

# **“HATING WHITEY” IS IN VOGUE**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the growing hatred of white people:

Over two decades ago, David Horowitz wrote a book, “Hating Whitey: And Other Progressive Causes,” that detailed how “Ideological hatred of whites is now a growth industry, driven by ‘civil rights’ activists and liberal academics.” Matters have only gotten worse. Now more than ever, “Hating Whitey” is in vogue.

“I hate white people.” You can’t get more declarative than that. The author, Damon Young, wrote that when he was a contributing opinion writer for The New York Times. It is a sure bet that the newspaper does not employ anyone who admits, “I hate black people.” That would be racist.

Young is not your ordinary racist. He is a specialist. He says he brushes his teeth with “black toothpaste,” and delights in using white toilet paper. He also adds a gallon of chocolate syrup to his daughter’s bottle of milk, while acknowledging that it is unhealthy: “She will have Type 2 diabetes at 4. But you can never be too young to reject anti-blackness and anti-black-ass cow’s milk.”

Some will say that this is satire. Sure it is. But it is also who he is.

Young says he likes to say the Lord’s Prayer with his family, but prefers not to end it with “Amen,” but with “And then kill whitey.”

He wrote that in 2018. This year he doubled down, writing a piece, “Whiteness Is a Pandemic.” On St. Patrick’s Day, Young told us that “Whiteness is a public health crime. It shortens life expectations, it pollutes the air, it constricts equilibrium, it devastates forests, it melts ice caps, it

sparks (and funds) wars," etc. Oh, yes, he is still a New York Times contributing opinion writer.

Dr. Chanequa Walker-Barnes teaches theology at Mercer University in Macon, Georgia. She recently showcased her theological training in a chapter she wrote in a new book. Here is her first paragraph. "Dear God, Please help me to hate White people. Or at least to want to hate them. At least, I want to stop caring about them, individually and collectively. I want to stop caring about their misguided, racist souls, to stop believing that they can be better, that they can stop being racist."

In May, Dr. Donald Moss published a piece in the Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association, "On Having Whiteness." He is a white male who splits his time teaching at the New York Psychoanalytic Institute and the San Francisco Center for Psychoanalysis. He contends that "whiteness" is a "malignant, parasitic-like condition" that makes the host person "voracious, insatiable, and perverse," noting that there is "not yet a permanent cure." This was a peer-reviewed article.

In June, Mara Gay, who is a member of the New York Times editorial board, said she spent a weekend on Long Island and was very upset with what she saw. She said it was "disturbing" to see "dozens of American flags." She interpreted the American flag to mean, "This is my country. This is not your country." When Gay, who is part black, was criticized, she blamed what she called "Whiteness."

When professionals promote "Hating Whitey," it is not without consequence.

In April, Dr. Aruna Khilanani, a New York City psychiatrist, told a Yale audience that she fantasizes about "unloading a revolver into the head of any white person that got in my way, burying their body and wiping my bloody hands as I walked away

relatively guiltless with a bounce in my step.”

In June, Itzel Ramirez, an Amazon delivery worker near San Francisco, assaulted an elderly white woman after telling her to “check her white privilege.” The 21-year-old beat the old lady into submission. She was charged with two counts of elder abuse and battery involving serious bodily injury.

Here’s a sociological fact that some will find shocking. *White people never identify themselves as white persons: their identity is based on their ethnicity, not their race.* That’s why we have parades named for the Irish, Italians, Poles, Germans, et al. There is no such thing as a “White-American Parade.”

It is racists, like the aforementioned writers and academics, who insist on seeing people with white skin as white people, and then hating them for what they project onto them. They have no other choice. After all, their obsession with “Hating Whitey,” and to some extent their livelihood, depends on it.

---

## DO WHITE CHRISTIANS DESERVE REPARATIONS?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue questions the legitimacy of reparations:

The idea that the descendants of slaves are owed reparations is based on the notion that white people owe black people money today because dead white people mistreated dead black people long ago. On this score alone, this is a racist proposal, the victims of whom are white.

Why should those who did not suffer the indignity of slavery be awarded financial compensation? And why should those who had nothing to do with it be forced to pony up? But if this crazed idea is to be taken seriously, then white Christians are also deserving of reparations. Who should pay? Muslims.

Economist Thomas Sowell recalls that it was Adam Smith, author of "The Wealth of Nations," who observed in 1776 that Western Europe was the only place in the world where slavery did not exist. Sowell further notes that nowhere in the world was slavery a controversial issue prior to the 18th century. It wasn't controversial in Africa or Asia or the Middle East—they were accustomed to slavery. No, it was in Western Europe and the newly created United States where objections were first registered.

It seems odd, then, that the nations which ended slavery are the ones being tapped for reparations. Yet that is exactly what the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Michelle Bachelet, wants. She recently said that those nations that "engaged in or profited from enslavement, the transatlantic trade in enslaved Africans, and colonialism—as well as those who continue to profit from this legacy," should pay reparations.

Bachelet, like so many other elites around the world, never addresses the need for reparations to white Christians. They need to do so.

Charles Sumner was an 18th century American politician, and one of America's most famous abolitionists. He not only condemned black slavery, he condemned white slavery. Indeed, he wrote a book about it, "White Slavery in the Barbary States," published in 1853.

Sumner detailed how Muslim pirates from North Africa, called corsairs, "became the scourge of Christendom, while their much-dreaded system of slavery assumed a front of new terrors.

Their ravages were not confined to the Mediterranean." In fact, they extended to "the chalky cliffs of England, and even from the distant western coasts of Ireland," forcing the inhabitants into "cruel captivity."

The most authoritative work on this subject can be found in Robert Davis' book, "Christian Slaves, Muslim Masters: White Slavery in the Mediterranean, the Barbary Coast, and Italy, 1500-1800." The Ohio State University professor of history estimates that "between 1530 and 1780 there was almost certainly 1 million and quite possibly as many as 1.25 million white, European Christians enslaved by the Muslims of the Barbary Coast."

How did the Muslim slavemasters manage to capture these white Christians? The Barbary pirates trolled the Mediterranean looking for ships to raid, taking their cargo and enslaving those on board. They also showed up at coastal towns of Italy, Spain, France, England, Ireland, and the Netherlands.

"While the Barbary corsairs looted the cargo of ships they captured," writes Davis, "their primary goal was to capture non-Muslim people for sale as slaves or for ransom." Meaning that the pirates were out to enslave white Christians. It should be noted that they treated their slaves just as harshly as white slavemasters in America treated their slaves. "As far as daily living conditions," he says, "the Mediterranean slaves certainly didn't have it any better."

According to political scientist Abraham H. Miller, "For over two hundred years, during the mid-1600s to the 1830s, Barbary Muslims trafficked in white European Christians. The Ottoman Muslims trafficked in White Christian slavery started even earlier, in the 15th century. All in all, Muslims enslaved more than two million white European Christians."

Similarly, Sowell contends that the number of whites who were enslaved in North Africa by the Barbary pirates "exceeded the

number of Africans enslaved in the United States and in the American colonies put together.” In fact, he adds, “white slaves were being brought and sold in the Ottoman Empire decades after blacks were freed in the United States.”

This raises an interesting question: Are white Christians today owed reparations?

Sowell knows the answer. “Nobody is going to North Africa for reparations, because nobody is going to be fool enough to give it to them.” “So,” Miller asks, “should white European Christians condemn all Muslims for their role in the enslavement of white European Christians? Should the Europeans of the Southern Mediterranean demand reparations from Muslims for the enslavement of their ancestors?”

I would go further: Should present-day Muslims living in America be forced to pay reparations to white Christians living here today? According to the logic of those who work in the reparations industry—you don’t have to be personally guilty or personally victimized to qualify—the answer is clearly yes (though we would not support it).

Perhaps the U.N.’s chief Human Rights official can offer some advice. But to do so she would first have to admit that her selective interest in this subject makes her unsuitable to continue. She should resign.

Contact her at: [mbachelet@ohchr.org](mailto:mbachelet@ohchr.org)

---

**SOME                      HEALTH                      OFFICIALS**

# ENDANGER OUR HEALTH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on some delinquent health professionals:

Doctor-induced maladies are called iatrogenic, typically the result of an unintended diagnosis. Unfortunately, when it comes to sex and drugs, there is no shortage of doctors who are giving lousy advice these days.

Health professionals across the nation have recently been advising people how to handle sexual relationships during the pandemic. What they are saying would shock many Americans.

The New York City Health Department says that “The risk of spreading the virus through feces (poop) is thought to be low, though the virus has been found in the feces of people who have COVID-19. Research is needed to know if the virus can spread through sexual activities involving oral contact with feces (such as rimming).”

For the uninitiated, this proviso is aimed mostly at homosexuals. Instead of telling the truth—this is a filthy and dangerous practice—the health experts simply exercise caution.

This same health department has a message for straights as well as gays. If you are going to have sex parties, a.k.a. orgies, “pick larger, more open and well-ventilated spaces. Bring and use alcohol-based hand sanitizer. Wear a face mask and avoid kissing.” Yes, be sure to wear your mask.

The Washington D.C. Health Department is just as helpful. “Rimming, or any sexual activity that involves putting the mouth on the butt/anus, might pass COVID-19. The virus has been found in feces.” Similarly, the San Francisco Department of Health advises, “Cleaning sex toys, sheets, rings, masks, collars and other items is important.”

The incredibly tolerant attitude that these health experts exhibit when it comes to sordid sexual practices during the pandemic is at odds with their treatment of the faithful. They all placed burdensome restrictions on houses of worship.

Last year, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio went after Jews with a vengeance. "My message to the Jewish community, and all communities, is this simple: the time for warnings has passed. I have instructed the NYPD to proceed immediately to summons or even arrest those who gather in large groups." The mayors of Washington D.C. and San Francisco made similar statements, and were sued by the local archdiocese for imposing draconian restrictions on their churches.

So what does our number-one guru doctor have to say about all of this? Earlier this year, Dr. Anthony ("Double Mask") Fauci warned church-goers that "coughing or sneezing" in a house of worship could be dangerous. Even talking was a problem, and "singing even more than talking."

Now weigh that with what "Double Mask" said about hooking up online. "If you're willing to take the risk—and you know, everybody has their own tolerance for risks—you could figure it out if you want to meet somebody. If you want to go a little bit more intimate, well, then that's your choice regarding that." Just make sure there is no singing.

We spent well over a year learning that COVID-19 is a respiratory disease that can kill. Happening at the same time has been the legalization of marijuana in many states. So where are all the medical professionals warning about that?

The disconnect is astonishing. We are a nation obsessed with respiratory diseases. We are also doing everything we can to stop people from smoking. Marlboro's that is. But marijuana is perfectly fine.

The American Medical Association has warned against marijuana legalization, but a majority of physicians, health



administrators, pharmacists and nurses support it. The CDC details all of the negative mental and physical effects of the drug yet it does not take a position against its legalization. Yet we know from drugabuse.gov that "Because of how it is typically smoked (deeper inhale, held for longer), marijuana smoking leads to four times the deposition of tar compared to cigarette smoking."

And what does "Double Mask" have to say about this? Practically nothing. Yes, Fauci is on record saying, "Smoking is terrible under any circumstance." But he has not said a word about marijuana legalization. He's too busy sending up flares about other respiratory problems.

The sex advice from these health experts clearly sanction, if not celebrate, promiscuity. Thus do they play a role in promoting STDs, including AIDS. The drug advice they give is similarly delinquent, making them responsible for the increase in marijuana-induced behavioral and physical maladies.

Do not believe for a second that these sages simply want to be non-judgmental. Last year some 1,300 health professionals roundly defended the urban riots that took place, saying that despite the need to abide by stay-at-home orders, Black Lives Matter protesters were justified—even when ignoring social distancing—because of the "pervasive lethal force of white supremacy."

It all depends on the demographics of the group under consideration, and the cause they are promoting, not health and safety measures. No wonder health officials have seen their credibility atrophy.

If all doctors simply told the truth, more lives would be saved. If more of them were like those associated with the Catholic Medical Association, we wouldn't have these problems. Regrettably, too many health issues are iatrogenic in nature.

---

# CROWD LOVES ANTI-CATHOLIC CANNES FILM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the debut of “Benedetta” at the Cannes Film Festival:

Worldwide, there are upwards of 1 billion Protestants, 1.4 billion Catholics and 1.8 billion Muslims. While Catholics revere Our Blessed Mother the most, the majority of Muslims, and many Protestants, hold the Virgin Mary in high esteem.

Atheist film director Paul Verhoeven, who has a history of bigotry, both in print and on the screen, wants them to know that he has been thinking about them. His latest contribution to hate speech is “Benedetta,” a movie designed to stick it to all of them, especially Catholics.

The film “*was inspired* by real events,” which means it is not an accurate portrayal. No matter, Catholic bashers believe every bit of it. The movie is based on a book by Judith C. Brown, “Immodest Acts: The Life of a Lesbian Nun in Renaissance Italy,” which features 17th century lesbian nuns who have gone off the rails.

Given our gay-crazy world, where every perverse act is not only tolerated, but celebrated, it is not surprising to learn that “the audience at the Cannes press screening applauded the film’s blasphemous nerve.” Another film critic noted that at her screening, “the movie was received with shocked laughter and applause,” yielding a “five-minute standing ovation.”

What were they so happy about? Benedetta, the star nun, has visions of having sex with Jesus, “a lanky-haired, high-key jealous hottie.” “When Benedetta orgasms,” Rachel Handler

writes, "she screams, 'My God!' and 'Sweet Jesus.'"

Benedetta and her lover, Sister Bartolomea, are shown "trading flirtatious remarks while audibly s\*\*\*\*ing next to each other in the nunnery's toilets and, scenes later [this next part is revealing], as is the lesbian tradition, f\*\*\*ing one another with a wooden figurine of the Virgin Mary carved very carefully into the shape of a dildo."

The Telegraph, an English newspaper, was delighted. "Could anything be more Verhoeven than using a wooden Mary as a sex toy?" When Verhoeven was asked if he thought the film was blasphemous, he denied that it was. It is also true that the Klan deny they are racists.

A critic cited in the New York Daily News called the movie a "blasphemous, sapphic nun f-k fest that's horny, traumatizing, violent and unhinged." Handler, who liked the film, said it was "deranged on nearly every single level, a blasphemous, maximalist, hilariously erotic satire."

The only prominent media source that was truly critical was Variety. It called the film pornographic, saying that Verhoeven is more interested in "kink" than anything else. "Simply put, 'Benedetta' intends to offend," amounting to "just another entry in the tawdry nunsplotation genre."

Verhoeven is correct to say that not everyone will be offended by the movie. Here is what he told Scott Roxborough, the European Bureau Chief for The Hollywood Reporter, "actually, I don't think the film will be scandalous—at least not in Western Europe." He's right. Western Europe is a fully atomized secular oasis.

"Maybe Americans will be different," he notes, owing to "more puritanism" there. In other words, Catholics, Protestants and Muslims who are insulted by his insults are puritanical and need to become more tolerant of his intolerance.

Verhoeven is no stranger to the Catholic League. He spent two decades co-authoring an offensive book that he hoped would become a movie; it never made it to the big screen. But his work, "Jesus of Nazareth," did tell us what he really thinks.

Jesus was not the son of God, the Dutchman says, and his mother, the Virgin Mary, was probably raped by a Roman soldier, resulting in Jesus' birth. Moreover, Jesus never performed any miracles and Judas Iscariot was not responsible for Jesus' betrayal. And how does he know this? He doesn't. He feels that it may be true.

The hatred of Christians in many parts of the world these days results in torture, imprisonment and death. In Western Europe and North America, the Christian haters do not resort to violence: They just seek to disparage and silence them. That's why Verhoeven delights them—he appeals to the sickest appetites of these fully deracinated people.

Contact Verhoeven's agent, Marion Rosenberg:  
[marion@marionrosenberg.com](mailto:marion@marionrosenberg.com)

---

## MEET THE NEW RACISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on who is promoting systemic racism:

Many conservatives deny that systemic racism exists. They are wrong. Racism runs deep into our institutions, and it explains why African Americans are being held back.

Does this mean that the Left has the right analysis? No, it only means they have correctly identified a serious problem. Where the Left errs is in its diagnosis. Systemic racism today

is largely the result of “progressive” initiatives, policies and laws. In other words, the Left is responsible for the malady it purports to abhor. They are the new racists.

Dictionary.com defines racism as “a form of prejudice in which a person believes in the superiority of what they consider to be their own ‘race’ over others.” That is what the Klan has long believed, and it is what the Left believes today, with one important difference: most of those who espouse this view are white, and it is their contention that while they are not racists, white America is.

The Left is twice wrong: a) white America, like every segment of the country, is extraordinarily tolerant and fair-minded and b) this is not true of the new racists, namely, those who are indicting America. Here is the evidence.

To combat racism, Idaho passed a law in April that bans schools from teaching that “any sex, race, ethnicity, religion, color, or national origin is inherently superior or inferior.” Other states have since passed similar laws.

Not too long ago, if someone were to object to what this Idaho law says, that person would be branded a racist. Today those who object include the National Education Association (the NEA), the nation’s largest teachers’ union, and virtually every politician, activist, and media outlet on the Left. It is they who have embraced the deeply racist agenda that marks critical race theory.

Critical race theory, which will be taught in the schools this fall, thanks to the NEA, holds that white people today are inherently racist and are responsible for past racial injustices *even if there is zero evidence that most white people have discriminated against a single African American.* Being white is all that counts.

According to this perspective, there are no individuals in white America—just clusters of white people. In other words,

it is the immutable characteristic of race that determines who we are, not the biographical data that makes us all unique individuals. If this isn't racist, the term has no meaning.

Critical race theory, however, is only one weapon in the arsenal of the new racists. Others simply resort to hate speech. Their hatred of America is palpable.

Over the Fourth of July weekend, one left-wing pundit and politician after another declared how racist America is. None was more forceful than Rep. Cori Bush, the newly elected black Democrat from Missouri; she quickly joined the Squad this year, the anti-American contingent of House Democrats. "Black people still aren't free," she exclaimed.

To the extent that blacks are not free, is due almost exclusively to people like her. For example, blacks are the biggest victims of abortion and crime: she champions the former and wants to defund the police. She apparently does not care that innocent blacks pay the biggest price in both instances.

Blacks are overrepresented in the armed forces and have served our nation with distinction; they have also used their service as a lever to achieve a middle-class status. She wants to defund the armed forces. Blacks strongly favor school choice, but Bush, who attended a Catholic high school, wants to deny poor blacks the right to go to a charter, private or parochial school.

What Bush is promoting is systemic racism—it is baked into her policy preferences. Moreover, if she really believed that black lives matter, she would seek to curb the killing of innocent black lives in the womb, and would go into East St. Louis on a Saturday night demanding that blacks stop killing each other. Instead, she wants more funds for abortion and none for the police. Thus has she systematized racism.

Nothing epitomizes systemic racism more than denying poor

black people the right to compete equally with whites, Hispanics and Asians in school. Bush, however, wants to make sure that her own people are locked into failed public schools, the kinds of schools her parents rejected when they enrolled her in a Catholic school.

The reality is that it is not white supremacists whom African Americans need to fear today—it is those who champion their cause. The new racists need to be outed, confronted and defeated. They are a threat to the wellbeing of African Americans, and to the nation as a whole.

---

## **BIDEN TEAM CLAIMS AMERICA IS RACIST**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Biden administration's views on racism:

Never before in American history has there been as many members of a presidential administration who have openly declared the United States to be a racist nation.

To read a sample from the Biden administration, click [here](#).

---

## **HOUSTON CHRONICLE SHOWCASES**

# ITS HUBRIS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in the Houston Chronicle:

Orthodox Jews, Muslims, Mormons, and many other faith communities, have all sorts of internal strictures governing modesty provisions (especially for women), sexual practices, and dietary rules that others may find disagreeable. But the media rarely say a word about them. Nor should they—it's none of their business. However, their reticence does not apply to Catholics.

In its July 1 editorial, the Houston Chronicle lectures the bishops about matters that they should leave alone. Not to be misunderstood, when the Catholic Church takes a public policy stand on any issue, it is fair game for criticism. But when it comes to internal matters, such as the sacraments, it is no more the business of a newspaper than it would be the business of the bishops to opine on the hiring practices of a newspaper.

The editorial tells the bishops they are wrong to even consider denying President Biden Holy Communion. "Biden, who attends Mass and says he personally opposes abortion," the editorial says, "has nevertheless throughout his political career supported the legal right for women to decide for themselves to have one."

If a Catholic president attended Mass and was personally opposed to racial discrimination, but nonetheless felt it was good public policy to support it, would the Houston Chronicle consider that acceptable? Of course not. The difference is that the paper is opposed to racial discrimination but not abortion. The Catholic Church opposes both.

The paper is factually wrong to say that Biden has been a champion of abortion rights "throughout his political career."



In 1974, a year after Roe v. Wade legalized abortion, Biden said the ruling went “too far” and that a woman seeking an abortion should not have the “sole right to say what should happen to her body.”

In 1976, Biden voted for the “Hyde Amendment” which bans federal funding of abortions. In 1981, he introduced the “Biden Amendment” which prohibits foreign-aid funding of biomedical research involving abortion. In 1982, he voted for a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn Roe v. Wade. In other words, in the decade following Roe, he had a mostly pro-life record.

In 1983, however, he reversed himself and voted against a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn Roe. That was the beginning of his pro-abortion stance.

After telling the bishops they are wrong to consider denying Biden the Eucharist, the editorial then contradicts itself when it admits that “what the bishops decide about who may take part in sacraments is their decision. If lay Catholics don’t like it, they can leave the church or press the bishops to reconsider.” Well said. Why, then, did it violate these precepts in the remarks that preceded this concession?

Even more baffling, why did the newspaper then pivot and start lecturing the bishops again? It immediately said that “we’d like to remind the bishops of the words of Pope Francis.” Next, they opine that if the bishops are going “to begin excluding politicians from communion on the basis of just one of those morale crusades,” it is guilty of “cherry-picking.”

What happened to the dictum that “what the bishops decide about who may take part in sacraments is their business”?

The editorial is a mess, from top to bottom.

Contact    Houston    Chronicle    Editorial    Board:  
[Raj.Mankad@chron.com](mailto:Raj.Mankad@chron.com)