

THE THORNY ISSUE OF GAY PRIDE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue raises some issues with respect to Gay Pride Month:

To many Americans, gay pride month is about giving due recognition to lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender persons and queers (LGBTQ). These are Americans who have been marginalized because of their status and are seeking an end to it. To be sure, there is near unanimity that bullying of any kind is unacceptable and that unjust discrimination should not be tolerated. Beyond that, the issue gets thorny, though there is a reluctance on the part of elites to admit it.

Today more than ever before, gay activists have succeeded in gaining the support of a large swath of government officials, and an even bigger slice of corporate America. It does not exaggerate to say that these key decision-makers see no reason to tap the brakes on any issue of importance to the LGBTQ community. To that extent, the gay rights movement has been a stunning success.

The Biden administration is leading the way, offering full-throated support to gay pride month. For example, the U.S. Embassy to the Vatican is flying a gay rainbow flag, and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi is front and center celebrating the “beauty, bravery and vibrancy” of this movement.

Similarly, corporate America has signed on to gay pride month in a way that is startling. The biggest banks, department stores, airlines, professional sports teams, liquor and beer companies, hotel chains, TV networks, newspapers, tech companies, and pharmaceutical houses are all on board without reservation. There’s the rub—without reservation.

It is one thing to recognize the equal dignity of all Americans—this is a staple of Catholic teachings—independent of their sexual orientation; it is quite another to endorse

everything associated with the gay pride agenda.

For example, why is it necessary for those elites who want to show respect for LGBTQ people to remain silent about the child abuse that is taking place in the name of gay pride? To be specific, anyone who sanctions sex transitioning for minors is promoting child abuse, whether it is intentional or not. Most teens who express a desire to transition will change their mind if given time. Moreover, hormone blockers are irreversible and the next step is sex reassignment surgery. From what we know, the results, in terms of wellbeing, are not auspicious.

Another issue that must be addressed is a close look at who the founders of the gay rights movement were and what they stood for. Their profile is not inspiring.

Harry Hay is regarded by many as the founder of the gay rights movement. He not only endorsed adults having sex with minors, he said the young men would love it. "If the parents and friends of gays are truly friends of gays," he said, "they would know from their gay kids that the relationship with an older man is precisely what thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen-year-old kids need more than anything else in the world." He was also a supporter of NAMBLA, the gay pedophile group.

Brenda Howard is responsible for the first gay pride march held in 1970. Known as the "Mother of Pride," the bisexual was a devotee of sadomasochism, bondage and polyamorous relationships. Gilbert Baker created the rainbow flag. He was an anti-Catholic bigot drag queen who went by the name "Busty Ross," a play on Betsy Ross.

Allen Ginsburg is known as among the first intellectuals associated with the modern gay rights movement. He was a strong defender of NAMBLA, the organization committed to normalizing child molestation. Larry Kramer founded ACT-UP, some of whose members crashed St. Patrick's Cathedral during a

Sunday Mass and spat the Eucharist on the floor; he was also a NAMBLA advocate. Harvey Milk, the famous San Francisco activist and politician, was heralded by President Obama. According to the gay author Randy Shilts, who wrote a book about him, Milk also had sex with minors.

Last year, statues of iconic Americans were destroyed by urban anarchists. Every effort was made to eradicate historic figures from American history texts, and annual celebrations in their name came under fierce attack. The elites, almost without exception, stood by and watched; some applauded.

If these Americans are worthy of being scrubbed from our history, why should those who founded the gay rights movement not be excised as well?

Make no mistake about it, the Catholic League is opposed to censoring American history, regardless of the profile of those who shaped it. Ditto for those who crafted the gay pride movement. Even seriously flawed persons are capable of making notable public achievements. And judging those who lived long ago by today's standards smacks of ethnocentrism.

The duplicity, though, is repugnant. Why is it okay to trash Harry Truman but not Harry Hay? Those who launched the cancel culture—they are all on the left—cannot now claim that what they started should stop at their doorstep. If they want to recognize flawed gay leaders, let them recognize flawed American heroes.

The best path forward is to cancel the cancel culture and stop with selective moral indignation.

PUBLIC OPPOSES ABORTION-ON-DEMAND

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the results of new Gallup surveys on abortion:

Two recently released Gallup surveys on abortion show how mixed Americans are on this subject. One of them is titled, "Americans Still Oppose Overturning Roe v. Wade." This a gross simplification. Indeed, by analyzing Gallup's own data, the opposite case could also be made.

It is true that when asked whether Roe v. Wade should be overturned, only 32% agree; 58% disagree. But when the survey digs deeper, it finds something altogether different. For example, only 32% believe that abortion should be legal in all circumstances; 67% disagree. Of that last number, 48% say it should be legal in certain circumstances while 19% say it should be illegal in all circumstances.

With regard to the meaning of Roe v. Wade, Gallup says the ruling "specifies that states may *regulate* abortion before fetal viability in the interests of maternal health, but not ban the procedure before that developmental stage (its *italic*)." That is technically true. It is also intellectually dishonest.

In practice, Gallup knows very well that the way this ruling has been interpreted and applied in most parts of the country, Roe means abortion-on-demand. And that, according to its own data, is precisely what Americans reject.

So why would only a third of Americans want Roe overturned given their overwhelming opposition to what Roe, in practice, allows? That's because many, if not most, falsely believe that Roe does not permit abortion-on-demand.

Gallup admits that support for abortion falls off dramatically after the first trimester. In other words, the average American does not want an outright ban because that would mean abortions in the early stages of pregnancy would also be illegal, hence the reluctance to overturn Roe. But the average American is also unhappy with totally unrestricted abortions, which is what Roe basically permits.

No one can make an informed decision on any subject unless the facts are made clear. When it comes to abortion, they rarely are.

SOROS-FUNDED GROUP ATTACKS BISHOPS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest attack on U.S. bishops:

President Biden says he is a “devout Catholic,” yet he continues to oppose many of the most serious Catholic teachings that bear on public policy. This is of great concern to the bishops, and a large contingent of them are considering whether Biden is deserving of Holy Communion. They will take this issue up next week in a virtual meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB).

Enter Faithful America. It is sponsoring a petition aimed at pressuring the bishops to “cancel your planned anti-Biden vote.” They claim to have over 20,000 signatures.

Who is Faithful America? It is not an organization like the Catholic League. No one goes to the office because there isn’t any—it has a P.O. Box listed on its website. There is no one

to call because it has no phone number. It says it is an “online community.” But it is not a community—it is simply a website that functions as a front group for Catholic haters.

Who funds it? George Soros, the atheist billionaire who hates Catholics.

Why is Faithful America launching this attack on the USCCB? Because it wants to protect President Biden. They like his pro-abortion and anti-religious liberty record.

There is nothing “anti-Biden” about the USCCB. To be sure, the bishops are rightly concerned about the message that he is sending: The president of the United States can be a Catholic in good standing and still reject core Church teachings on the rights of the unborn, marriage, the family, sexuality, and religious liberty. Indeed, he can seek to force Catholic doctors to perform sex transition surgery and close down Catholic hospitals that refuse to perform abortions.

The USCCB will not be intimidated by phony “organizations” that have no anchor in the Catholic community.

Contact Nathan Empsall, the Episcopalian priest who heads up this dummy effort: nathan@faithfulamerica.org

CHINA’S WAR ON CATHOLICS DESERVES HEARINGS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the persecution of Catholics in China:

We are asking Sen. Robert Menendez, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to conduct hearings into

Communist China's war on Catholics. While conditions have never been auspicious for Catholics there, or for other religious bodies, matters have recently gotten out of hand.

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

Contact Rebecca Schatz, legislative director for Sen.

Menendez: rebecca_schatz@menendez.senate.gov

THE BISHOPS ARE NOT PARTISANS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue addresses the issue of partisanship on behalf of the bishops:

A week from today there will be a virtual meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). Critics of the bishops are accusing them of being political partisans. They are wrong. While every bishop has his own political leanings, it is simply false to argue that the USCCB is a political tool of either the Republicans or the Democrats.

The USCCB has praised and criticized the leaders of both parties, depending on their policies and how they mesh with Catholic teachings on public policy matters. Most of the more recent criticism asserts that the bishops are hostile to the Democrats and welcoming to the Republicans.

To dispel this myth we have issued a report on instances where the bishops were supportive of President Obama, critical of President Trump, and supportive of President Biden. Of course, there have been many instances when they took a different stand on each of the three presidents. It all depends on the issues, not on party allegiance.

To read the report, click [here](#).

ACLU HAS ALWAYS BEEN POLITICAL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the politics of the ACLU:

Michael Powell has done some great work at the New York Times, and his lengthy 3615-word article on the ACLU that was published June 7 is no exception.

I know the ACLU well. As part of my Ph.D. dissertation on the ACLU that I did at NYU, I interviewed the founder of the organization in 1978. I have also authored two books on the ACLU, as well as many articles and pamphlets. There are some aspects of the ACLU that Powell did not address but are worth mentioning.

“ACLU is Torn Over Free Speech Mission and New Voice” is the title of his story. In actual fact, from the very beginning the ACLU was never the kind of principled free speech advocate that many have long believed it was. Moreover, as Powell details, the “new voices”—meaning the unprincipled ones—are ascendant; the role of non-partisan civil libertarians is declining.

When Roger Baldwin founded the ACLU in 1920 (the current leadership falsely claims there were ten founders of the organization—there was only one), he did so to serve the interests of labor, using free speech as a means to that end. This explains why the ACLU did not protest Prohibition (which Baldwin later regretted) and why it sided with the Communist Party. In the 1920s, Baldwin went to the Soviet Union and published a book about his experience, “Liberty Under the Soviets.”

In 1934, when millions of Ukrainians were being massacred by Stalin, Baldwin wrote, "I champion civil liberties as the best non-violent means of building the power on which workers' rule must be based....When that power of the working class is once achieved, as it has been only in the Soviet Union, I am for maintaining it by any means whatever."

I titled my first book, "The Politics of the ACLU," to challenge the myth that it has always been a principled civil liberties institution. To be sure, it has won many important victories, and it has long been home to some of the most distinguished civil libertarians in American history (e.g., the late Nat Hentoff and Alan Dershowitz), but there are also too many cases where it has patently violated its purported mission as a non-partisan watchdog.

In the 1930s, the ACLU threatened a libel suit against the American Mercury because it published an article that was critical of the organization. It led to quite a public dustup at the time when both the ACLU and the magazine decided to enlist the famous Baltimore journalist, H.L. Mencken, to review both sides and offer his assessment. He concluded that there was nothing libelous about the article and that the ACLU was not a non-partisan entity. For that he was called a "fascist" by some of the ACLU's leaders.

In the 1940s and 1950s, the ACLU moderated its policies, mostly in response to threats occasioned by World War II. For the first time, it balanced national security issues with individual rights, showing more deference to the former than ever before. It even went so far as to justify the internment of 110,000 Japanese Americans. To this day the ACLU falsely claims that it opposed the internment. The national organization did not; only the Northern California affiliate did.

From the 1960s to the turn of the century, the ACLU turned left again—taking up non-civil liberties issues such as

economic justice. Its extremist positions on narcotics, pornography (including child porn), prostitution, students' rights, prisoners' rights, and the like, evinced an atomistic view of society, one that showed little interest in the need to balance individual rights with individual responsibilities.

The ACLU did not become fully politicized until Anthony Romero took over as executive director in 2001. As the New York Times story demonstrates, the ACLU today has evolved into a highly partisan organization that balks at defending conservative speech while embracing the left-wing agenda. It talks more about white supremacy than it does civil liberties, traditionally understood.

Romero is driven by ideology and money. He is further to the left than any of his predecessors, and his fundraising ambitions make him sound more like an activist for the Southern Poverty Law Center than the ACLU.

Not surprisingly, religious liberty, which was never a priority, is now seen through the lens of the LGBT agenda, making it a threat to their "progressive" cause. The ACLU never lifted a finger to help falsely accused priests and it left unchallenged state restrictions on houses of worship during the pandemic. And, of course, it considers the rights of the unborn to be non-existent.

In other words, while there is some truth to claim that the ACLU is "torn over its free speech mission," it is not exactly a 50-50 split. There are still some principled officials left, but most of them have departed. Just as the Democratic Party has moved sharply left, the ACLU has as well, even to the point of funding Democratic candidates for public office.

Baldwin, who started as a Communist sympathizer and moved toward the middle, would not recognize what it has become.

ANTI-CATHOLIC AD AIRS ON TV

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an anti-Catholic ad that is currently airing on TV in some markets:

There is a despicable anti-Catholic ad running on some TV networks. It is produced by Lacuna Ventures, LLC, a company with offices on Long Island and Westchester, New York. The website that features the ad is righttofight.com.

The ad asks that victims of sexual abuse committed by a priest, or someone else in authority in the Catholic Church, contact the company so that a claim can be filed. It stresses that in New York, New Jersey and California that time is running out to do so.

If someone has been violated by a minister, rabbi, imam, school teacher, coach, psychologist, psychiatrist, athletic administrator, camp counselor, guidance counselor, Hollywood studio official, media employee, doctor, nurse, lawyer—or anyone else—he can take a walk. They are not interested. They are only interested in going after priests.

“If you are a victim of crime committed by an African American, and would like help in filing a claim against him, contact us now.”

Would any firm in the United States run such an ad? Would any media outlet accept it?

To see the ad, click [here](#).

It's time we jammed their lines.

Call (800) 825-6298

BIDEN DEPARTS FROM CATHOLIC TEACHINGS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a Catholic League report:

We have prepared a report, "President Biden's Policies: Departures from Catholic Teachings," that outlines many instances where his decision-making on important moral issues is at variance with established Catholic teachings. It has been sent to all the bishops in the United States.

To read the report, click [here](#).

DISSIDENT CATHOLICS ATTACK THE BISHOPS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on what's going on at the National Catholic Reporter:

There is nothing new about the National Catholic Reporter working to undermine Catholic teachings, but their latest attack on the bishops is in a class of its own. Consider its June 3rd editorial.

The backdrop to the Reporter's angst is the June 16 virtual meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). The bishops are scheduled to discuss, among other items, what to do about Catholic politicians who persist in

flouting Church teachings on salient issues such as abortion. Our “devout Catholic” president, of course, has never found an abortion he could not justify. Indeed, now he wants us to pay for them.

The Catholic League is officially agnostic on what the bishops should do. Unlike the Reporter, we know our place and are not about to preach to them. But that doesn’t mean we are blind to what Biden is doing. In fact, we will detail his departures from Catholic teachings next week.

The Reporter tries hard to be cute by encouraging the bishops to deny Biden Communion. “Just do it,” they say. Why? So that way “if there happens to be a Catholic remaining who is not convinced that the bishops’ conference, as it stands today, has become completely irrelevant and ineffectual, they will be crystal clear about that reality after the conference leaders move forward with this patently bad idea.”

The Reporter does not speak to the bishops—it speaks *down* to them. The journalists love to lecture the theologians, as in telling the bishops that “excessive attention to the worthiness of those receiving Communion is contrary to a proper, traditional theology of the sacraments.” Their arrogance is appalling.

According to the Reporter, it is not just the bishops who are wrong—the Catholic Catechism is also wrong.

Here is what the Catechism says about abortion. “Human life must be respected and protected absolutely from the moment of conception.” It also says, “Formal cooperation in an abortion constitutes a grave offense.”

Regarding the paramount role of Communion, it lays out very clearly why it is the premier sacrament. It says, “the Eucharist occupies a unique place as the ‘Sacrament of sacraments’: ‘all other sacraments are ordered to it as to their end.’” It also says, “Anyone who desires to receive

Christ in Eucharistic communion must be in a state of grace.”

If we had a racist Catholic president, the Reporter would be calling on the USCCB to excommunicate him. But when it comes to abortion, they swing the other way. The Church regards both abortion and racism to be “intrinsically evil.” It is the Reporter that is inconsistent, not the bishops.

The Reporter is not content to disagree with the bishops; no, it chooses to insult them. They accuse the bishops of creating a “MAGA church,” one that sees “Donald Trump instead of Jesus as its savior.” To top things off, they accuse them of being “lazy, out of touch” and “in the pockets of wealthy donors pushing a political agenda.”

Make no mistake about it—this is character assassination. The fact that it emanates from an alleged Catholic source makes it all the more despicable.

Contact the Reporter’s executive editor, Heidi Schlumpf:
hschlumpf@ncronline.org

ILLINOIS GOV. WEIGHS SEX ENGINEERING BILL

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a radical sex education bill that passed the Illinois legislature on May 28:

There is a sex education bill sitting before Illinois Gov. J.B. Pritzker that is the most wildly irresponsible assault on common decency and common sense ever proposed; in a stealth

move, it was passed by state lawmakers on the Friday of Memorial Day weekend. It has little to do with sex education as most people understand it; rather, it is a radical sex engineering bill.

The *National Sexuality Education Standards* is an initiative of the Future of Sex Education (FoSE) and the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS); the latter was established in the 1950s by disciples of the sex-abusing king of sexology, Alfred Kinsey.

The scope of the curriculum goes far beyond conventional sex education programs. Indeed, it is the most extreme attempt to transform the norms and values of young people ever envisioned.

By the end of the 2nd grade, when most students are 7-years old, they will be expected to list “medically accurate names for body parts, including the genitals.” They will also define “gender, gender identity, and gender-role stereotypes.” Bodily autonomy will also be stressed, as well as knowledge about different family forms, including “cohabiting” and “same-gender” variants.

By the end of the 5th grade, students will be expected to “distinguish between sex assigned at birth and gender identity and explain how they may or may not differ.” They will also learn about the “differences between cisgender, transgender, gender nonbinary, gender expansive and gender identity.”

By the end of the 8th grade, students will be expected to explain what it means to be “bisexual, lesbian, gay, queer, two-spirit, asexual, pansexual.”

By the time students are ready to graduate from high school, they will be taught to become an “advocate” for “all genders, gender expressions, and gender identities.”

There is another part of the curriculum that speaks to issues

of anatomy and physiology. Fifth graders, for instance, will be taught about “hormone blockers on young people who identify as transgender.” Tenth graders will learn about “the role of hormones and pleasure.” By the time they graduate from high school, they will be instructed to become “advocates” for “people of all sexual orientations.”

There is a glossary for students to learn as well. Terms such as “gender expansive,” “gender nonbinary,” “gender nonconforming,” and “genderqueer” appear in the Appendix. “Gender pronouns” that are considered normal include referring to oneself as “they/them/theirs.”

Abortion is treated as a “pregnancy option.” “Sexual intercourse,” students learn, “may mean different things to different people, but could include behaviors such as vaginal sex, oral sex, or anal sex.”

The curriculum is a wholesale attack on parental rights and traditional moral values. Worse, it sanctions behaviors that are positively dangerous.

No one is ever “assigned” his or her sex. Fathers determine the sex of the child born as the result of a heterosexual union; hospital staff validate it. Not all family types are equal: not to tell students that there is a gold standard, one that provides the greatest opportunity for a boy and a girl to be a success in school, work and marriage—it is called the intact family—is intellectually dishonest and does them a disservice.

Terms such as “gender nonbinary,” “gender expansive,” “asexual,” “pansexual,” and the like are linguistic inventions that are not based on medical science; they are ideological predilections. Moreover, no one in his right mind goes around calling himself “they” anymore than someone goes around calling himself “we.”

Teaching ten-year-olds about hormone blockers is done to

advance the transgender movement. What will not be taught is how such therapies can create all sorts of long-term problems—they are irreversible—for those who take them. Just as irresponsible is to teach tenth graders about sexual pleasure. Why are they not instead being instructed on the merits of individual responsibility and the necessity of exercising restraint?

The curriculum crosses the line in a serious way when it instructs high school students to become “advocates” for the LGBT agenda. Students can advocate for any cause they want, but it is not the right of educators to tell them which cause they must adopt.

Finally, to teach students that anal sex is the equal of vaginal sex is pernicious. If they want to teach about this subject, they should teach what webmd.com says about it. It has a frank discussion on the health dangers that anal sex incurs. No wonder it concludes, “The only way to completely avoid anal sex risks is not to have it.” That is what students should be taught.

Educators need to know their place. They are employed to help students become literate, master the basics, and become good citizens. They are not there to sexually engineer them.

To read the longer and more graphic version of this analysis click [here](#). That is the one being sent to Gov. Pritzker.

Contact Anne Caprara, the governor’s chief of staff: anne.caprara@illinois.gov