoor gatherings in state parks, without ever mentioning the threat to public health caused by the anarchists.

Bars are being busted and shuttered all over the nation, and this is exactly what Dr. Anthony Fauci wants. At the end of June he said, "Congregation at a bar, inside, is bad news. We really got to stop that right now."

What if someone is seeking anonymous sex online? Would that be okay? Fauci said, "If you're willing to take the risk—and you know, everybody has their own tolerance for risks—you could figure out if you want to meet somebody." He concluded, "If you want to go a little bit more intimate, well, then that's your choice regarding risk." He did not explain how strangers can have sex while social distancing.

In other words, Fauci is telling those looking for online sex that the risk is on you, but when it comes to those who want to take the risk of going to their neighborhood bar for a beer, they need to be stopped.

We have come to this stage of cynicism precisely because of the "boy who cried wolf" syndrome. The politicians, judges, journalists, and doctors who send mixed messages are to blame. Only they can rectify the damage they have done to their reputations, never mind the damage they have done to public health.

---

# THE SCOURGE OF WHITE LIBERAL RACISM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the problem of white liberal racism:

It is now considered a truth of the highest order that the United States is irredeemably racist. This has been the steady drumbeat of reporters and commentators for months on end. The villains, of course, are white people. However, thanks to Robert P. Jones, we can rest assured knowing white Christians are the real devil.

Jones has a problem with white people, especially white Christians. This is so notwithstanding the fact that he is both white and Christian. I erred: Let me take back the word “notwithstanding.” It would be more accurate to say, “owing to the fact.”

Jones, who is the CEO and founder of Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI), is not alone. It has become fashionable these days for white liberals to partake in public mea culpa exercises. These mass confessionals are designed to purge the mind and soul of any vestige of white guilt and white privilege. In the case of Jones, he has assumed a different posture. He has decided to put himself on a moral perch. Sitting high above the deplorables, he delights in chastising white Christians for inventing and sustaining racism.

A few years ago, Jones published *The End of White Christian America*. Fortunately for him, he was wrong: the bad guys are still around. I say “fortunately” because the stubbornness of white Christians not to fold has allowed him to roll out his new book, *White Too Long: The Legacy of White Supremacy in American Christianity*.

Just in time for his new book, Jones has a piece posted on the

nbcnews website titled, "Racism Among White Christians Is Higher Than Among The Nonreligious. That's no coincidence." Is this true? No it is not. So how does he come to this conclusion? He does so on the basis of his "Racism Index," a politically contrived measure predetermined to elicit the desired response.

This is an old game. Jones has a Ph.D. in religion; mine is in sociology. His lack of training in the social sciences is painfully obvious. His made-up scale, what he calls his "Racism Index," is anything but scientific. To say that his formula is tendentious would be a gross understatement.

Jones cites research conducted by PRRI that convinces him that white Christians (evangelical Protestants, mainline Protestants and Catholics) "are nearly twice as likely as religiously unaffiliated whites to say the killings of Black men by police are isolated incidents rather than a pattern of how police treat African Americans."

Regrettably for Jones, the white Christians are right.

Michael Tonry, a researcher whom no one would consider a conservative, came to a surprising conclusion in his book *Malign Neglect*. "Racial differences in patterns of offending, not racial bias by police and other officials, are the principal reason that such greater proportions of blacks than whites are arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and imprisoned."

Robert Sampson and Janet Lauritsen, who have sterling liberal credentials, found that "large racial differences in criminal offending," not racism, explained why more blacks were in prison proportionately than whites for longer terms.

In 2016, Harvard professor Roland G. Fryer Jr. led a team of researchers to study this issue. They examined more than 1,000 police shootings in 10 major police departments in three states. "On the most extreme use of force—officer-involved shootings—we find no racial differences in either the raw data

or when contextual factors are taken into account.” The black economist admitted, “It is the most surprising result of my career.”

In 2019, social scientists from Michigan State University and Arizona State University reported on the results of their two-year study. “When adjusting for crime, we find no systemic evidence of anti-Black disparities in fatal shootings, fatal shootings of unarmed citizens, or fatal shootings involving misidentification of harmless objects.”

In other words, the white Christians came to the right conclusion and the unaffiliated were wrong in their understanding of the way the police interact with blacks.

Here’s another one of the measures used by Jones to indict white Christians. “Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for Blacks to work their way out of the lower class.” White Christians were more likely to disagree with this statement than the unaffiliated. This is considered to be further proof of their inherent racism.

The problem with this position—blaming slavery and discrimination for the existence of a large black lower class—is that it does not explain why, as far back as 1965, half of blacks in the United States had already made their way to the middle class. Those stuck at the bottom could not logically be explained by referencing slavery and discrimination when, in fact, the 1960s saw an explosion in civil rights legislation. Something else was going on.

That something else was the creation of the welfare state and the crackup of the black family. Dependency did more to harm blacks from becoming upwardly mobile than Jim Crow laws ever did. The refusal of white liberals to acknowledge this verity is alarming.

Why the reluctance to state the obvious? That’s easy. White

liberals are the ones who crafted the welfare laws and lobbied hard to get blacks on the welfare rolls.

The raw truth is that white liberals, not white Christians, are responsible for the white-black divide. As Thomas Sowell points out in his new book, white liberals have resisted every school choice initiative, including charter schools.

Yet it is precisely in charter schools and Catholic schools where lower-class blacks have found a lever to ascend to the middle class. Similarly, the sight of white liberals, who live in tony neighborhoods, leading the charge to defund the police, is nauseating. This is the kind of effort we might expect from the Ku Klux Klan.

Blaming white Christians for the problems of black Americans is not only unsupported by the empirical evidence, it is a dodge. It is white liberals who have worked overtime to keep blacks down. They need to get out of the street, repent, and undo the damage they have done.

Contact Jones's media staffer, Jordun Lawrence: [press@prri.org](mailto:press@prri.org)

---

## **BLAMING THE CHURCH FOR THE HOMELESS IN L.A.**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on attempts to blame the Catholic Church for a homeless problem in Los Angeles:

Government officials want to build a homeless shelter in Venice, a beachfront neighborhood in the City of Los Angeles. For good reason, those who live in the area don't want it.

Indeed, no community wants a homeless shelter in their neighborhood. For no good reason, the *Los Angeles Times* took after St. Mark Catholic Church and the Archdiocese of Los Angeles for opposing the idea.

St. Mark and the Archdiocese of Los Angeles are not insensitive to the needs of the homeless. Indeed, St. Mark's operates Safe Place for Youth, a drop-in center that provides food for the homeless; the parishioners serve the meals. What concerns them is the building of a homeless shelter that is literally around the corner from the church and a Catholic elementary school.

An editorial in the *Los Angeles Times* is livid that the Church is offering resistance, saying "it is incomprehensible and disgraceful to see a church and the Archdiocese of Los Angeles fighting even a modest effort to get people permanently housed."

Given its editorial perspective, it is entirely comprehensible, yet disgraceful, that the *Los Angeles Times* would play this shaming game. Would it be so quick to excoriate those affiliated with another religion—or those associated with a secular institution—for opposing the shelter? It admits that safety is a concern for those who live in the area, but it apparently does not mean much to them.

Maybe the paper should spend more time explaining why Los Angeles has such a serious homeless problem in the first place. Figures released last month, and reported by National Public Radio, show that 66,433 people live in the streets of Los Angeles County. This is up by 12.7% in one year. Why?

Two years ago, the Southern California public radio station, KPCC, did an investigation of the homeless in Los Angeles County. Why were 43,000 people sleeping in the streets in tents, cars and makeshift structures? "A KPCC investigation found reports of bedbugs, rats, foul odors, poor lighting,



harassment, lax care in medical wards and even a 'chicken incubator' in a room where homeless people were sleeping."

In other words, the homeless shelters are, as one occupant said, "dangerous as heck." The KPCC report detailed "theft, harassment and even assault by other clients in shelters, and that staff were either indifferent to or untrained to handle the conflict."

Just last September, the newspaper ran an editorial about the homeless in Venice that was totally fair. It accurately observed "the tension between the homeless and the other residents of the neighborhood there," noting that there is a need to "balance the rights of the homeless with the needs of the city."

So what broke? This editorial implies that the Catholics who live there, and who already service the homeless, are not acting unreasonably when they defend the needs of their parish and schoolchildren. Whoever wrote the editorial of July 26, 2020 should explain why those who wrote the editorial of September 11, 2019 were wrong.

As expected, the "open-minded" Hollywood crowd wants nothing to do with the homeless. The closest homeless shelter to City Center, Hollywood is a quarter mile away; one is a half mile away and another is three-quarters a mile away. There are seven located between a mile and 5 miles away; 24 are 5-10 miles away; and 21 are situated 10-15 miles away.

In the Hollywood Studio District there is a homeless hospice and there is a food bank located in Beverly Hills, but these are not the kinds of facilities that endanger innocent persons.

Why aren't the diversity mavens at the *Los Angeles Times* railing against this kind of classist discrimination? Moreover, it sure looks like systemic racism. Maybe it's because those who work at the paper live in a filthy rich Snow

White neighborhood.

The headquarters of the *Los Angeles Times* is in El Segundo, almost 12 miles from Los Angeles. The closest homeless shelter is 6.27 miles away. A Google search found that “El Segundo home prices are not only among the most expensive in California, but El Segundo real estate consistently ranks among the most expensive in America.” It is 71.2% white and 3.79% black. Looks like there is enough white guilt there among the white privileged to last a lifetime.

Contact: Sewell Chan, the editorial page editor:  
[sewell.chan@latimes.com](mailto:sewell.chan@latimes.com)

---

## UNALIENABLE RIGHTS PANEL DRAWS FAMILIAR FOES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on critics of a State Department document on unalienable rights:

On July 16, the U.S. State Department, led by Secretary Mike Pompeo, issued its “Report of the Commission on Unalienable Rights.” Since that time, it has become increasingly evident that its critics, at home and abroad, are using the same playbook.

In the United States, the Center for American Progress is leading the way. In the United Kingdom, openDemocracy Limited (it publishes openDemocracy.net) is the key source. Both have released statements critical of the Report and both are funded by the Ford Foundation and George Soros’s Open Society Institute, two notoriously anti-Catholic and pro-abortion entities.

The Center for American Progress is a large-scale organization that was founded by John Podesta. He was White House Chief of Staff to President Bill Clinton and chairman of Hillary Clinton's failed presidential campaign; he also worked in the Obama administration. Today this enormously wealthy institution is run by Neera Tanden. She also worked in the Clinton and Obama administrations and was active in Hillary's bid for the White House.

The Center for American Progress employs left-wing experts covering 21 different issues, one of which is Religion and Values. Unlike its support for LGBT rights, it shows very little enthusiasm for promoting religious rights. Indeed, it is more interested in detailing how religious liberty can be a problem.

Thus, it was not surprising to learn that it would release a letter signed by more than "30 faith leaders" warning against Pompeo's "new push to put property rights and religious freedom at the forefront of American diplomacy." What was surprising is that the signatories—mostly pro-abortion and pro-gay rights activists (including those who falsely claim a Catholic status)—would actually go so far as to say that by giving primacy to religious freedom, the Report "will weaken religious freedom itself."

What's that? Only left-wing religious leaders would argue that giving prominence to religious freedom would weaken it. These same people would never say that giving prominence to LGBT rights would weaken those rights.

They are upset with the "hierarchy of rights" outlined in the Report. They argue that when it comes to rights, "none should be subordinate to another." Though they do not mention LGBT rights, it is clear from their political leanings and affiliations that they had these rights in mind when they expressed concern that the Report might "justify marginalizing certain rights."

The analysis provided by openDemocracy, "Justifying American Exceptionalism: The Commission on Unalienable Rights Undermines Modern Human Rights," is more specific.

This so-called "independent global media platform" is comprised of left-wing philanthropists and activists from around the world. It was founded in 2000 to "ensure that marginalized views and voices are heard." For the uninitiated, that does not include the most marginalized views and voices in the Western world today, namely those of a religious or conservative persuasion.

The openDemocracy document, like the letter issued by the Center for American Progress, is not happy with the elevated status given to religious liberty in the Report. It is particularly incensed over the high profile given to the Declaration of Independence. "There is no mention of the French Revolution or the Enlightenment which formed the background for the Declaration of Independence," it says.

Not to be picky, but it is not certain how the French Revolution, which began in 1789, could have "formed the background for the Declaration of Independence," which was written in 1776. But who cares about history?

Perhaps Mary Ann Glendon, who heads the Commission, should have mentioned that the reason why we must give priority to unalienable rights is because the French Revolution decimated them.

She could have cited, for instance, the murder of the Catholic clergy, the plunder of Catholic property, and the bloodstained attempts to destroy Catholicism in all of its vestiges. She might have ended by agreeing with historians that the French Revolution was the world's first totalitarian regime. But this is probably not what these sages were thinking.

Unlike the Center for American Progress, openDemocracy cites LGBT rights several times. It is these newly invented rights

that really fires the globalists. They want to make sure that when the First Amendment guarantee of religious liberty clashes with the homosexual agenda, the former loses every time.

Both the U.S. and the U.K. organizations are miffed that the Report does not mirror the universality of rights noted in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Report does not dodge this anticipated complaint, noting that while the Universal Declaration “does not explicitly establish a hierarchy of rights,” it is the duty of the U.S. State Department to “determine which rights most accord with national principles, priorities, and interests at any given time.”

It might also be said that among the rights mentioned in the Universal Declaration that these organizations want to put on the same plane with religious liberty is the “right to rest and leisure” (Article 24).

More rest and leisure for these geniuses is exactly what the doctor ordered.

---

## **PLANNED PARENTHOOD TRIES TO ERASE ITS PAST**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Planned Parenthood’s rejection of its founder:

The founder of Planned Parenthood, Margaret Sanger, was a notorious racist and anti-Catholic bigot, yet this never stopped the organization from defending her until now. Indeed, I once clashed on TV with a Planned Parenthood official who

denied Sanger was a racist. Now the abortion-happy institution has come clean and is admitting the obvious.

In fact, the New York-based abortion mill is removing Sanger's name from its building (her name from local streets in Greenwich Village may also be removed).

With rare exception, the removal of tributes to historic leaders from public spaces should be resisted. This certainly includes Margaret Sanger. By removing her name from public association with the organization she founded, Planned Parenthood is trying to erase its bigoted and bloody history, one which continues to this day.

Regarding its current record, Rev. Dean Nelson, a black minister who directs Human Coalition Action, notes that "nearly 80 percent of Planned Parenthood's surgical abortion facilities [are] located within walking distance of Black neighborhoods." This is not by accident: It is being faithful to the aspirations of Margaret Sanger, a position shared by Planned Parenthood officials today.

Planned Parenthood is finally saying that there is "overwhelming evidence for Sanger's deep belief in eugenic ideology." No matter, Sanger's biographer, Ellen Chesler, claims we are not being fair to her heroine, saying her views have been misinterpreted. Really?

Was Planned Parenthood misinterpreted when it wrote of the necessity of weeding out the "undesirables," meaning African Americans? "Many of the colored citizens are fine specimens of humanity," it boasted in 1932. "A good share of them, however, constitute a large percentage of Kalamazoo's human scrap pile." A year later Hitler rose to power and wasted no time launching his eugenics program.

In vivid contrast to the eugenics policies adopted by Planned Parenthood and the Nazis was the enlightened perspective of Pope Pius XII. "Can it be licit, by order of the public

authority," he said in 1940, "to kill directly those who, although they have not committed any crime deserving of death, still, because of their physical or psychic defects, cannot be useful to the nation and might be a weight for it and, it is reckoned, might be an impediment for its vigor and strength? No, because it is contrary to the natural law and the divine precept."

It is nice to know that 80 years later, Planned Parenthood is finally catching up to the wisdom of the Catholic Church, even if its reasoning is politically motivated. If it were principled, it would embrace natural law, but if it did it would have to go out of business.

Planned Parenthood has more work to do. It now needs to address its anti-Catholic legacy. Chesler wrote that Sanger was "rabidly anti-Catholic as she grew older." It is time for the abortion behemoth to make a public statement denouncing Sanger's anti-Catholicism.

Planned Parenthood's historic racism, and its monistic fixation on aborting black babies, needs to be taught in the schools, starting this fall. Its despicable legacy must never be erased.

*Let Planned Parenthood know that it must now address its history of anti-Catholicism.*

Contact Jacquelyn Marrero, director media relations at Planned Parenthood of Greater New York:  
[jacquelyn.marrero@ppggreaterny.org](mailto:jacquelyn.marrero@ppggreaterny.org)

---

# GOD SURVEY REVEALS STATUS DIVIDE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new Pew survey on religion:

The Pew Research Center's latest survey on religion worldwide reveals some interesting socio-economic patterns.

In general, the developing nations are more likely to believe that it is necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values than is true in the developed nations. Within each nation, the same phenomena exists: the wealthy are less likely to agree that God is central to morality than is true of those at the bottom of the class strata.

In the United States, 54% say it is not necessary to believe in God in order to be moral and have good values; 44% say it is necessary. Education drives the outcome: the most highly educated are the least likely to acknowledge the seminal place of God in shaping moral outcomes. Education, of course, is linked to income. Interestingly, the gap on this scale between those with higher income and those with lower income is greatest in the United States.

Political leanings matter as well. Those of a more conservative bent are the most likely to affirm the role of God in moral decisions; those who lean left are the least likely. This is true in all 15 nations surveyed.

When the question is personalized, i.e., when respondents are asked about the role of religion in their own lives, 72% of Americans say it is important.

It is clear from this survey, as well as many others, that socio-economic status helps to explain religiosity: there is an inverse relationship between the two, meaning that the more



educated and affluent a person is, the less likely he is to say religion plays an important role in his life.

From a Catholic perspective, the sin of pride is operative. To be exact, the highly educated believe that they have no need for God; they believe they are morally self-sufficient and prefer to follow their own moral compass. Sociologically, this matters (after all, we all interact with each other). Ergo, we need to explore the content of their moral compass.

In the United States, those who say religion is critical to morality are essentially saying that their vision is shaped by the Judeo-Christian ethos, which is rooted in the Ten Commandments. Those who say God is not important are more likely to have their vision shaped by moral relativism; it defines their moral compass.

Which brings us back to the survey. It is one thing for someone, including a person of faith, to say that it is possible for an individual to be moral without also being religious. Indeed, examples abound. However, it is quite another to say that a *society* can be moral if most people entertain a secular vision.

This is not to say that the European nations, most of which have adopted a secular vision, are morally corrupt. They are not. But this is no tribute to them. Every western nation is still benefiting from the residue of the Judeo-Christian culture which has long shaped their society. History has shown, however, that in the long run, a culture that embraces moral relativism is inviting nothing but trouble.

---

# KEY UNALIENABLE RIGHTS THREATENED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest attacks on Christianity:

Last week, the U.S. State Department released its “Report of the Commission on Unalienable Rights.” The distinguished panel of experts, chaired by Harvard Law professor Mary Ann Glendon, gave prominence to the role that religious liberty plays in the making of a free society. “Foremost among the unalienable rights that government is established to secure, from the founders’ point of view, are property rights and religious liberty.”

Regrettably, property rights and religious liberty are threatened today, both at home and abroad. News stories from the past few days show that Christians are having to endure attacks on both of these key rights.

The Christian Post reports that Christians are being forced to renounce their faith in Communist China and that displays of Jesus must be replaced with pictures of Mao Zedong and President Xi Jinping. The cult of the personality, especially of Mao, the genocidal tyrant, was once a staple in China, but those norms were relaxed for many years. Now they are back with a vengeance.

Open Doors, which monitors religious persecution of Christians worldwide, ranks Pakistan as one of the worst nations in the world for Christians to live. According to the Daily Express, a British media outlet, Christian churches are now being told to remove crosses from their churches in Pakistan. Why? Because Muslims are complaining.

The New York Times reports that a fire engulfed the Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul in the western French city of

Nantes. The Gothic church's organ and stained-glass windows were badly damaged. The fire is being investigated as the work of arsonists.

A statue of Jesus was beheaded at a Catholic church in South Florida. According to ABC News, this incident at Good Shepherd Catholic Church in West Kendall is being investigated by the Miami-Dade police and the Department of Homeland Security. A spokesperson for the Archdiocese of Miami, Mary Ross Agosta, saw this for what it was. "This is not only private property, it is sacred property."

The New Haven Register has a story on what vandals did to St. Joseph's Church in New Haven. "Satanic" and "anarchist" symbols were found on the church's door. This was not the work of some drunken teenagers.

Chris Churchill at the Times-Union did a fine story on Pastor John Koletas from Lansingburgh, New York. Unlike the vandals, the head of the Grace Baptist Church did not deface religious symbols. But he did engage in hate speech against many demographic groups, including Catholics. He called the pope "the most evil man in the world" and blamed Catholics for causing the Civil War. Catholics also partake in alcohol (which he said was promoted by "satan") and are a "bunch of child molesters."

Why now? Why are we seeing a crackdown on Christianity abroad, and a rash of violence against Christian churches at home? Christianity has always been a threat to communists and to Islamists, so periodic assaults on it are nothing new. The attacks in the United States are more a reflection of the hate-filled environment that marks our nation at the current time.

If there is one common denominator between these two parallel phenomena at home and abroad it is the conviction that Christianity stands in the way of reconstructing society. This

sociological observation is correct.

What joins the communists in China, the Islamists in the Middle East, and the anarchists in the United States is the quest for total control of society. They cannot achieve that end without leveling Christianity, which is why they must be resisted. We cannot allow our unalienable rights to be destroyed by totalitarians.

---

## **NEW YORK TIMES' BIAS IS NOT ALWAYS OBVIOUS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on further evidence of bias reporting at the *New York Times*:

The opinion editor of the *New York Times*, Bari Weiss, resigned this week after being shamed for doing her job. She criticized what she saw as a censorial workplace, one that was biased against conservative opinion. Indeed, she said she experienced “unlawful discrimination” and a “hostile work environment.”

What Weiss endured was widely covered by the media. What the media do not cover are the multiple instances of bias of a more subtle nature, and in this regard, the *New York Times* is hard to beat. Take, for example, two news stories that were recently posted online.

Every institution has its poster boy for sexual abuse crimes, and for the Catholic Church in the United States that would be former cardinal Theodore McCarrick. The *New York Times*' 3300-word story on the predatory priest was not only a dud (it broke no new ground), it never touched on the most serious issue relevant to McCarrick's sordid history.

What Catholics want to know is not one more anecdote about McCarrick's homosexual adventures—which is all the story offered—they want to know who knew what and when about his behavior. The Catholic clergy and laity have been waiting for more than two years for the Vatican report on him. Why the delay? Never once do the reporters mention this.

Why are they so stunningly incurious about the only thing that matters about the McCarrick saga? To be blunt, why are they being protective of Pope Francis? It certainly would not be so generous to his two predecessors.

On a completely different note, the newspaper did a story on Nick Cannon, a prominent media star who was fired from ViacomCBS for making anti-Semitic remarks. The mega-media outlet issued a statement that made clear its objections. "ViacomCBS condemns bigotry of any kind and we categorically denounce all forms of anti-Semitism."

That sentence appeared in the following media outlets: AP, UPI, ABC, CBS, NBC, BBC, *Variety*, *USA Today*, *New York Post*, MSN, Time, HuffPost, Fox Business, *Hollywood Reporter*, *Miami Herald*, *Washington Examiner*, Townhall, and Yahoo.

Why didn't the *New York Times* print that sentence? It is not as though no one saw it. Here is what its story said. "A ViacomCBS spokeswoman said in a statement that the company categorically denounced all forms of anti-Semitism."

Why did the newspaper shorten the actual statement? Because it decided—this was no mistake—not to call attention to ViacomCBS denouncing "bigotry of any kind," not just anti-Semitism.

This matters, especially to the Catholic League, because ViacomCBS has had in its employ known anti-Catholic bigots, the most recent and obvious example of which is Trevor Noah.

On May 20, I wrote to the ViacomCBS board of directors saying, "Trevor Noah is out of control." After providing an example of

his latest assault on priests, I mentioned how a year earlier I contacted Viacom's executives (this was before the merger with CBS) about Noah's "relentless anti-Catholic remarks."

Anti-Catholicism is just as unacceptable as anti-Semitism, or any other expression of bigotry. Yet in the worldview of the *New York Times*, only the latter matters (and even there many Jews would not agree).

The omission of any mention of the Vatican report on McCarrick, coupled with the omission of ViacomCBS's statement registering its opposition to "bigotry of any kind," are two examples of the kind of discreet bias that marks the *New York Times*. It's what happens when the newsroom becomes "a hostile environment."

Contact Eileen Murphy, senior vice president, Communications:  
[eileen.murphy@nytimes.com](mailto:eileen.murphy@nytimes.com)

---

## CATHOLIC LEFT SUPPORTS BLACK LIVES MATTER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Catholic support for Black Lives Matter:

If someone were running for president and said he was committed to [destroying the nuclear family](#), we wouldn't expect any practicing Catholic to support him. What if the same candidate said he was [pro-abortion](#)? What if he said he was [against school choice](#)? What if he said he wants to [defund the police](#)? No Catholic who follows Church teachings could ever support such a person.

These questions must be raised because an article endorsing a group that supports these four policy positions, Black Lives Matter, was just published by a man who used to work at the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, and now works for Faith in Public Life, a left-wing outfit. Moreover, it was published by a Catholic left-wing media outlet, [Commonweal](#).

Worse, the author, John Gehring, slams the “white hierarchy” of the Catholic Church, and some Catholic organizations (including the Catholic League), for not supporting this agenda. Gehring is funded by George Soros, the atheist billionaire who funded the “Catholic spring,” a movement aimed at taking down the Catholic Church.

The bishops need to know who their foes are, as well as their friends. Gehring is working against them, and Commonweal is egging him on. Such is the state of Church politics in 2020.

*Contact Commonweal editor, Dominic Preziosi:*  
[dominic@commonwealmagazine.org](mailto:dominic@commonwealmagazine.org)

---

## **COVID-19 CONCERNS JETTISONED FOR PROTESTERS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how some states are making exceptions for protesters in handling COVID-19:

A Catholic League analysis of the way six states have responded to outdoor gatherings, church services, and protesters reveals disparate treatment: there is one set of rules for protesters and another for everyone else.

## *California*

A directive was issued on May 25 by the State Public Health Officer that treated faith-based services and protesters equally. It said it would make “an exception to the prohibition against mass gatherings for faith-based services and cultural ceremonies as well as protests.” Restrictions were placed on indoor gatherings, but those held outdoors were permitted, provided there was social distancing.

However, on July 6, a ban was placed on chanting and singing in churches. No restrictions were mandated for protesters. In fact, there was no attempt to ensure that protesters practiced social distancing.

## *Illinois*

In June, Gov. J.B. Pritzker placed restrictions on houses of worship, but none on protesters. He eased his most draconian restrictions at the end of June, but he still urged that singing and “group recitation” be curbed.

On June 4, the Department of Health asked that protesters get tested but nothing was mandated. Indeed, nothing was done about limiting the size of the protests or maintaining social distancing. Moreover, the chanting and “group recitation” ban imposed on churches did not apply.

## *Massachusetts*

Gov. Charlie Baker put restrictions on indoor church services, but did not treat outdoor church gatherings any different than secular outdoor gatherings. However, some outdoor assemblies have been banned altogether: festivals, walk-a-thons, road and bike races, and organized athletic events are prohibited until further notice.

Gov. Baker did make one exception to his directive. He declared that “outdoor gatherings for the purpose of political



expression are not subject to this Order.”

### *Minnesota*

On June 15, the “Stay Safe MN” Phase III regulations issued by the Department of Health put restrictions on faith-based services, both indoor and outdoor. The Health Commissioner, Jan Malcolm, warned that protest gatherings could pose a public health risk. She urged, but did not require, social distancing, wearing masks and hand-washing.

Protests were not limited in size, as were church gatherings, and no attempt was made to enforce any restrictions on these assemblies.

### *New York*

In June, four pages of mandated limitations on worship services were issued by the New York State Health Department, including a ban on chanting or yelling. On June 26, a federal district judge issued a preliminary injunction on placing restrictions on church gatherings. Judge Gary Sharpe reprimanded Mayor Bill de Blasio and Gov. Andrew Cuomo for showing “preferential treatment” to protesters.

Unlike everyone else, contact-tracers are not allowed to ask New Yorkers if they participated in a protest. Last week, de Blasio went further saying he is banning all parades through September. However, he said Black Lives Matter protests were too important to be subjected to the ban on large outside gatherings.

### *Washington*

The state government’s website puts forth restrictions on religious and faith-based organizations. It sounded the alarms by warning that “frequent reports of spiritual gatherings” can become “COVID-19 ‘superspreader’ events.”

On the protests, most especially those that engulfed Seattle,

the Secretary of Health could not bring himself to address the threats to public health posed either by the violence itself, or by the mass gatherings of people in close quarters. These assemblies were not seen as “superspreader” events.

### *Summary*

These states, and there are others like them, put on grand display how thoroughly politicized public health issues have become. State and local executives, along with leaders in the medical profession, have made a mockery of their alleged interest in public health, making everyone doubt their sincerity. Their contempt for religious liberty is beyond question.

In doing so, they have belittled their status and increased the likelihood that their future directives and guidelines will not be observed.