

# ABORTION-BY-HANGER      DEEMED SAFE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the 2021 Women's March on Washington which will be held on Oct. 2nd. [Note: This news release contains graphic language.]

According to the organizers of this year's [Women's March on Washington](#), there is nothing dangerous, scary or harmful about a pregnant woman inserting a wire hanger into her vagina to kill her child. That's why those who show up with a hanger, or hanger imagery, will get booted, even if their purpose is to protest abortion-law restrictions.

On the website of this event, it lists items that should and should not be brought. Among the latter, it says: "Coat-hanger imagery: We do not want to accidentally reinforce the right wing talking points that self-managed abortions are dangerous, scary and harmful."

Liberals, they suggest, are fine with women using a hanger to abort their child. It's a safe instrument. Thus have they made the case to shut down Planned Parenthood. We don't need more abortion clinics—we need more coat hangers.

Amazingly, the organizers of the march say that using a wire hanger to rip a child out of a woman's body is sanitary, but not to wear a mask, or practice social distancing, at this outdoor event is unsanitary. Here's their advice: ***"EVERYONE IS REQUIRED TO WEAR A MASK AND PRACTICE SOCIAL DISTANCING. WE WILL PROVIDE HAND SANITIZER STATIONS THROUGHOUT THE MARCH."***

They have further instructed women who show up wearing a Handmaid's costume that they can take a hike.

Why? Even though these outfits are being worn by women to protest abortion restrictions, the organizers contend that

they are used “primarily by white women across the country.” That sends a bad message to “Black women, undocumented women, incarcerated women, poor women and disabled women.”

Pro-abortion activists have changed a lot. In 1969, four years before *Roe v. Wade*, 300,000 protesters marched in Washington demanding the legalization of abortion. According to the Los Angeles Times, “marchers wore coat hangers around their necks and held signs reading, ‘Never again.’”

Now coat hangers are in vogue—only right wing loons object to pregnant woman using them to murder their child.

But not everyone is convinced that hangers are safe. Dr. Jen Gunter is a Canadian-American gynecologist and pro-abortion activist. She has even written a radical manifesto, *The Vagina Bible*. But when it comes to abortion-by-hanger, she is not a fan.

She describes what happens when a woman or girl “thrusts it [the coat hanger] blindly upwards into the vagina.” She may not know, Gunter says, that “to get into the uterus the coat hanger has to navigate the small opening in the cervix called the os.” The problem with that is the end of the hanger is “sharp not tapered so it can lacerate and perforate.”

Let’s say the woman gets through this stage. “The uterine wall is soft and easily perforated,” and if this happens “there is a high risk of lacerating a uterine artery.” This, in turn, means that the woman could “easily bleed to death.”

That’s not all. “The other dangers with uterine perforation is the bowel. If it is punctured, it will “most certainly kill her unless she gets appropriate medical care.” This means “major surgery to drain abscesses, remove necrotic bowel, and possibly even a colostomy. The uterus will also be infected and may be damaged beyond repair.”

Even if the woman gets this far, “it is unlikely she will

induce an abortion immediately.” She risks infection, and “bacteria from septic abortions often disseminates and each hour the condition remains untreated death takes a step closer.”

If the organizers of the Women’s March on Washington are right, that would make Dr. Gunter is a right-wing misogynist nut. But if she is right, that would make them monsters.

Contact: [press@womensmarch.com](mailto:press@womensmarch.com)

---

## MADNESS IN THE SCHOOLS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue discusses what is happening in the classroom:

The new school year is off to a wild start. Perversion, anti-Americanism, and racism are being taught in some schools, and it’s happening at all levels, from K-graduate school. Those pushing this sick agenda are imbued with hate: their animus is clearly directed at Western civilization, the very home to liberty and equality they have targeted for assault.

In one Minnesota school district, a sex education class asks heterosexual students to engage in role playing, pretending they are homosexual; they are also asked to consider whether they should have sex with each other. Other students in the Richfield School District are asked to pretend that they belong to the opposite sex, and to consider whether they should have sex with a woman. In a gesture toward inclusivity, they are taught about anal sex. This begins in kindergarten.

In a more sane time, the educators would be arrested for child abuse.

Fairfax High School in Virginia was the site of a recent school board blowup. One of the parents, Stacy Langton, complained that the school library housed porn books that discussed man-boy sex; they also featured illustrations of oral sex, masturbation and "violent nudity."

She also read aloud obscene words from the books about the male sex organ and fellatio, only to be interrupted by a female school board member who was worried—now she was worried!—that children in the room might hear what was being said. Langton was not deterred and kept on talking.

In a more sane time, the school would be sued for corrupting the morals of minors.

Alexander Hamilton High School in Los Angeles started the year with a deranged teacher who took down the American flag from the classroom. Inserted in its place were a Palestinian flag, the transgender flag, a Black Lives Matter flag and "the modern PRIDE flag." Hanging from the wall were posters saying, "F\*\*\* THE POLICE" and "F\*\*\* AMERIKKA. THIS IS NATIVE LAND."

In a more sane time, the teacher would have been terminated.

The public school system in Evanston, Illinois started the academic year with a pending lawsuit against it. The officials who run it are teaching children about the horrors of being a white person. That's just for starters. They are teaching third, fourth, and fifth graders that "it is important to disrupt the Western nuclear family dynamics as the best/proper way to have a family." They explicitly denounce as "normal" the family that consists of "mom, dad, son, daughter, and pet."

So what family form should we emulate? Dysfunctional ones? Of course, in the racist mindset of these anti-Western civilization maniacs, there is no such things as "dysfunctional" families—they are simply "alternative families."

In a more sane society, the school system would be branded as racist and the administrators would be quarantined.

It's not just in the elementary and secondary schools where insanity reigns. Columbia University has a new program where students are implored to "critically engage with whiteness." They specifically target white students who claim to be "liberal, progressive, and a champion of social justice." Looks like conservative students are written off as hopeless, and are therefore exempt from these thought control exercises.

American University and Western Washington University have decided to follow the lead of schools like Stanford University by introducing segregated housing for black students. "Black Affinity Housing" is what these dorms are being called. George Wallace must be smiling from his grave. And a professor from Virginia Tech recently told students that she was working "on a daily basis to be antiracist and confront the innate racism" within herself, which, she said, was the "reality and history of white people."

In a more sane society, the segregationists and the confessed white racist would be arrested for violating the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Pope Benedict XVI warned us many times about the attacks on our Judeo-Christian heritage. His only mistake was in underestimating the extent to which educational elites have literally gone off the deep end.

In a more sane society, the elites would be straightjacketed and taken to the nearest asylum. If they were lucky, that is.

---

# IS DE BLASIO A RACIST?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the issue of mandatory vaccinations and charges of racism:

Is New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio a racist? According to the co-founder of the New York branch of Black Lives Matter, Chivona Newsome, he is.

How could a white man who is married to a black woman be a racist? Moreover, he is the same man who refused to demand that social distancing measures be followed by Black Lives Matter protesters—he said the cause of the protests (many of which turned into riots) trumped public health concerns. Yet Black Lives Matter labels him a racist.

“The September 13th vaccine mandate is racist and specifically targets black New Yorkers,” said Newsome. “The vaccination passports are modern day Freedom Papers, which limit the free will of black people.”

She added that “The vaccination mandates infringe upon the civil liberties of the black community.”

Is de Blasio really a racist? Not for these reasons. If a racist is defined as someone who holds that one race is superior to the other, he fails this test as well. But if the definition of a racist is someone who deliberately crafts policies that overwhelmingly victimize low-income blacks, he passes. Indeed, he is more of a threat to blacks than white supremacists are.

De Blasio has fought every school choice initiative that has ever been proposed to help blacks escape the failed public schools that he has consigned them to. He has sought to crush charter schools, even though blacks are demanding more of them. Similarly, he has blocked school vouchers for Catholic schools, even though blacks want them as well.

"I am angry at the privatizers," de Blasio told the National Education Association in 2019. "I am sick and tired of these efforts to privatize a precious thing we need—public education....I hate the privatizers and I want to stop them."

That's right, de Blasio wants to make sure black families have zero opportunities to send their children to charter and parochial schools, even though only 10% of black eighth graders in New York City public schools are proficient in math and 14% in English.

While mandatory vaccinations are hardly racist, it is rather amusing to see de Blasio tagged as a racist for making this decision. In fact, according to his own logic, Black Lives Matter is not being illogical when it makes this accusation.

When it comes to racial disparities in education, de Blasio sees racism everywhere. That is why his latest gambit is to do away with honor rolls and examinations to enter elite public schools. The irony is rich: He sent his son Dante to one of those elite public schools, but now he thinks it's time to lower standards.

Black students are suspended for discipline more than non-black students in New York City public schools, and de Blasio is furious with that outcome. Blacks are more likely to be arrested than non-whites, and that is another racial disparity he sees as driven by racism. Indeed, he lowered the penalties for public urination because too many "people of color" (blacks, not Asians) were being arrested.

The idea that every racial disparity is positive proof of racism is exactly what one of the leading gurus of critical race theory, Ibram X. Kendi, teaches. And up until the mandatory vaccination issue, it was de Blasio's position as well. Now he is being devoured by his own ideological agenda.

Things could really get ugly if, as Newsome says, she may respond with an "uprising" similar to the riots that ensued

last year following the death of George Floyd. According to her, 72% of blacks aged 18-44 are unvaccinated.

It will be interesting to see if all those young white people from the tony sections of Brooklyn—the privileged ones who rioted with Black Lives Matter last year—will join the “uprising.” It’s a sure bet that almost all of them are big fans of being forced to take the jab.

They will have to choose. Do they stay with their Black Lives Matter friends and prostitute their politics by opposing vaccination mandates, or do they tell their friends to take a walk and get a vax? If it’s the latter, this isn’t going to go over well with Black Lives Matter.

Not every racial disparity is a function of racism, but to those like de Blasio who have been peddling this nonsense for years, it is too late in the game to call off the dogs. They’ve already left the pen and are coming right at him.

Contact: [BdeBlasio@cityhall.nyc.gov](mailto:BdeBlasio@cityhall.nyc.gov)

---

## DO LGBT RIGHTS HAVE NO EFFECT ON CHRISTIANS?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a study on LGBT rights and anti-Christian bias:

In a study that was recently published in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, six researchers from four universities concluded that there is no evidence to support the idea that LGBT progress comes at the expense of increasing bias against Christians. If this were true, it would undercut



one of the more salient bases for opposing LGBT rights.

As will be seen, there are good reasons to question this conclusion. Moreover, a palpable bias on the part of the professors is evident.

If, as the study contends, that anti-Christian bias does not proceed from gains won by the LGBT community, then why do Christians believe there is an animus against them? "Christians' beliefs about conflict with sexual minorities are shaped by understandings of Christian values, social change, interpretation of the Bible, and in response to religious institution."

In other words, the notion that bias against Christians tends to increase as LGBT rights progress is not real—it's in their heads. The study finds that the source of their faulty perception is due to their Christian beliefs, not to any real instances of anti-Christian sentiment or behavior. This, in turn, is a consequence of Christians being on the losing side of the culture wars. Having lost "their sway," they now see themselves as victims of a "symbolic threat."

The authors further claim that since Christians are "relatively privileged," it suggests that their "desire to maintain group dominance may be driven by desires for cultural dominance."

The study ends in a way that is customary for research papers, with a section titled, "Limitations and Future Directions." It's too bad that these psychologists didn't list their own predilections as a limiting factor. In fairness, this hardly makes them unique. Though it ought to be done.

Max Weber, the distinguished sociologist, wrote about what he called a "loaded dice" theorem. He argued that although researchers should strive for objectivity, they need to acknowledge that the very selection of the subject that they chose to study is itself a value choice, or a bias. He further

insisted that “statements of fact are one thing, statements of value another, and any confusing of the two is impermissible.”

Weber’s concerns are particularly relevant to this study, and indeed to virtually all studies done these days by behavioral and social scientists on an array of subjects dealing with the family, sexuality and religion. To be exact, how many professors in these areas are more sympathetic to Christian sensibilities than they are to the LGBT agenda? Next to none. There is little in the way of diversity of thought in higher education.

The authors of this study give plenty of reasons to question their objectivity. To take a small but telling example, no serious researcher talks about “cishet” people. This neologism, which means a heterosexual who identifies with his nature-derived sex (they would object to my characterization), can only be found in places like “The Queer Dictionary.” This is the talk of gay activists, not scholars.

More important, when they say that Christians are “privileged,” they are making a statement that is more political than scientific. Surely low-income and working class Christians are not members of some “privileged” segment of society. Indeed, by what measure are middle class Americans, many of whom are struggling to pay their mortgage and saving for their children’s education, members of some “privileged” group?

In fact, if being “privileged” were defined by the number of hours worked per week, and the number of days off per year, professors would be the most privileged class in the world. In fact, once they get tenure they can slide and do practically nothing and still keep their job. (I was in the professoriate for 16 years, so I speak with experience.)

Where is the evidence that Christians want “group dominance”? This is an assertion, not an empirical finding. Reclaiming, or

maintaining, rights that are being diminished is hardly proof that “dominance” is the goal. The end that is sought may be nothing more than equity.

At the beginning of the article, the *Masterpiece Cakeshop* case is cited. The authors never mention that it was the anti-Christian statements made by the Colorado Civil Rights Commission that persuaded the U.S. Supreme Court to side with the Christian baker. Surely evidentiary findings of bigotry would matter if the victims were LGBT persons. Why should anti-Christian bigotry count for less?

The way the authors see it, this case was about “being obligated to serve sexual minorities,” something which “violated Christians’ religious freedom.” Similarly, at the end of the article they maintain that “same-sex couples continue to experience more discrimination from wedding industry professionals than heterosexual couples.”

The truth is that the owner of the bakeshop never refused anyone, including gays, from buying one of his goods. What he refused to do was custom-make a wedding cake for two men, a request that would force him to sanction a ceremony that violates the tenets of his Christian faith. That is not a small difference.

Why wouldn’t those who work in the wedding business be more prone not to cooperate with such requests? After all, they are not car salesmen. Furthermore, for Catholics, to take one example, marriage is a sacrament, one that is reserved for a man and a woman.

The authors found that “Perceptions of anti-Christian bias seem to be particularly acute for conservative Christians.” It would be shocking if they found otherwise.

As any survey research findings show, the difference between liberal Christians and secular Americans on moral issues is virtually identical these days. To put it differently, if a

Christian is okay with gay marriage, he is not likely to spot anti-Christian bias in anything the parties to it might request.

One of the main conclusions of this study holds that while LGBT individuals “bear the brunt of discrimination,” there is “less evidence of widespread bias against Christians.” They take it a step further by arguing that “there is no evidence, to our knowledge, connecting the experience of LGBT individuals to bias against Christians.” [To read a sample of the evidence, click [here](#).]

If bias against Christians is measured by discrimination in school and in the workplace, then it is true that much progress has been made. But if bias is measured by Christian bashing, there is a big problem.

Those who work in the media, education, the entertainment industry, the arts, and government have said the most vile things about conservative Christians, comments that would never be counseled if said about gays or transgender persons. If anything, the ruling class has locked arms with the gay community, and that often pits them against Christians.

To say that there is no evidence “connecting the experience of LGBT individuals to bias against Christians” is fatuous. There are scores of cases involving Catholic schools which have been sued by deceitful gay teachers.

None was fired because he was a homosexual: every case involved gay teachers who claimed to be married to a person of the same sex, in direct defiance to the norms they voluntarily accepted as a condition of employment. In many cases, these teachers deliberately went public with their status, hoping to force a confrontation in the courts.

The federal government has been sued for allowing orthodox religious schools to receive federal funds, schools which maintain that marriage is the union of a man and a woman, not

people of the same sex. Colleges have been sued for denying biological men to live in women's dorms.

Speech codes have been adopted in the workplace, ordering employees to use pronouns for transgender persons that violate their free speech rights and deny common sense. Catholic adoption agencies have been sued for following Catholic teachings on marriage and the family. Catholic hospitals have been sued for not agreeing to perform transgender surgery. Pro-life activists have been harassed by LGBT store owners.

The collision between LGBT rights and religious liberty is at a fever pitch. The former are nowhere mentioned in the Constitution, but the latter is enshrined in the First Amendment.

It's time to stop floating the fiction that LGBT advances have not resulted in a diminution of rights for Christians, or in a bias directed at them. The elites have laid anchor, and it is not in the Christian camp.

---

## **PELOSI'S "VIEW" ON ABORTION**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Nancy Pelosi's latest defense of abortion:

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who identifies as a Catholic, was asked at her weekly press briefing to reply to comments made by San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone that were critical of the Women's Health Protection Act, a radical pro-abortion bill. "You're a Catholic," the reporter said. "What's your reaction?"

Here is what she said (she ended with a reference to

Cordileone expressing her disagreement).

"Yeah, I'm Catholic. I come from a pro-life family. Not active in that regard. Different in their view of a woman's right to choose than I am. In my right to choose, I had five children in six years and one week. And I keep saying to people who say things like that, when you have five children in six years and one day, we can talk about what business it is of us to tell anyone else [what] to do. For us, it was a complete and total blessing, which we enjoy every day of our lives. But it is none of our business how other people choose the size and timing of their families."

The key word is "view." It is Pelosi's "view" that her pro-life family, and the teachings of the Catholic Church, are wrong on abortion.

A view is defined by Merriam-Webster as "an opinion or judgment colored by the feeling or bias of its holder."

Have you ever heard someone say that it is his "view" that there are 12 months in the year? That would make it rebuttable. No, what people say is that *there are* 12 months in a year. They speak declaratively. It is not an opinion.

The pope recently said that abortion is "murder," and Archbishop Cordileone called it "child murder." Neither argued that it was his "view." Indeed, the pope said that "any book on embryology" makes clear that life begins at conception.

If disagreements on abortion amount to nothing more than different "views," as Pelosi contends, then why wouldn't disagreements on slavery amount to the same? Consider what a pro-slavery "Catholic" might say if asked how to reply to his archbishop on the merits of slavery.

"Yeah, I'm Catholic. I come from an abolitionist family. Not active in that regard. Different in their view of a slavemaster's right to choose than I am. In my right to

choose, I bought five children in six years and one week. And I keep saying to people who say things like that, when you have bought five children in six years and one day, we can talk about what business it is of any of us to tell anyone else [what] to do. For us, it was a complete and total blessing, which we enjoy every day of our lives. But it is none of our business whether other people choose to own slaves.”

Those who oppose slavery and abortion rest their case on moral absolutes, not opinion. Pelosi’s moral relativism places her outside the Catholic community.

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

---

## **BIDEN’S PRO-ABORTION BILL IS OFF-THE-CHARTS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden’s latest pro-abortion bill:

“The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 3755, the Women’s Health Protection Act of 2021.” That is the statement released by the White House on September 20. In actual fact, the proposed law has nothing to do with women’s health—it is a pro-abortion bill.

This is true notwithstanding the bill’s contention that “Abortion is essential health care and one of the safest medical procedures in the United States.” Essential health care would be things like heart surgery and treatment for Covid, not elective abortion. And it is fatuous to say that it

is safe. Safe for whom?

The bill maintains that abortion restrictions are “a tool of gender oppression.” If this were true, why were America’s first feminists staunch opponents of abortion? In 1858, Elizabeth Cady Stanton spoke about “the murder of children, either before or after birth.” She branded it “evil.” Similarly, Susan B. Anthony called abortion “child murder” and “infanticide.”

So if the first feminists were strongly opposed to abortion—they said it was analogous to treating women as property—when did abortion restrictions become “a tool of gender oppression”? In the 1960s.

That was when two men, Lawrence Lader and Dr. Bernard Nathanson (who later became a Catholic and a pro-life activist), convinced feminists such as Betty Friedan that abortion should be seen as an example of women’s liberation. In other words, it took the boys to teach the girls about their own “emancipation.”

As for this bill, it is anything but “women friendly.” To be explicit, it would abolish the requirement that abortion can only be performed by a physician, thus allowing mid-wives, nurses and doctor’s assistants to do the job. The bill also eliminates health and safety regulations that are specific to abortion facilities.

Now ask yourself this: If a bill were passed that would allow dental hygienists to pull your tooth, and that it could be done in a facility without customary health and safety regulations, would anyone in his right mind consider this to be progress?

Iterations of this bill have been introduced every year since 2013, but it wasn’t until this year that dramatically new language was introduced. The neologisms are emblematic of the wild-eyed activists who work in the White House.



For example, the bill talks about “reproductive justice” and the necessity of opposing “restrictions on reproductive health, including abortion, that perpetuate systems of oppression, lack of bodily autonomy, white supremacy, and anti-Black racism.”

This is the mindset of those who are positively obsessed with race, the kind of people who find discussions about chocolate and vanilla to have racial undertones. Just as some who were obsessed about communism in the 1950s found communism under every pillow, those who work in the Biden administration find racism under every blanket.

The bill insists that “Access to equitable reproductive health care, including abortion, has always been deficient” for blacks and other minorities. In actual fact, thanks to Planned Parenthood, this is a lie: access to abortion services have been fantastic for blacks.

Planned Parenthood erects 86 percent of its abortion facilities in or near minority neighborhoods in the 25 counties with the most abortions. Although these 25 counties make up just 1 percent of all U.S. counties, they accounted for 30 percent of all the abortions in the U.S. in 2014.

Is it any surprise that although blacks comprise roughly 13 percent of the population, they account for at least a third of all the abortions? It is therefore dishonest to claim that they lack access to abortion mills.

Another novelty found in this bill is the linguistic game of pretending that males and females can change their sex. For example, it says that abortion services “are used *primarily* by women (my italic).” This is factually wrong. Only women can get pregnant and only women can abort their child. A man can identify as a woman (or as a gorilla for that matter), but he can never get pregnant.

Similarly, the geniuses who wrote this bill make more than two

dozen references to “pregnant people”; this is roughly twice as often as they speak of “pregnant women.” Now if a man can get pregnant, in what orifice does his baby exit? His ear?

If this isn’t nutty enough, the bill’s authors add that it is their intention “to protect all people with the capacity of becoming pregnant—cisgender women [meaning real women] transgender men [meaning delusional women who think they are a man], non-binary individuals [there is no such breed], those who identify with a different gender [the mentally challenged], and others.” Who the “others” are remains a mystery.

Catholics need to take note. Though this “off-the-charts” bill is not likely to pass, it is the expressed desire of our “devout Catholic” president that it should. Biden can carry his rosary to the moon and back, but all that matters are his values and his policies, and in many instances they are anything but Catholic.

*Contact White House press secretary Jen Psaki:*  
[jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov](mailto:jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov)

---

## **TEXAS REJECTS BIDEN’S SEXUAL POLITICS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Biden administration’s latest example of sexual politics:

On September 20, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton sued the Biden administration in an attempt to stop a June 15 guidance, or legal notice, by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) on the rights of transgender persons.

The EEOC says it is authorized to make a wide-ranging decision on the rights of transgender persons, leaning on the 2020 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Bostock v. Clayton County* for legitimacy. Texas disagrees saying that the EEOC is guilty of overreach, assuming powers it was never granted by this high court ruling.

According to the EEOC, relying on *Bostock*, it is empowered to force employers to allow biological persons to dress as a member of the opposite sex. However, as the Texas brief points out, there are state agencies that have a dress code, and if an employee were to dress as a member of the opposite sex, it would violate its standards.

Texas also objects to the EEOC directive that says employers must respect the right of biological persons to use the bathrooms, locker rooms, and showers of the opposite sex, meaning that males could use the facilities reserved for women.

The EEOC also seeks to force employers and employees to call persons of the opposite sex by the pronouns of their choice, so that it would be a violation not to call a woman who identifies as a man "he/him," or even "they/them," despite the fact that such nomenclature is biologically and grammatically illiterate. Texas not only refuses to discipline workers for these alleged infractions, it insists that the guidance violates the free speech rights of employees.

Does *Bostock* give the EEOC the powers it claims it has?

No one disagrees that *Bostock* concluded that Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which bars discrimination on the basis of race and sex, applies to discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. This clearly means that no one can be fired from the workplace for simply being a homosexual or a transgender person. But what about dress codes, males showering with females, and transgender speech

codes? They are not even hinted at in Title VII.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch, who wrote the majority decision in *Bostock*, anticipated the first two concerns, and sought to alleviate fears that they could be justified on the basis of this ruling.

“The employers worry that our decision will sweep beyond Title VII to other federal or state laws that prohibit sex discrimination. And, under Title VII itself, they say sex-segregated bathrooms, locker rooms, and dress codes will prove unsustainable after our decision today. But none of these other laws are before us; we have not had the benefit of adversarial testing about the meaning of their terms, and we do not prejudge any such questions today. Under Title VII, too, we do not purport to address bathrooms, locker rooms, or anything else of the kind.”

In other words, the EEOC is deliberately ignoring the plain language of *Bostock* by granting itself the authority that is nowhere sanctioned in this Supreme Court ruling. As for forcing employees to yield their First Amendment right to free speech, the word “pronouns” is nowhere mentioned by Gorsuch; he is agnostic on this issue.

The Texas lawsuit also contends that the Fourteenth Amendment does not permit the federal government to “substantively redefine a State’s constitutional obligations.” It argues that this is exactly what the EEOC power grab does.

Very few Americans want to see people discriminated against on the basis of any conventional demographic characteristic, but when it comes to matters involving privacy and modesty—to say nothing of looming sexual assault issues—that is a different story. Moreover, telling people what linguistic terms they must use in addressing coworkers is draconian.

The contempt that President Biden has for respecting elemental standards of decency, as well as his dismissal of our First

Amendment right to free speech, did not begin with his administration's twisted interpretation of *Bostock*. It began on his first day in office.

On January 20, 2021, our "devout Catholic" president signed an executive order saying that biological persons can use the bathroom and locker room of their choice. On the same day, the White House website was updated to allow visitors to use whatever pronouns they want, thus setting the table for transgender-pronoun mandates in the workplace.

Never before has there been a presidential administration so determined to promote sexual engineering, complete with a wholesale disregard for freedom of speech. It is becoming increasingly clear that Biden is an abolitionist of the worst kind: he is bent on abolishing the nature-based differences between men and women. Moreover, he will punish those who do not adopt his sexually correct lexicon.

At a minimum, we need to know more about who is advising him on these issues. This is especially urgent given that it is becoming more obvious by the day that he is not in full command of his faculties.

Contact White House press secretary Jen Psaki:  
[jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov](mailto:jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov)

---

## **MASKETEERS ARE NOT DOING US ANY FAVORS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why some Americans love masks:

Have you ever noticed that in the big cities, there are many more people walking around with masks than in the suburbs? When I leave Long Island to go to work in New York City, few are wearing masks outdoors. But as soon as I get to the Big Apple, it changes: people are wearing masks walking down the street, on bicycles and in cars.

What explains the difference? For one, liberals dominate in urban America, and it is they—the masketeers—who are enamored of masks.

California is one of the most liberal states in the country. Not surprisingly, its big cities are heavily populated with masketeers. Dennis Prager said earlier this year that “where I live (the Los Angeles area), I am usually the only person on the street not wearing a mask.” He adds that “You do not need medical or scientific expertise to understand the foolishness of outdoor mask-wearing.”

Pundits recently noticed that one of the reasons why California Governor Gavin Newsom easily fended off a recall challenge was because of his stringent Covid policies. The masketeers love him.

He authorized a veritable lock-down of the state, and did not end his stay-at-home order until June 15. His health officials ordered all unvaccinated persons age 2 and over to wear a mask in indoor public spaces and businesses. Los Angeles County went further, mandating that those age 2 and over wear masks in indoor settings regardless of their vaccination status.

Starting September 20, Newsom is forcing everyone who attends an indoor event over 1,000 persons to provide vaccination verification or a negative Covid test. San Francisco recently announced something similar for bars, restaurants and gyms.

Californians strongly approve of these restrictions. In a recent survey, 66% said they support a universal mask mandate for indoor public places; only 25% were opposed. A majority,

51%, said they like masks so much that they would personally choose to wear one indoors in public *even if not required to do so*! Similarly, a majority are in favor of the state forcing everyone in California to get vaccinated.

Is there not something strange going on here? Are not liberals the ones who hate authority—the police being Enemy #1—and are not liberals the ones who espouse “bodily autonomy”? So why the love affair with masks?

Truth be told, the masketeers are phonies. As evidenced at the Emmy Awards, masks are dispensable whenever liberal celebrities decide that seeing their lovely faces on TV means more than public health considerations. Only their lowly staff assistants were required to mask up.

To be sure, rights are not absolute, and a mature society will attempt to balance civil liberties with such competing interests as civility, community, national security and public health considerations. It’s just that we wouldn’t expect this from those who are ordinarily dismissive of any competing claims on individual rights.

Then again, liberals wouldn’t be liberals if they didn’t embrace statist prescriptions: they adore mandates as much as they do cancelling those who disagree with them. And they can always make exceptions for themselves.

The masketeers, most of whom are well educated, have been nurtured to believe in science, and are therefore obliging when the “experts” speak. The problem is that unanimity does not exist among the scientists. In fact, perspectives which challenge the conventional wisdom are often censored.

A free society requires individual rights and respect for authority. But it also needs a healthy skepticism about new restrictions mandated by the state, especially those that defy common sense. The masketeers are not doing us any favor.

---

# MEDIA EXPLOIT THE POPE AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the media's reaction to remarks made by Pope Francis aboard the papal plane:

It is not the Catholic Church that is obsessed with sex, it is the media.

Of the six questions Pope Francis was asked aboard the papal plane on September 15, half were on sex: there were two questions on homosexuality and one on abortion. Yet the pope was not returning from a conference on sexuality and the family—he was returning from Budapest and Slovakia after addressing issues that had absolutely nothing to do with the media's obsession.

Most media accounts said nothing about the pope's comments on homosexuality, and they gave brief mention to his remarks on abortion. That's because most in the big media strongly disagree with the Catholic Church's teachings on these issues. Therefore, we will tell you what the media will not.

When asked about "the recognition of homosexual marriages," Pope Francis was quite blunt. "Marriage is a sacrament, the Church has no power to change the sacraments as the Lord has instituted them." In reference to civil unions, which are open to many parties, not just homosexuals, he said he understands that "the States have the possibility civilly to support them." What he said next was salient. "But marriage is marriage."

The pope continued with his comments on homosexual marriages. "The Lord is good, he desires the salvation of all, but please, don't make the Church deny its truth," he said. "Many



people with a homosexual orientation approach penance, they seek counsel from the priests, the Church helps them, but the sacrament of marriage is something else.”

The pope was even more precise when he spoke about abortion.

“It’s more than a problem, it’s murder, whoever has an abortion kills, no half words. Take any book on embryology for medical students. The third week after conception, all the organs are already there, even the DNA...it is human life, this human life must be respected, this principle is so clear! To those who cannot understand, I would ask this question: is it right to kill a human life to solve a problem? Is it right to hire a hitman to kill a human life? Scientifically it is a human life. Is it right to take it out to solve a problem? That is why the Church is so hard on this issue, because if it accepts this it would be like accepting daily murder.”

While the media downplayed the pope’s comments on some subjects, they gave much profile to his statement on pro-abortion politicians in the United States. He was asked about the propriety of them receiving Communion.

However, the brief statement that Pope Francis made on this subject lacked the clarity of what he said about homosexual marriage and abortion. Regrettably, this allowed the media to spin his words to suit their politics.

The pope acknowledged that there are Catholics who are “not in the community” and therefore “cannot take Communion.” He certainly made plain his preference for priests to address this issue in a pastoral manner, but his comments were anything but precise.

“I am not very familiar with the details of the United States...But if you’re close, tender, and give Communion? It’s a hypothesis. The pastor knows what to do at all times. But if you go beyond the pastoral dimension of the Church you become a politician, and you can see this in all the non-pastoral

condemnations of the Church.”

The media were not put off by his rambling response. Instead, they seized upon it to defend their man, Joe Biden.

“Pope: No Place for Politics in Biden Communion Flap.” This headline, courtesy of the Associated Press, was picked up by literally dozens of media outlets across the nation. But is it accurate? At best, it was a stretch; at worst, it was dishonest. However, the media know that many people only read the headline, so they have a vested interest in spinning things their way. In short, the pope’s ambiguous remarks were quickly given clarity by his fans in the media.

The media do not want American bishops to criticize, much less sanction, pro-abortion Catholics such as President Biden and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. They know that if their favorite politicians are tagged as Catholic phonies, it will hurt their ideological agenda. So they jump at every chance to protect them, even if it means twisting the pope’s words. It’s really not hard to figure out.

We have seen this game played many times before. When the pope says something the media don’t like, such as on homosexual marriage and abortion, they either don’t report it or they give it short shrift. But when he says something they like—or when his imprecise language gives them an opening to interpret things their way—they give it much attention.

The media have been using Pope Francis from the beginning of his pontificate. He doesn’t deserve this treatment from anyone, especially not from those who identify as objective journalists.

---

# **GARLAND      SMEARS      PRO-LIFE ACTIVISTS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a remark recently made by Attorney General Merrick Garland:

The controversy over a Texas pro-life law has led some to make irresponsible remarks, and no one has topped Attorney General Merrick Garland. The law, which forbids doctors from performing an abortion on a mother carrying a baby whose heartbeat can be detected, provoked Garland to make totally unfounded claims of violence on the part of pro-life activists.

On September 6, Garland said, "We will not tolerate violence against those seeking to obtain or provide reproductive health services, physical obstruction or property damage in violation of the FACE Act." This indictment of pro-life activists is without merit. Indeed, it is a despicable smear against them.

If pro-life Americans are so violent, Garland should be able to rattle off the names of abortionists whom they have killed. In the 21st century, there have been four such killings: one in 2009 and three in 2015. Two men, both ex-cons, were responsible, and neither was assisted or associated with a pro-life group. They acted alone.

In 2009, Dr. George Tiller was killed by Scott Roeder. When it happened, I condemned it. "We have to get the message out that life means we have to respect all life," I told CBS Evening News, "including somebody as bad as Dr. Tiller was."

Tiller, by his own admission, performed over 60,000 abortions. His specialty was killing babies in utero who were nearly born, or were partially born. Hence his nickname, George "The Killer" Tiller.

Roeder was a deranged man who was hardly representative of pro-life activists. He had been diagnosed as schizophrenic, and got into trouble when he stopped taking his medication. His wife testified that she thought he was bipolar, and his brother also spoke about his mental problems. He had previously been arrested for carrying explosives, and he spent time in prison for other violations.

In 2015, Robert Lewis Dear Jr. killed three people in a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado. He had previously been arrested and convicted for carrying a "long blade knife" and illegal possession of a loaded gun.

His mental state was worse than that of Roeder's. A judge ordered him to undergo a mental competency exam to see if he was sufficiently competent to represent himself. After fielding the results, the judge ruled that Dear was not mentally fit to stand trial: he cited findings that he suffered from a "delusional disorder." Dear was sentenced indefinitely to a Colorado state mental hospital.

It makes no sense for anyone who champions the abortion-rights cause to worry about being killed because of the Texas law. Roeder and Dear were lone wolves, both of whom had a criminal record and mental problems.

Garland, being a pro-abortion proponent who works for our "devout Catholic" pro-abortion president, has been noticeably silent on threats to pro-life activists. Yet just this summer innocent pro-life Catholic demonstrators were harassed by pro-abortion militants in Brooklyn, New York, and a Catholic church in Louisville, Colorado was defaced with pro-abortion slogans.

On September 13, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, who dismissed a challenge to the Texas law, was subjected to intimidation when his home was descended upon by pro-abortion activists. This came following a threat by extremists from

ShutDownDC to “directly” confront Kavanaugh and his family.

If Garland were even-handed, he would know that pro-life Americans have been violently attacked and been subjected to death threats for many years. There have been bomb threats against Catholic churches, firebombings of Catholic school busses with pro-life signs, calls for violence against pro-lifers on college campuses, and widespread acts of church vandalism.

And lest we forget, while the killing of unborn babies is legal, the fact remains that abortion clinics are a much more deadly place for children than they are for those who do the killing. Think about that, Mssrs. Garland and Biden.

*We have the email for the Associate Attorney General, Vanita Gupta, Contact: [vanita.gupta@usdoj.gov](mailto:vanita.gupta@usdoj.gov)*