

2021 YEAR IN REVIEW

The Catholic League's 2021 Year in Review is now available. It contains an overview of some of our most important battles and victories over the last year. To read it, click [here](#).

DE BLASIO RUINED NEW YORK CITY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on outgoing New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio:

New York Mayor Bill de Blasio's last day in office is New Years Eve. What he has done to the world's greatest city is incalculable: he has been an unmitigated disaster.

He is often compared to Mayor David Dinkins, but the comparison is unfair. While Dinkins did great damage, which was undone by Rudy Giuliani, he was merely incompetent. De Blasio's war on New York City was deliberate, a clear example of what happens when a Marxist takes over.

De Blasio's life has been built on a series of lies. He was born Warren Wilhelm Jr. in 1961. When he graduated from New York University in 1983, he changed his name to Warren de Blasio-Wilhelm. In 2002, he changed his name again, settling on Bill de Blasio. More important, he never stops bragging how he is the champion of the poor, yet when he ran for mayor in 2013, he accepted \$50,000 from a group of slumlords.

When the New York Times nailed him for his allegiance to "democratic socialism" (which is an oxymoron), he said he

never used those words. When shown the proof that he had, he answered, "It doesn't matter."

The lying is not confined to politics. De Blasio lied to his own children about where he and his wife honeymooned: he said they went to Canada, when in fact they went to Cuba, which was illegal. This made sense. After all, he had previously traveled to Nicaragua to support the Communist Sandinista regime, so why not break bread with Castro's Cuba?

Marxists hate religion, especially Catholicism. After de Blasio was elected in November 2013, he appointed 60 New Yorkers to his transition team, all of whom represented the various demographic constituents. The clergy selected included every prominent group, except for Catholics, even though Catholics are a majority of the population.

Just three weeks into his first term, de Blasio's love for abortion rights was evident when he supported "100%" what Gov. Andrew Cuomo said about so-called extreme conservatives. Those who are "pro-life," the disgraced former governor said, "have no place in the state of New York, because that's not who New Yorkers are." Spoken like a true liberal advocate of *women's* rights.

Two-and-a-half months into his administration, de Blasio told Irish Catholics to take a hike: he refused to march in the St. Patrick's Day Parade, falsely claiming that homosexuals were barred from participating. Yet in 2017, the Marxist millionaire applauded when the Puerto Rican Day Parade chose to honor a known thug, Oscar Lopez Rivera, co-founder of the FALN, a terrorist organization.

De Blasio is the unmitigated enemy of the poor. Blacks and Hispanics want charter schools and support school choice initiatives, but the mayor has done everything in his power to stop them from having the same choices afforded white affluent New Yorkers. He has also worked against elite public schools,

even though his son attended one of them. Under his predecessor, Michael Bloomberg, failing public schools were shuttered. Under de Blasio, they were awarded *additional funding*.

Crime has exploded in New York—murder has skyrocketed—yet de Blasio says there are less arrests for other crimes. That's true. When the cops are told to stand down, muggers can do whatever they want, with impunity. There is little in the way of law and order in the city, thanks to de Blasio. The biggest victims, or course, are blacks.

When some Black Lives Matter protesters rioted in 2020, often joined by Antifa, another band of urban terrorists, de Blasio cheered them on, and did nothing to help the police or crime victims. He also gave the rioters a dispensation from his social distancing edict—they could march hand in hand. Yet he tried to close down houses of worship during the pandemic.

When de Blasio took over on January 1, 2014, he gave his “Tale of Two Cities” address, condemning the “economic and social inequalities that threaten to unravel the city we love.” He failed. Indeed, he made things worse. As the New York Times said on December 14, 2021, “The city’s unemployment rate of 9.4 percent is more than double the national average.”

The new mayor, Eric Adams, has his work cut out for himself. We wish him well. De Blasio is finished. He should do us all a favor and move to a place where he would be right at home. North Korea comes to mind.

WHY CHRISTMAS IS GOOD FOR AMERICA

By Don Feder

Mazel Tov to the season to be jolly

This article originally appeared on, December 8, 2021 in the Washington Times.

I once interviewed Elyakim Haetzni, then a member of the Knesset, who told me that he always supported higher subsidies for religious education in Israel.

I was puzzled. “Elyakim, you said you’re an agnostic. Isn’t that a contradiction?” I asked. “Not at all,” he replied. “Even though I’m not a believer myself, I know that religion makes my country stronger.”

That’s how I feel about Christmas. I don’t celebrate the holiday, but I support its public celebration robustly. Christmas is something that brings us closer as a people.

This era is marked by relentless assaults on our institutions and traditions. Statues of historical figures as diverse as Stonewall Jackson and Theodore Roosevelt are removed from public display. At sports events, it’s become routine for players to refuse to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Students are taught to hate America through critical race theory and other educational indoctrination. The Supreme Court is under attack by partisans who fear it will overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

As a Jew, I have no problem with Christmas trees in parks or nativity scenes in front of city hall, whether or not they’re camouflaged with Santas and snowmen. They are reminders of our religious heritage.

America was founded on the Judeo-Christian ethic. A majority of Americans are Christians, to one degree or another. Our institutions are based on an ethos derived from Sinai and Bethlehem. The Founding Fathers spoke of rights endowed by our Creator and dated the Constitution Anno Domini (in the year of our Lord) 1776.

That's one of the things that makes the Left nervous about Christmas. It wants America to be a cosmopolitan land of rootlessness – united by nothing more than our location on the globe and a vague belief in democracy. That's why it cheers the alien horde surging across our southern border and purging Christmas from the public square. Anything that disunites us is good in its eyes.

As much as the Declaration of Independence or Constitution, Christmas unites us as a people.

According to a 2017 Pew poll, roughly 90% of Americans celebrate Christmas – probably more than any other holiday, including Thanksgiving and the Fourth of July. In a way, that makes Christmas a national holiday.

Christmas has a venerable lineage. Although the custom of the gaily festooned tree only goes back to the 19th century, the gift-giving tradition is said to be inspired by the wise men who journeyed to Bethlehem. I give not because I want something in return but as an expression of love.

Besides generosity, one of the holiday's chief appeals is hopefulness.

For North America, Christmas comes during a gloomy season that's brightened by colorful decorations and colorfully wrapped presents.

Optimism is a uniquely American virtue. The settlers came here seeking opportunity. Regardless of their station at birth, America gave them a chance for a fresh start.

Like Hanukkah, Christmas urges us to have hope for the future. Even though things look bleak, God will make it turn out right in the end.

One of the most popular songs of the season, which came out during the depths of World War II, speaks to that. “Christmas Eve will find me where the love light gleams. I’ll be home for Christmas, if only in my dreams.”

With our economy in the doldrums, crime surging and enemies everywhere – like the Star of Bethlehem and the Hanukkah menorah – Christmas points the way to hope.

More than anything else that is what I wish for my country.

Don Feder is the communications director at the Ruth Institute and a good friend of Bill Donohue.

CHRISTMAS IS TOUGH ON THE NON-RELIGIOUS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on those with no religion at Christmastime:

A Pew Research Center survey on religion released last week found that 63% of Americans identify as Christian, down from 75% a decade ago. The fastest rising segment of the population, in terms of religious affiliation, are those who answer “none” when asked what religion they belong to. What we know about the religiously unaffiliated suggests that Christmastime can be tough for them.

The “nones” are not monolithic. While they constitute 29% of the population, only 4% are atheist and 5% are agnostic; the

rest say they identify as “nothing in particular.” Overall, among those who are not religious, 13% pray daily and another 16% pray weekly or monthly. A total of 21% of those with no religion say religion is either “very important” or “somewhat important” in their life.

How can this be? Why would 1 in 5 of those who profess not to be religious claim that religion is important to them? They are obviously struggling with their identity. That may not be a bad thing, especially at this time of the year. From a religious perspective, the results can be fortuitous.

When doing research for my book, *The Catholic Advantage: Why Health, Happiness and Heaven Await the Faithful*, I found that many of the “nones” had a hard time coping with their status. That is why they could not let go of the cultural, even religious, aspects of their upbringing (though some were brought up with no religion). For example, some actually founded churches—churches without God, of course. Atheist services, often held on Sundays, are complete with singing and time for meditation.

This condition is not unique to the United States: Britain and Australia report the establishment of atheist churches. “During the service,” says one of the British leaders, “attendees stomped their feet, clapped their hands and cheered.” They sang “Lean on Me” and “Here Comes the Sun,” but they had no time for “How Great Thou Art.”

Who are the “nones”? They are mostly young people and mostly liberal Democrats. Indeed, agnostics and atheists are the most left-wing of the “nones.” We also know many of these people have a checkered existence.

ABC News did an interesting article on the Pew survey. The reporters interviewed several people, and what they found was revealing.

Many disagreed with Christianity’s teachings on sexuality,

especially homosexuality. Others were not happy with the place of women in their religion, and some recoiled at the tendency to “pass judgment.” To get a sense of what the “nones” are going through, consider an 18-year-old of Haitian descent.

She calls herself a queer and is now a freshman at Princeton University. “After leaving her New Jersey [Baptist] church three years ago, she identified as atheist, then agnostic, before embracing a spiritual but not religious life. In her dorm, she blends rituals at an altar, chanting Buddhist, Taoist and Hindu mantras and paying homage to her ancestors as she meditates and prays.”

What is striking about this phenomenon is the relative absence of religious Americans who mimic the “nones.” In other words, it is those who have no religion who copycat the faithful, not vice versa. Religious Americans appear not to envy anything about the lifestyle of the “nones.” Quite frankly, what’s there to like?

Keep the “nones” in your prayers. Some are bound to find their way home during the Christmas season, while others will finally find a home they never had.

COSTCO OFFENDS CHRISTIANS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue explains why Costco has offended Christians:

Why do organizations that have a very good family-friendly reputation find it necessary to offend Christians, especially during the Christmas season? As I recently [detailed](#), the Salvation Army did so by adopting the racist ideas imbued in critical race theory. Now Costco has offended Christians by

relegating Christmas to a second-class status.

In the December edition of *Costco Connection*, a publication of Costco Wholesale, the lead article, "A Festive Season," compares Christmas to Hanukkah and Kwanzaa in a way that is downright insulting.

Written by Tim Talevich, the editorial director of the magazine, he offers a 111-word account of Hanukkah, a 38-word statement about Christmas and a 43-word summary of Kwanzaa. This alone would not mean much, but when we read what he says about the three holidays, it takes on more significance.

What Talevich says about Hanukkah and Kwanzaa is accurate and nicely done. But when it comes to Christmas, he resorts to editorializing, and in a way that is not endearing to Christians. We are told that December 25 is "likely not his [Jesus'] birthday" and that the "early Christians didn't even celebrate Christmas." He closes by saying "it's a popular secular and religious event around the world."

There is a big difference between these three holidays. Hanukkah is a minor holiday in the Jewish tradition, one that is not mandated by the Torah the way other Jewish holidays are (e.g., Yom Kippur). Christmas is a major holiday for Christians. Kwanzaa was made up out of whole cloth in 1966 by an ex-con who served four years in prison—five years after he founded Kwanzaa—for beating and torturing two women.

It may be that December 25 is not the actual birthday of Jesus. So what? Why be pedantic about it? That's when it is celebrated. We declared our independence from England on July 2, 1776, yet we celebrate the Declaration on July 4. Moreover, if Talevich is quick to doubt the birth date of Jesus, why did he write with certainty about the Maccabees in the second century B.C.?

The first evidence of celebrating Christmas is around A.D. 200. What does this mean to the average Christian? Nothing.

Lots of celebratory events in history evolved over time, for all sorts of reasons. So what is the point that Talevich wants to make?

Any cultural observer worth his salt knows the game that is being played here. In keeping with the cultural mantra about inclusion and diversity—which are clearly political constructs—he seeks to elevate any day in December that could possibly compete with Christmas. That is why he even finds time to mention the winter solstice on December 21, National Ugly Sweater Day on December 17, and Festivus on December 23.

Talevich is not alone in diluting the importance of Christmas. Secularists can't cancel it, though many have tried, but they can create faux competition with it. Those who think this is an overreaction need to ask themselves how African Americans would react if we turned February into Diversity Month, celebrating our multicultural heritage. What would this do to the significance of Black History Month?

Talevich ends by saying, "Costco's role in all this? We're here with food, gifts and just about anything else you might need to fully celebrate December's holidays."

He is being disingenuous. Without Christmas, Costco's cash registers wouldn't ring so loudly. The food and gifts they sell are overwhelmingly Christmas gifts, and everyone knows it.

Recognizing all legitimate holidays is a good thing, but treating a major religious holiday as if it were inauthentic is offensive. This wouldn't matter if Costco had a lousy reputation. And it wouldn't matter if Talevich were a low-level employee. But neither is true. Which is why it matters.

Contact: ttalevich@costco.com

NFL AND NIKE LOSE ON ANTI-SLAVE BILL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the NFL and Nike came out on the losing side of an anti-slave labor bill:

On December 14, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to ban imports from the Xinjiang region in China that uses slave labor. However, on December 15, the bill was blocked in the Senate by Oregon Democrat Ron Wyden; given Senate rules, his objection was sufficient to prevent the bill from moving forward. Then some Democrats pushed back. Wyden folded on December 16, and the Senate unanimously passed the legislation.

For many years, the Uyghurs [pronounced Weegers], a Muslim minority, have been treated like slaves by the Communist Chinese government. That is why an anti-slave bill was needed.

Politico gave an accurate summary of the bill. "The Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act effectively bans all imports from China's Xinjiang region, where the U.S. government has said that the Chinese Communist Party is perpetuating a genocide against the religious minority, including slave labor, forced sterilizations and concentration camps."

The two most important U.S. organizations that are responsible for supporting slave labor in China are the National Football League and Nike. Nike practically owns Sen. Wyden—it has greased him with contributions totaling into more than \$60,000—but without the enabling role played by the NFL, the genocide and slave labor would not be flourishing.

NFL commissioner Roger Goodell is not shy about his enthusiasm for Communist China. Two years ago he said, "China is a priority market for the NFL. We believe that our game has a great deal of potential to expand to grow and bring new fans into our game. We have had double-digit growth this past year in China in our fan base and people engaging with our game. So we are excited by it."

John Donahoe, Nike's CEO, is just as exuberant about working with the slavemasters in China. "Nike is a brand that is *of* China and *for* China." (My italics.) Last year, a study by the Australian Strategic Policy Institute named Nike as one of the companies that uses slave labor to make its products.

The NFL and Nike are joined at the hip.

In 2018, the NFL issued the following press release: "The National Football League and Nike announced a long-term extension to their on-field rights partnership. Central to the extension, Nike will continue to provide all 32 NFL Clubs with uniforms and sideline apparel bearing the Nike brand for use during all games."

The degree of oppression in China, especially among religious minorities, is not in dispute. On July 1, 2021, the U.S. State Department released a damning assessment of conditions there.

"Over the last four years, the People's Republic of China (PRC) has carried out a mass detention and political indoctrination campaign against Uyghurs...Authorities use threats of physical violence, forcible drug intake, physical and sexual abuse, and torture to force detainees to work in adjacent or off-site factories or worksites producing garments, footwear...material for solar power equipment" and many other products. Garments and footwear are both Nike products.

It is not just a Muslim ethnic minority that is being oppressed.

Nina Shea, director of the Center for Religious Freedom at the Hudson Institute, offered an assessment of religious liberty in China.

“China’s Christians, at 100 million strong and constituting that country’s largest religious minority, are facing a new government policy of severe religious repression and persecution.” Minors are barred from attending houses of worship, churches are being closed, desecrations are increasing, Bibles are limited in supply, and adults are subject to state surveillance. Those who disobey are imprisoned.

To show how politically corrupt the NFL is, and how desperate it is to please its Communist friends in China, consider that on December 16 it published a map on social media that depicted the sovereign nation of Taiwan as part of China. Taiwan is a free country; China is a slave state. The NFL is in bed with the Communists selling out our democratic allies in Taiwan.

President Biden will sign the bill, but no one should trust him. His special climate envoy, John Kerry, who is worth \$250 million, has come under fire for owning stakes in an investment group that funds companies linked to the slave labor camps in China. Moreover, in the aforementioned State Department study, “material for solar power equipment” was cited as a good that is produced by slave labor.

Last month, Kerry was asked by a reporter why he doesn’t speak to the issue of human rights in China. He said “that’s not my lane here.” No wonder Politico said that the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act “encountered obstacles from the White House and the private sector.” Kerry was the White House obstructionist, and the NFL and Nike played the same role in the private sector.

What makes this all the more disgusting is the “social

justice” policies promoted by the NFL and Nike. They are quick to side with the likes of Black Lives Matter, condemning America for being a racist country, yet they profit off of slave labor and genocide in China.

Contact Brian McCarthy, VP of Corporate Communications, NFL:
Brian.McCarthy@nfl.com

Contact Nigel Powell, Executive VP & Chief Communications Officer, Nike: Nigel.Powell@nike.com

ARCHBISHOP GOMEZ’S FINEST HOUR

Catholic League President Bill Donohue comments on the great work of Archbishop Gomez:

The National Catholic Reporter, which works hard to undercut the Church’s teachings on many issues, has named Los Angeles Archbishop José Gomez as their Newsmaker of 2021. The dissidents are angry at him for a speech he gave on November 4th. Here is my response.

On November 4, Los Angeles Archbishop José Gomez made one of the most brilliant addresses given in Catholic circles in recent memory. His speech was given at the Congress of Catholics and Public Life in Madrid, Spain.

Like so many other Catholic intellectuals, Gomez is rightly concerned about the radical secularization that has taken root in the Western world. Unlike most of them, he has also been in the trenches. I know because the Catholic League has assisted him in his efforts to combat the agenda of secular zealots,

made plain, for instance, in attempts to break the seal of the confessional.

Gomez takes direct aim at the ruling class, those who occupy the command posts in the United States and Europe. "In the elite worldview," he says, "there is no need for old-fashioned belief systems and religions. In fact, as they see it, religion, especially Christianity, only gets in the way of the society they hope to build." He offers as an example the "cancel culture" that is so prevalent.

There can be no denying the veracity of Gomez's observation. Anyone who dares challenge the conventional wisdom, on issues ranging from critical race theory to gender ideology, is a candidate for censorship. It is not those who promote these pernicious views who are being silenced, it is those who challenge them.

Sociologists have long understood that when the dominant cultural strain in society atrophies, it is filled with an ersatz philosophical or religious variant. Power vacuums never last long. Thus, Gomez is right to call attention to the extent to which the de-Christianization of the West has been replaced by movements such as "social justice," "wokeness," "identity politics" and the like.

"They claim," as he perceptively notes, "to offer what religion provides." Indeed, they provide "a sense of meaning, a purpose for living, and the feeling of belonging to a community." This is exactly what the great sociologists have been saying for over a hundred and fifty years. Sadly, it is now happening in the United States.

Gomez's critics take umbrage at his comment that the reigning movements function as a new religion. He properly notes that "Today's critical theories and ideologies are profoundly atheistic." Anyone who follows what the proponents of these ideologies espouse know that Gomez is right. Indeed, they

don't even try to hide their animus against Christianity.

John McWhorter is a Columbia University professor and he understands what Gomez is talking about. An African American, he has written a book, *Woke Racism: How a New Religion Has Betrayed Black America*." Both men call attention to identity politics and radical race theories—which judge people on the basis of their race, not their individual characteristics. These ideological currents not only profoundly racist in themselves, they satisfy the religious yearnings of those drawn to them.

As a man of God, Gomez wants us to repair to the Gospel, not to "these new religions of social justice and political identity." But to his critics, many of whom are Catholic theologians, what he says is verboten. Some no doubt would like to cancel him.

Franciscan Father Daniel Horan is upset with Gomez for making a speech that exhibits a "shocking disconnection from reality." Too bad he never says what the disconnect is. He cites for support a left-wing Jesuit theologian, Fr. Bryan Massingale, who, according to Horan, said the problem is that bishops like Gomez "have the audacity to speak with unearned authority about issues they clearly do not understand."

It would be hard to find a more arrogant example of professorial elitism than this. Readers should know that Horan and Massingale spend much of their time writing and lecturing about homosexual and transgender issues. Gomez spends much of his time writing and lecturing about the Catholic Church: He is president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Thus has he earned the authority to speak about any issue of interest to the Catholic community.

Fr. Tom Reese wonders why Gomez "abandoned" the term "social justice" to those he considers the enemy of religion, especially when social justice has a place in the "long

history of the church's social teaching." This is a serious misreading of Gomez's address. He has not abandoned social justice—the term has been hijacked by those whose ideology sharply departs from the Church's understanding of it.

The late Fr. Richard John Neuhaus wrote a seminal book, *The Naked Public Square*, that describes what happens when a society rooted in the Judeo-Christian heritage weakens. The cultural holes are destined to be filled with exactly the kinds of secular movements that Gomez alludes to in his speech. The only difference is that even someone as bright as Neuhaus did not envision how quickly and radically the transformation would be.

That is what make Gomez's presentation so valuable. He sees what is going on in the United States and Europe and beckons us to get back to basics, the basics as outlined by Jesus. If we do not resist the forces of decadence and division, the future will soon become unrecognizable.

CONFUSION STILL REIGNS OVER HOLIDAY SYMBOLS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the never-ending confusion over the meaning of holiday symbols:

Last month a Jewish woman asked a New York Times reporter whether it was discriminatory to deny the display of a menorah in the lobby of her luxury co-op while permitting a Christmas tree. The reply she received was not helpful.

This month a Jewish woman from northern California lost in federal court in her attempt to have a menorah displayed

alongside a Christmas tree in a public school that her child attends. Comments made by those on both sides showed how confused they are about this issue.

In the New York City case, the Jewish woman was right to complain that for many years the co-op board allowed both the Christmas tree and the menorah. What broke? However, the board chairman was right to say that the menorah is a religious symbol and a Christmas tree is a secular symbol.

Nonetheless, he was wrong to imply that this meant he could not continue the practice of displaying both holiday symbols. There is no law prohibiting him from doing so, which is precisely why he never ran afoul of the law for all the years he allowed both to be displayed.

A reporter for the New York Times was right to say that most apartment buildings elect to display secular symbols during the holidays, thus avoiding controversy over religious symbols. He was wrong, however, to say that the Supreme Court ruled that "a menorah is not a religious symbol when it appears alongside a Christmas tree." The ruling in question is the 1989 *County of Allegheny County v. ACLU* decision, and it said no such thing.

That ruling clearly said the menorah was a religious symbol, albeit one that also carried secular meaning. It was decided that it was permissible to display it in the county courthouse because it was erected alongside a Christmas tree, which it properly recognized as a secular symbol. In other words, the menorah never lost its religious significance by putting it next to a secular symbol, but the effect of doing so meant that the entire display could not reasonably be seen as an expression of religion.

In the California case, the woman and her lawyers maintained that the school was showing preferential treatment to Christianity by allowing the display of a Christmas tree but

not the menorah. But the former is a secular symbol; a menorah represents a miracle, and as such is properly seen as a religious symbol. The fact that the Christmas tree is associated with a religious holiday—which also happens to be a federal holiday—does not therefore make it a religious symbol anymore than Jack Frost becomes a religious symbol because it, too, is related to Christmas.

It could be argued that the school could have allowed the menorah because it would have been displayed next to a Christmas tree. What complicated this case was the woman's request to display a huge inflatable menorah; school officials contended that large inflatables are never allowed. She should have taken up their offer to display the menorah in some other part of the school.

Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas has been saying for years that the high court has failed to offer clarity on these matters. He's right.

At the root of the problem is a militant secularism and intolerance for religious liberty. Christians should welcome the erection of Jewish religious symbols in public places, and Jews should reciprocate; reasonable time limits should be observed.

The fact that this even needs to be said shows how utterly bankrupt the celebration of diversity is: Those who truly believe in diversity would welcome the display of religious symbols, and not try to censor them

NEA DUMPS MILITANT BOARD MEMBER

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a happy ending to a serious issue involving the National Education Association:

Last week, we emailed a letter I wrote to the president of the National Education Association, Rebecca S. Pringle, asking her to “terminate [Mollie Paige] Mumau’s membership on the board of directors of the NEA.” I did so after learning that Mumau had posted on Facebook a call to shoot Americans who refused, on religious grounds, to receive a vaccination.

Mumau posted her vile comment on December 7. My letter to the NEA chief was emailed on [December 8](#). On the day of Mumau’s post, [she was listed](#) on the website of the NEA as a board member. We checked [today](#) and she no longer is.

We pursued this issue after learning from an online news outlet, [andmagazine.com](#), that Mumau was no longer employed by McLane High School in Erie, Pennsylvania. We called the school today to verify this account and found that it was accurate. If she is no longer employed by the school district, then it stands to reason that she cannot serve on the NEA’s board of directors; she has no standing in education.

This is a great victory. “There is no legitimate place in public life for anyone who advocates the mass slaughter of innocent Americans,” I said to Pringle, “and it is doubly offensive that it should emanate from a teacher.”

We did more than write to the president of the NEA. We contacted the NEA Executive Committee, the Executive Officers of the Pennsylvania State Education Association, the Superintendent of the McLane School District, and the Erie County District Attorney.

We also asked our email subscribers to contact the NEA, providing them with an email address. They made it happen. We are very proud of them.

Cheers everyone! At least some measure of justice has been done.

PRO-ABORTION FANS CONTINUE TO LIE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest wave of lies told by the fans of abortion:

Given the prominence of abortion cases before the U.S. Supreme Court, the subject is weighing heavily on the minds of those on both sides of this issue.

If there is one thing that everyone should insist on it is honesty. Regrettably, the pro-abortion side is jam packed with those who have a hard time telling the truth. Here are three examples, all from December, and the month is only half over.

Yesterday, Whoopi Goldberg [said on “The View”](#) that “I, too, am pro-life. No one I know [who] has had an abortion went willingly or happily. They went because they had to go, because they didn’t have a choice.”

They didn’t have a choice? What does this say about the “pro-choice” movement? Is it based on a lie? Moreover, it is disingenuous for Whoopi to say she is “pro-life”: [it is reported](#) that she had six or seven abortions by the age of 25.

Barbara R. Casper is a retired professor of medicine at the University of Louisville, and the author of a [recent op-ed](#) in

the Courier Journal on this subject. Taking the pro-abortion side, she said, "I am not pro-abortion. In fact, I dare say no one is actually pro-abortion."

She is wrong. On September 30, 2021, Dr. Ghazaleh Moayed [testified](#) before the House Oversight Committee on abortion. She told the panel that "for thousands of people I've cared for, abortion is a blessing, abortion is an act of love, abortion is freedom."

On December 2, 2021, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi defended *Roe v. Wade*, which effectively sanctions abortion-on-demand. She expressed grave concern over the prospect that the Supreme Court might overturn this decision. "It's really scary—and I say that as a practicing Catholic."

The Catholic Church regards abortion to be "intrinsically evil." By contrast, Pelosi is not only an enthusiast of partial-birth abortion, she wants to force the taxpayers to pay for them. Practicing Catholics don't endorse the killing of babies who are 80 percent born, and they do not want the public to fund these abominable procedures.

One of the great things about being pro-life is that our side doesn't have to lie.