

# DOJ URGED TO HOLD SAN FRANCISCO ACCOUNTABLE

The City of San Francisco is unconstitutionally encroaching on the religious liberties of its citizens. Catholic League president Bill Donohue wrote to Justice Department Secretary Bill Barr today urging him to require San Francisco public officials to respect the First Amendment right of people to worship.

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

---

# BIDEN MUST FIRE BIGOTED STAFFER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue is calling for Joe Biden to terminate an anti-Catholic person on his staff:

Anti-Catholicism is engulfing the Biden camp. The latest guilty party is Nikitha Rai.

We learned today that Rai, who is Deputy Data Director for the Biden campaign, is incensed over the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court. She argues that Barrett's Catholic beliefs should bar her from serving.

On September 28, Rai had a Twitter exchange with Shadi Hamid, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute. At issue was Barrett's alleged membership in a charismatic Christian organization that holds to traditional moral values. Biblical teachings on marriage and sexuality became the topic of discussion.

After someone else made reference to these teachings, citing Barrett's previous service to a "South Bend private school" [she was a trustee at Trinity School], Hamid questioned why this was news. "Isn't this the standard position for any orthodox Catholic?" Rai answered, "Unfortunately, yes." Hamid then said, "to be fair, it's the standard position for any orthodox Muslim or Jew as well..."

Rai's response was unequivocal. "True. I'd heavily prefer views like that not to be elevated to SCOTUS, but unfortunately our current culture is still relatively intolerant. It will be a while before those types of beliefs are so taboo that they're disqualifiers."

In other words, any person of faith who holds to biblical teachings on marriage and sexuality is intolerant and should be barred from serving on the Supreme Court. That would include all practicing Catholics, evangelical Christians, Mormons, Muslims, and Orthodox Jews.

Nikitha Rai is the intolerant one. Her rank bigotry disqualifies her from serving in the Biden campaign. She should be dumped immediately.

Contact Jen O'Malley-Dillon, Biden's campaign manager:  
[jod@joebiden.com](mailto:jod@joebiden.com)

---

## **BIDEN'S EVOLVING VIEWS ON ABORTION**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Joe Biden's changing views on abortion:

Joe Biden entered the senate in 1973, the same year the Supreme Court legalized abortion in its *Roe v. Wade* decision. He has evolved from being strongly pro-life to rabidly pro-abortion. Here is a list of his changing positions.

1974: A year after *Roe v. Wade* was decided, he said the ruling had gone “too far” and that a woman seeking an abortion should not have the “sole right to say what should happen to her body.”

1976: He votes for the “Hyde Amendment” which bans federal funding of abortions.

1981: He introduces the “Biden Amendment” which prohibits foreign-aid funding of biomedical research involving abortion.

1982: He votes for a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

1983: He votes against a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

1984: He votes for the Mexico City Policy which bans federal funding for abortions.

1987: He becomes chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and leads the fight against Supreme Court nominee Judge Robert Bork, whom he said was opposed to *Roe v. Wade*.

1994: He says, “Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them.”

1995: He votes to ban partial-birth abortion.

1997: He votes to ban partial-birth abortion.

2003: He votes to ban partial-birth abortion

2007: He criticizes the Supreme Court decision upholding the ban on partial-birth abortion, calling it “paternalistic.”

2008: He says he is opposed to overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

2012: He says the government does not have “a right to tell other people that women, they can’t control their body.”

2019: He says he is opposed to the “Hyde Amendment” which bans the federal funding of abortion.

2020: He says he supports abortion “under any circumstances.”

There is no one in public life who has undergone such a dramatic transformation. He did not change because of the Catholic Church: it did not change its position on abortion. He did not change because of science: it did not change its position on when life begins. It was Biden who changed, and he did so for totally political reasons.

---

## BARRETT’S FAITH TRASHED BY MEDIA AND ACTIVISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on who is trashing Amy Coney Barrett’s Catholicism:

As I predicted [last week](#), Supreme Court nominee Amy Coney Barrett would be spared another round of anti-Catholic commentary by senate Democrats. From what was said over the weekend, my assessment was correct.

Indeed, Rep. Nancy Pelosi affirmed that it “doesn’t matter what her faith is.” Sen. Dick Durbin, who made anti-Catholic remarks when Barrett was being considered for an appellate post in 2017, said this time around, “I’m going to be extremely careful.”

It is clear that the Democrats got burned for their bigotry three years ago and are not prepared to go down that road again, at least not in an ostentatious way (look for oblique attacks on her faith). That does not mean, however, that their surrogates in the media and activist organizations will restrain themselves. In fact, they are on the loose again.

Organizations that are either expressly atheistic or are wholly secular are, of course, ripping Barrett's Catholicism. American Atheists and Americans United for Separation of Church and State issued news releases arguing that Barrett's commitment to religious liberty means she will discriminate against LGBTQ people.

Freedom From Religion Foundation contends that Barrett would "complete the Christian Nationalist takeover of the high court for more than a generation." Similarly, the American Humanist Association maintains that Barrett would be the sixth Catholic on the Supreme Court, a red flag; her reported membership in a charismatic Christian group was deemed "particularly concerning."

The Daily Kos ran two articles hammering Barrett. One called her a "religious extremist," and the other said she is "primed and ready to substitute the Church's particular teaching [on abortion] as the only true religious position on the matter." (Notice abortion was not framed as a biological issue.)

Left-wing activist Katie Hill, who runs a political action committee, said questions about Barrett's religion are fair game: we need to know if she "will impose her faith on the American people." (The way secularists impose their beliefs in education?)

Elizabeth Bruenig used her *New York Times* column to state that Barrett's nomination has "renewed attention to a fundamental conflict, centuries underway, between Catholicism and the American ethos." (This is a polite way of wondering if

practicing Catholics—in the 21st century—can be good Americans.)

Mother Jones ran a piece that was long on innuendo and short on facts calling attention to Barrett's alleged membership in a Christian charismatic group. Bill Maher sounded the alarms saying Barrett was "really, really Catholic." Imagine someone saying Ruth Bader Ginsburg was "really, really Jewish"—everyone would know what that means.

MSNBC's Joy Reid was more forthright on this issue, leading Megyn Kelly to condemn her "bigoted attacks on Catholics." Ron Charles of the *Washington Post*, and Lindy Ki, a Biden delegate, raised questions about Barrett's respect for separation of church and state (they have it backwards—respect for the autonomy of religious organizations is the pressing issue).

First prize goes to David Atkins of the Washington Monthly. "In reality, there is no anti-Catholic bias against Barrett from the left." Looks like the secular dogma lives loudly within him.

The Trump campaign was doing more than blowing political smoke when it said that Biden should end his silence about the anti-Catholic attacks on Barrett. He should. If a Muslim Supreme Court nominee were the target of bigotry stemming from Republicans or conservatives, he would surely condemn it.

I am happy to say that I have been contacted by New York City Councilman and Pentecostal minister Reuben Diaz Sr., and Rabbi Aryeh Spero, both of whom have pledged to condemn anti-Catholics. Too bad Biden, a professed Catholic, can't do the same. However, if he did, he would have to start by condemning his [running mate](#).

---

# NOT ALL ABORTION POLLS ARE EQUAL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on abortion surveys:

On September 25, the *Wall Street Journal* ran a lengthy piece on Joe Biden's Catholicism. It was quite informative. However, one of the items it mentioned was a Pew Research Center survey from 2019 that showed "56% of Catholics said abortion should be legal in all or most cases, compared with 61% for all U.S. adults." The journalists reported that accurately, however the poll was misleading.

The best way to learn what the public thinks about abortion restrictions is to ask several questions. Indeed, the more the better. This is costly, which is why such surveys are a rarity. But if we are to get an accurate grip on public sentiment, we cannot rely on polls that fail to get below the surface. The simpler and more generalized the questions, the more meaningless they are.

Since 1995, Pew has asked adults if abortion should be "legal in all cases"; "legal in most cases"; "illegal in most cases"; or illegal in all cases."

When respondents are asked if abortion should be legal or illegal, it is plausible to assume that what typically comes to mind are worst case scenarios. If abortion were totally illegal, there would be no exceptions for rape, incest, or the death of the mother. Fortunately, such instances are extremely rare, but the fact that they exist moves the needle in favor of opposing a complete ban. However, this is not an accurate index of public sentiment.

On June 13, 2018, Gallup found that 60% of respondents believed abortion should be legal in the first three months of pregnancy; 28% said it should be legal in the second three months; and 13% said it should be legal in the last three months. Under current law, abortion is legal through term.

In 2019, a Marist poll found that 75% of Americans said abortion should be limited to—at most—the first three months. According to CBS News, a Marist poll in 2020 found that “65% of Americans are likely to vote for a candidate who believes abortion should be outlawed after the first three months of pregnancy; allowed only in cases of rape, incest, or to save the life of the mother; or not permitted under any circumstances.”

In short, the deeper a survey digs on the subject of abortion, and the more realistic the questions are, the more likely it is that the majority of Americans will conclude that although they do not want to make abortion totally illegal, they want it to be considerably limited in scope. The reason why an abortion is sought, and the trimester in which it occurs, are two issues that matter gravely. Polls that do not tap these verities are deficient. Indeed, they are misleading.

---

## **TRUMP BLASTED FOR OPPOSING INFANTICIDE**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on reaction to President Trump’s “Born Alive” executive order:

President Trump announced this week that he will sign an executive order mandating that doctors attend to babies born alive, “no matter what the circumstances.” The proximate cause



of his order is the practice of denying medical care to babies born alive as a result of a botched abortion.

The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to late-term abortions. What Trump plans to do goes beyond partial-birth abortion: His executive order is targeted at prohibiting infanticide. Astonishingly, he is being criticized in some quarters for doing so. Some maintain that infanticide is not a problem.

Dr. Kristyn Brandi is a board member of Physicians for Reproductive Health. She opposed a legislative effort earlier this year that would provide sanctions for doctors who refused to provide medical care for babies born alive following a botched abortion. "The bill maligns and vilifies providers and patients to push a false narrative about abortion later in pregnancy."

"States can and do punish people for killing children who are born alive," opines Florida State University law professor Mary Ziegler. Journalist Danielle Campoamor says it is a "lie" to say babies born alive after a failed abortion need protection, saying such a scenario is "incredibly unlikely." Yet the Associated Press, which quotes critics of Trump's proposed order, says there were "143 deaths between 2003 and 2014 involving infants born alive during attempted abortions."

NARAL, the pro-abortion giant, even says, "The term 'born alive' is not a term rooted in science or *reality* (my *italic*)." Jacqueline Ayers, a vice president at Planned Parenthood Action Fund, says Trump's order is a "solution to a nonexistent problem," yet he undercuts his own position by offering a quote from Virginia Governor Ralph Northam. Northam has said that it is up to the mother to decide whether a baby born alive after a trimester abortion should receive medical care. He added that in the meantime, while she is figuring out what to do, "the infant would be kept comfortable."

It is not just Northam who allows infanticide. New York Governor Andrew Cuomo does as well. In 2019, he removed all criminal penalties for medical personnel who intentionally allow an innocent baby to die.

Lying about infanticide is the natural progression of a mindset that justifies partial-birth abortion. Indeed, the lying became publicly known in 1997 when Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, admitted on national TV that he “lied through [his] teeth” when he “just went out there and spouted the party line” about how rare partial-birth abortion is.

All the health professionals, journalists, activists, and politicians who deny the reality of babies being born alive after a failed abortion need to tell that to Gianna Jessen. She survived an abortion. And so have many others. They should look at her in the face and say she has no business being alive.

In 1994, Mother Teresa said, “The greatest destroyer of peace today is abortion.” Now her acute observation has to be amended to include infanticide. Kudos to President Trump for opposing these barbaric acts.

---

## **BARRETT WILL BE SPARED BIGOTED HEARING**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the upcoming hearings on President Trump’s nominee for the Supreme Court:

It now looks like President Trump will nominate Amy Coney

Barrett to fill the vacancy on the U.S. Supreme Court. He met with her twice this week. He also admitted that he did not meet with Barbara Lagoa, widely believed to be Barrett's strongest competitor.

Barrett, who was subjected to a round of anti-Catholic commentary in 2017 when she was being considered for the appellate job she now holds, is not likely to endure a second round of bigoted attacks. That's because those who made those remarks paid a heavy price for doing so.

I am proud that the Catholic League played a major role in putting these unjust critics of Barrett on the defensive. More than any other Catholic organization, we led the fight against Barrett's foes.

To date we have issued 10 new releases on this subject, garnering 32 media hits—we have been cited on TV, radio, newspaper, and internet stories. Most important, we mobilized Catholics to contact Senator Charles Grassley, who chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee when Barrett was being considered for the appellate position. They did so in droves.

On September 17, 2017, I wrote to Senator Dick Durbin and Senator Dianne Feinstein objecting to their line of questioning. In both instances, Catholic-baiting questions and comments were made. What made this [news release](#) special was providing our subscribers with Grassley's email address: we urged them to request that the senator speak to the issue of anti-Catholicism.

In my statement to the media, I said, "Senator Durbin and Senator Feinstein came perilously close to applying a religious test to circuit court nominee Amy Coney Barrett. Such a test is unconstitutional." On October 31, 2017, Grassley took to the floor commenting on Barrett's critics, noting that "Others have spoken on the issue of a 'religious test' but I'll remind my colleagues the Constitution" bars

such a measure. He added that “we received many letters on this topic.”

I was accurately quoted in Politico today saying the Catholic League staff has been scanning internet sites looking for instances of anti-Catholic bigotry, but so far “red flags” have been scarce. This explains why we have not issued a statement condemning such discourse. “There’s not enough there right now,” I said. “People are being more careful this time around.”

Of course, not everyone has been shy about going after Barrett’s Catholicism. Villanova University professor Massimo Faggioli, a Catholic dissident, says the Democrats should not hold back in questioning her religious beliefs. Wandy Felicita Ortiz, a New York writer, attacked Barrett’s religious convictions by saying the nominee “hates your uterus.” Newsweek had to apologize for claiming that Barrett inspired *The Handmaid’s Tale* (a story about religious fanatics).

Many commentators, not all of whom are sympathetic to Barrett, have warned against playing the anti-Catholic card. Some have made principled arguments while others have observed that it would backfire.

S.E. Cupp advises Democrats that a repeat of the bigoted attacks on Barrett will only get Trump reelected. Bonnie Kristian, writing for Yahoo News, says that an attack on Barrett’s faith is the “wrong way” to go. Democratic Senator Joe Manchin flatly said, “It’s awful to bring in religion. It truly is.” Professor Jonathan Turley, who says he is “fervently secular” in his views, opined that Democrats should leave Barrett’s religious beliefs alone.

The Jewish Forward argued that questioning her religious convictions “should be off limits.” Father Tom Reese, who is not a Trump supporter, said, “The Democrats are making a big mistake if they talk about her religion.” Brandeis University

professor Eileen McNamara said it best: “Let’s keep the focus during this nomination and confirmation fight—whenever it comes—on the Constitution, not on the Baltimore Catechism.”

If Amy Coney Barrett is indeed President Trump’s pick, the ugly proceedings she endured three years ago are not likely to be repeated. But we can never be complacent. We therefore request that everyone ask Senator Lindsey Graham, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to be on the alert for Catholic-baiting questions and remarks.

*Contact Graham’s chief of staff, Richard Perry:*  
[Richard\\_Perry@lgraham.senate.gov](mailto:Richard_Perry@lgraham.senate.gov)

---

## **NYC FAILS TO VET PERVERTS**

How did a sexual abuser in a high-ranking job in the New York City Department of Education get by investigators? How can this happen when New York State lawmakers claim to be outraged about the sexual abuse of minors?

To read Catholic League president Bill Donohue’s letter to education officials, click [here](#).

---

## **CATHOLIC NOMINEES TO HIGH COURT FACE BIAS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Senate Democrats who will vote on the next nominee to the U.S.

## Supreme Court:

According to multiple news reports, the two leading candidates to fill the opening on the U.S. Supreme Court are Amy Coney Barrett and Barbara Lagoa. Both federal judges are Catholic. This raises a serious issue: In the event that either woman is nominated, senators who have shown a bias against Catholics being seated on the federal bench should recuse themselves.

There are five Democrats who are already tainted. Their remarks were made as members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

### 1) Sen. Dick Durbin

On September 7, 2017, I wrote to him regarding his remarks of September 6 on the suitability of University of Notre Dame Law School professor Amy Coney Barrett to be seated on the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. I accused him of crossing the line when he drilled down on her Catholicity.

“Do you consider yourself an orthodox Catholic?” This was a remarkable question posed by Durbin. After all, he attended Catholic schools for 19 years. He said he had “never seen [that term] before.” He then asked, “What’s an orthodox Catholic?” This was disingenuous. Durbin was trying to get Barrett to opine on her Catholic values and how they may affect her judicial decisions. He would never do this to any nominee who was Jewish or Muslim.

Barrett was not perturbed. “It is never appropriate for a judge to apply their personal convictions, whether it derives from faith or personal conviction.”

This was not the first time Durbin showed his true colors. In 2005, when considering the qualifications of John Roberts, a Catholic, for the Supreme Court, he told a CNN correspondent that senators need to “look at everything, including the nominee’s faith.” Yet there is no record of Durbin looking

into the faith of non-Catholic nominees for the federal bench.

## 2) Sen. Dianne Feinstein

On September 7, 2017, I wrote to her about comments she made while questioning Barrett on September 6. "When you read your speeches, the conclusion one draws is that the dogma lives loudly within you."

I wrote the following to Feinstein. "No one was fooled by your question. Why didn't you come right out and ask her if she takes her judicial cues from the Vatican? That would be more honest." I also asked her, "Do you, as a matter of course, probe the propriety of having a person of deep faith on the court who is not Catholic? If so, please share that information with me. If not, try treating Catholics as equals."

In 2005, when questioning John Roberts, Feinstein asked him if he agreed with President John F. Kennedy when he pledged to respect separation of church and state. Thus did she dig up the old canard about "dual loyalties." Apparently, she was unaware that Kennedy made his Houston remarks in 1960 following an outburst of anti-Catholicism by leading Protestants.

## 3) Sen. Kamala Harris

In 2018, Harris questioned the suitability of Brian C. Buescher to be seated as a federal district judge. On December 26, 2018, I issued a news release condemning Harris for attacking the nominee because he was a member of the Knights of Columbus, a pro-life Catholic organization.

Harris asked Buescher, "Were you aware that the Knights of Columbus opposed a woman's right to choose when you joined the organization?" Her real target was the Catholic Church's teachings on abortion and sexuality. Harris has also declared war on pro-life activists who expose the ugly practices of

abortion mills.

#### 4) Sen. Mazie Hirono

Hirono took the same position against Buescher as Harris did, which is why I included her in my statement of December 26, 2018. Here is what she said to the Catholic nominee. "The Knights of Columbus has taken a number of extreme positions. If confirmed, do you intend to end your membership with this organization to avoid any appearance of that?" She cited the Knights' opposition to gay marriage as an example.

If the Knights are "extreme," then millions of Americans, most of whom are not Catholic, are on the fringes. Those who believe that marriage should be reserved for one man and one woman are hardly extremists. They are simply stating the obvious (only a man and a woman can make a family). No matter, Hirono wants those who believe this verity to be excluded from the judiciary.

#### 5) Sen. Chuck Schumer

On August 13, 2003, I issued a news release criticizing Schumer's remarks opposing Alabama Attorney General Bill Pryor's nomination to the 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Pryor oversaw the removal of the Ten Commandments monument from the state Supreme Court building.

"His beliefs are so well known," Schumer said of Pryor, "so deeply held, that it's very hard to believe—very hard to believe—that they're not going to deeply influence" him if he gets confirmed.

In effect, Schumer was subjecting Pryor to a "*de facto*" religious test. Charles Krauthammer said "the net effect of Schumer's 'deeply held views' litmus test...is to disqualify from the bench anyone whose personal views of abortion coincide with those of traditional Christianity, Judaism and Islam."



These five senators have shown themselves incapable of fairly considering the nomination of a practicing Catholic to the nation's highest court. Should Amy Coney Barrett or Barbara Lagoa be chosen by President Trump to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court, these Democrats should recuse themselves.

---

## **PELOSI WANTS TO KEEP CHURCHES CLOSED**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Rep. Nancy Pelosi's position on the reopening of churches:

Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi wants to stop Catholics from attending Mass. She took this position after San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone called for San Francisco Mayor London Breed to amend her policy on church attendance. Breed said churches can reopen at 25 percent capacity but that only one person at a time is allowed inside churches to pray.

Pelosi not only supports this policy, she lambasted Archbishop Cordileone for protesting it. She lectured him, saying, "we should follow the science on this." But she never shared her so-called scientific findings.

The archbishop was forthright in challenging the "one-person at a time" edict on prayer. "Does that make sense to you: one person indoors in a church?" He asked, "Is there a rational basis? Nobody has given me a rational basis for that." Not Pelosi, not Breed—no one has offered any rational explanation for this outrageous abridgement of religious liberty.

Robert Siegel, an infectious disease specialist at Stanford University, tried to justify the policy by saying it is okay

for people to shop in stores but not okay to go to church. "People in places of worship tend to be vocalizing more and vocalizing louder by singing. They tend to be in contact with each other for longer periods of time." Siegel is wrong.

I went to Mass yesterday and, like every week during the pandemic, there was no singing, no talking of any kind. Furthermore, no one was sitting next to someone else, unless they were a family member. Blue tape was put across the pews: parishioners could only sit in designated areas. The Mass lasted 35-40 minutes.

Afterwards, I went to the supermarket. There were many more people there than were in church, and no social distancing was practiced. Moreover, I spent at least as much time in the store as I did in church. In addition, there was absolutely no vocalizing in the church (except for the priest), but there was plenty of chatter in the supermarket.

Mayor Breed allows shoppers to go to huge supermarkets and hardware stores, and to wait in line without social distancing. Pelosi gets her hair done at an indoor salon, violating the same law she says applies to everyone else. In mid-August, she called back the Congress, never explaining how coronavirus protocols were to be observed.

Archbishop Cordileone knows what is at stake, which is why he mobilized over 1,000 Catholics yesterday to partake in a Eucharistic Procession on the streets of San Francisco. More bishops should follow suit.

As he said last week, "Our fundamental rights do not come from the state...they come from God." He made it clear that he respects "legitimate authority" and recognizes that "government has a right to impose reasonable public health rules." But he hastens to add that "when government asserts authority over the church's very right to worship, it crosses a line."

We are asking everyone to show their support for Archbishop Cordileone by signing a petition asking Mayor Breed to lift the restrictions. To do so, click [here](#).

Contact Pelosi's chief of staff:  
[terri.mccullough@mail.house.gov](mailto:terri.mccullough@mail.house.gov)