

CANCEL CULTURE DEFINES THE LEFT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the cancel culture:

Technically speaking, censorship is something that only the government can do: it has the power to stop speech before it is uttered and prohibit the distribution of the written word. In a free society, such instances must be limited and well defined. For the most part, our society has done a pretty good job in ensuring freedom of speech.

Today we are faced with a cancel culture, a condition whereby some controversial ideas are being cancelled; in effect, they are being censored. But the censor is not government: it is the private sector. The social media corporations—Facebook, Google, Twitter—are the major culprits. These Silicon Valley behemoths are not interested in cancelling all controversial ideas, simply the ones they dislike.

The social media ruling class is not made up of liberals; they are Leftists. That's the difference between a moderate (liberal) and a radical (Leftist). As such, they don't believe in freedom of speech anymore than they believe in freedom of religion. To say they are a threat to our society is an understatement.

If it were the reverse—if speech that conservatives disliked was being cancelled by social media companies—it would be just as appalling. To be sure, the First Amendment provisions on speech and religion do not apply to the private sector; they are only limitations placed on the government. However, when the abuse of power exercised by private-sector titans is so overwhelming that legitimate views of a contrary nature cannot be expressed, then liberty is jeopardized. Facebook, Google

and Twitter need to be broken up by government. Meantime, I wish Elon Musk well.

The origins of the cancel culture are traceable to the campus, not Silicon Valley. The professoriate has long favored freedom of speech for some, but not for others. In other words, free speech for the Left, but none for conservatives.

Remember “Crossfire,” the CNN show that featured nightly debates on current issues? It started with Tom Braden and Pat Buchanan, on the left and the right, respectively; Michael Kinsley and Robert Novak also hosted the show. Then there was “Hannity and Colmes” on Fox News. Neither exists anymore.

I mention this because I cut my teeth on these shows. When teaching at a college in Pittsburgh, I flew to D.C. on a regular basis to do “Crossfire,” and when I came back home to New York in 1993 for this job, I continued to do the show. Three years later, Fox News was founded and I was a regular on many of the shows, including “Hannity and Colmes.”

These types of shows did not die because of low ratings (a subsequent “Crossfire” was a flop, owing to attempts to tamp down the debates), but because liberals lost almost every round. If the Left was cleaning the clock of conservatives, the shows would still be on the air.

Before I left academia, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute arranged for me to debate scholars on a range of issues, in many colleges and universities. In some cases, students tried to shout me down. What was true then—it is even more true today—was the total absence of conservative students shouting down left-wing speakers. It never happens. It’s *always* the Left that does the cancelling.

The Left is driven more by emotion and feelings than by reason: They are not persuaded by empirical evidence or logic. Yet they see themselves as creative thinkers. The good news is that while they may control the command centers in our

culture, they don't own us—there is still an opportunity to push back. Most people have common sense, and more and more Americans are rallying to our side.

The Left knows that this analysis is true, which explains their penchant for censorship. They can't beat us in discourse, so their only weapon is to stop the discourse. They are a pitiful bunch.

DOUBTING THE RESURRECTION BUT NOT PREGNANT MEN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on belief in the Resurrection:

Reflecting on the meaning of Easter, I got thinking about secularists who scoff at the idea that Jesus was resurrected. What exactly are their beliefs? Before analyzing some of them, it's worth taking a quick look at why the Resurrection story is true.

Faith, of course, is an abiding feature of all religions, but it is not on faith alone that the account of Jesus' resurrection is persuasive.

New Testament scholar N.T. Wright notes that it is fatuous to believe that the early Christians invented the resurrection as a myth. To wit: The idea of the Messiah dying and coming back to life would have struck Jews at the time as bizarre—there was no concept for this belief in Jewish theological beliefs.

What about the empty tomb?

There is a passage in Matthew where it mentions the attempt by

some Jews to discredit Christianity by saying the body was stolen. Of course, to make this claim they would have had to have been complicit in at least tacitly admitting that the tomb was empty. But why would Jews or Romans want to steal the body—wouldn't that keep the story alive? It is even more unbelievable to maintain that the disciples stole the body. That would make them masochists. After all, why would they want to endure being beaten and killed for the sake of a lie?

Then there are the post-Resurrection accounts.

We learn from Paul (1 Corinthians 15:3-8) that Jesus "appeared to Cephas [Peter] then to the Twelve. After that, He appeared to more than 500 brothers at once" and "then to all the apostles."

Now some secularists will say that they don't believe in the historical Jesus. Fine. So why do they believe in the writings of the ancients, those like Aristotle, who came before Christ? Lest we forget, it was the monks who preserved the writings of antiquity, and it was St. Patrick who played a pivotal role in this historic exercise. Looks like secularists can't escape relying on our bounty.

What about their convictions? Just consider the content of some of their beliefs today.

It is now fashionable in elite circles, e.g., the White House and the nation's leading colleges and universities, to believe that two men can marry and have a family. But men don't have the anatomical equipment to pull this off, which is why they crib from the largess of heterosexuals.

It is also popular to say that male and female status is "assigned" at birth, and that it can be changed. This, too, is nonsense. No one "assigns" a person's sex: Hospital personnel typically *record* the sex of the person (which was knowable prior to birth). Moreover, every person who has ever lived possesses either XX chromosomes or XY chromosomes, making them

either female or male, respectively. There is no XYZ third option.

Secular elites believe—Joe Biden is one of them—that men can become pregnant. That is why they refer to pregnant women as “birthing persons,” so as to be inclusive. But everyone lucky enough not to have had his mind corrupted by delusional professors knows that it is *always* women who carry babies, deliver them and wean them. Furthermore, men can no more menstruate—no need to have tampon dispensers in their bathrooms, even at Ivy League schools—than women can undergo radiation for prostate cancer.

Some secularists believe in the Great Ape Project—Peter Singer does and he teaches at Princeton. They are convinced that chimps, bonobos, gorillas, and orangutans should have the same rights as humans. That may not be such a good thing. Before King Kong breaks out the champagne, he should know that Singer believes that parents should be allowed to kill their infants, meaning that little Kong may not make it past the chimp stage.

Others, like the late Christopher Stone, a distinguished law professor, taught his students at USC that “valleys, alpine meadows, rivers, lakes, estuaries, beaches, ridges, groves of trees, swampland [and] air” should enjoy legal rights. More recently, a judge in New York had to rule on whether an elephant named Happy was entitled to be released from a prison called the Bronx Zoo. Unhappily for him, he lost.

Sorry secularists, you’re in over your skis. Don’t expect us to believe that the resurrection of Jesus is not believable but your fairy tales about pregnant men and tree rights are.

Happy Easter everyone!

BISHOP McMANUS NOT WANTED AT HOLY CROSS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a controversy at the College of Holy Cross:

Bishop Robert McManus, who heads the Diocese of Worcester, has notified the College of Holy Cross that he will not attend the school's commencement on May 27. He made his decision after the school's president, Vincent Rougeau, was petitioned by some students, faculty and alumni to disinvite him. This marks the fifth consecutive year that the bishop has not attended a graduation ceremony at the Jesuit school.

This year the source of the controversy began on April 3 when McManus issued a statement that was critical of the Nativity School, a middle school affiliated with Holy Cross. The school had been flying a Black Lives Matter and a gay pride flag next to the American flag for over a year, but was only recently brought to the attention of the bishop. When he learned of what was going on, he asked the school to stop flying the two flags. That request sparked the online petition.

In his public statement on this issue, McManus wrote that while the Catholic Church respects everyone equally, "the flag with the emblem Black Lives Matter has at times been coopted by some factions which also instill broad-brush distrust of police and those entrusted with enforcing our laws." He also said that "gay pride flags are often used to stand in contrast to consistent Catholic teaching that sacramental marriage is between a man and a woman."

"As the Bishop of this diocese," McManus said, "I must teach that it is imperative that a Catholic School use imagery and symbols which are reflective of that school's values and principles so as to be clear with young people who are being

spiritually and morally formed for the future.”

Bishop McManus is to be commended for telling the truth. If anything, he was too kind.

Black Lives Matter has not been coopted by anyone—from the very beginning this Marxist, anti-Christian organization has been very specific about its goals. It has explicitly called for the destruction of the nuclear family. As I have said before, this is precisely the kind of objective that the Klan would endorse. Nothing would further punish the black poor more than to further destabilize the intact family.

It is striking how the same left-wing students, faculty and alumni that deplore violence stand in unison with an organization that is responsible for the murder of at least 25 persons and has engaged in arson, vandalism and looting, often in black neighborhoods. The cost of its wanton destruction is upwards of \$2 billion. White supremacists couldn't have done a better job.

How ironic that these brave Catholic students are still defending an organization whose leaders have ripped off the public—no one more than blacks—by buying mansions for themselves, leaving the black community high and dry. Their refusal to pay taxes is now under investigation throughout the nation.

Flying a gay pride flag at a Catholic school sends an unmistakable message: We don't buy the Church's teachings on sexual ethics. As such, it is not a plea to respect homosexuals: on the contrary, it is an in-your-face rejection of Catholicism. That this should take place at a time when child abuse is taking place in some schools, and parental rights are under attack—in the name of sexual orientation and gender identity—makes the flag issue all the more reprehensible.

It is a shame what has happened to Holy Cross. It is not the

college that once made so many of its graduates proud.

We cannot allow those who are responsible for this travesty to carry the day. We need to show our support for the courageous stance taken by Bishop McManus.

Contact Joan DeMasi at the bishop's office:
jdemasi@worcesterdiocese.org

BIDEN IS CLUELESS ON TRANSGENDER YOUTH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden's recent remarks on transgender youth:

It was reported on April 1 that President Biden took the opportunity on "Transgender Day of Visibility" to commend the parents of transgender children for "affirming your child's identity," saying it is "one of the most powerful things you can do to keep them safe and healthy."

This was not an April Fool's joke. No, this is the mindset of the president and an administration that purports to being compassionate, but in reality is promoting child abuse on a massive scale. No need to impute malicious motive—cluelessness will do.

It's too bad they don't actually listen to the stories of young people who have undergone this abnormal process.

A recent story in The Telegraph about an English girl who transitioned to a boy, and back again, is heartbreaking. The April 6 article is titled, "I Was Allowed to Transition at 18 Without Question—But I Regretted It." Here is a synopsis of

her travails.

Allie was raised in Lancashire “in a very masculine environment.” Because her mother worked nights, she was cared for by her father. She shared a home with two stepbrothers, who were eight years older than her. Her parents divorced when she was 11. In that same year, she became convinced that she was “meant to be a boy.”

Allie learned through the internet about trans people and thought this might be the answer to her condition. She decided she was “meant to be born male.” Initially, she found herself sexually attracted to girls, but then realized she was bisexual. At age 12, she suffered from anxiety and depression. She spent the next year fluctuating between feeling “girly” one day, and wanting to “dress like a man,” the next day.

At 14, Allie was sexually abused by a stranger after “being groomed online.” Four years later she decided she wanted to transition to a boy. “The big narrative being pushed is that transition will be the answer to all your problems,” she said.

This is exactly the position of the Biden administration. It turned out to be tragically wrong.

Allie’s private doctor prescribed testosterone so she could transition. He never once attempted to explore “the possible causes of my gender dysphoria, such as my *mental health problems* or my difficulties fitting into society (my emphasis).” Thus did she prove to be more astute than her doctor.

Not only that, she was given a “30-minute phone consultation.” In fact, she never had “a face-to-face consultation.” When she was given her prescription, there was “no exploration of my sexual trauma, and no mention of my upbringing and how that could have affected things.” No one told her about possible side effects, “such as heart problems and loss of bone density, or the extent to which it could impact fertility.”

The first year after she transitioned she was “over the moon.” Her body became more muscular and her periods stopped. She felt “a lot more emotionally stable” and was treated well by her friends. This was all good, except that she came to the conclusion that she “was never completely comfortable.” She knew something was wrong, and events proved she was right.

During her first year at the University of Lancaster she experienced “a bad mental health episode.” She attempted suicide and was diagnosed with autism.

When Allie turned 20, she realized that “I really wanted a family—and I had chosen to self-sterilise for no good reason.” She then decided to transition back to being a female [she never really became a male—nature made that impossible], partly because “ever since transitioning, my menstrual cycle has been an absolute mess.” She is now being treated for polycystic ovary syndrome.

Allie was 11 when she learned of her mental health problems, and began to transition when she was 18. This needs to be said if only because she is a lot older than the young people Biden wants to empower. He is encouraging children to “go with the flow,” telling parents they need to be supportive.

At one of the presidential debates in 2020, Biden threw his support behind children as young as 8 and 10 who think they want to transition to the other sex. “The idea that an 8-year-old child or a 10-year-old child decided, you know I want to be transgender. That’s what I’d like to be. It would make my life a lot easier. There should be zero discrimination.”

Note that Biden sees this issue in terms of discrimination, not mental or physical health. This is the kind of robotic response he has been trained to develop.

Of course, chemical castration and body mutilation are the real issues, not discrimination. Nobody thinks that eight and ten-year olds are being discriminated against because they

cannot drink alcohol, drive a car or vote. Responsible adults are committed to the psychological and physiological wellbeing of children—they don't allow them to be exploited by irresponsible adults.

At some point in the future, historians will look back at this period in history and wonder why so many prominent Americans aided and abetted child abuse. That day can't come too soon.

Contact White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki:
jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THESE PEOPLE?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on reaction to the recent Florida sex-ed law:

The law recently signed by Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis, the Parental Rights in Education bill, prohibits teachers from instructing kids as young as 5-years-old about sexual orientation and gender identity; it also ensures parental rights. Though it never mentions the word "gay," it is nonetheless being dubbed the "Don't Say Gay" bill.

There are several issues here.

Why would a teacher want to ask little kids whether they are sexually attracted to those of the opposite sex or the same sex? What's wrong with these people? Why would a teacher want to lie to little kids about their ability to switch their sex, something which is immutable, God-given and nature-ordained? What's wrong with these people?

“It’s not like there’s no kernel of truth in that maybe kids that young shouldn’t be thinking about sex at all.” Those are not the words of a prude—those are the words of Bill Maher. Speaking about supporters of the DeSantis bill, he noted that “it’s not like you’re not allowed to literally not say gay, but they just don’t want teachers talking about it. They think it’s the province of parents.”

So if Maher gets it, why don’t others? Why did a trio of women hosts at the Oscars slam the law, jumping up and down yelling, “Gay, Gay, Gay”? Why did Hillary Clinton also mislabel the bill, ending her recent podcast screaming, “Gay, Gay, Gay”? What’s wrong with these people?

It’s one thing for the political opponents of the law, including celebrities, to call it the “Don’t Say Gay” bill, quite another when the media do the same. To be sure, the media have every right to quote critics of the bill who characterize the bill this way, but they have no right to officially brand it this way.

We did a Nexis search of the number of media outlets that, in its headline, identified the bill as the “Don’t Say Gay” bill. From March 1 to April 8, we found over 450 such instances.

When conservatives put a negative political label on a bill they dislike, the media invariably identify it by its proper name—the one given to it by the bill’s sponsor. They may shorten the Affordable Care Act to ObamaCare, but they won’t publish a headline calling it the “Socialist Healthcare” bill. Nor should they. But when it comes to their political allies in the Democratic Party, they have a different set of rules.

What’s wrong with these people? Why do they prostitute their journalistic ethics?

What’s really wrong with all of these people is not simply that they lie about the bill, but that they really want little kids to be sexually engineered by teachers, preferably behind

the back of their parents. They need to be confronted and defeated at every level.

RESOLUTION BY LONG ISLAND LAWMAKER IS TABLED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a news release issued earlier today:

This morning we disseminated a [news release](#), in the form of an open letter, that I wrote about a Long Island lawmaker who proposed a resolution that would stifle the religious speech of those who offer a prayer before a meeting of the Suffolk County legislature. We also listed the email contact for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. They took the matter up today.

I am delighted to report that the chairman, Robert Trotta, contacted our office before noon saying the resolution has been tabled. My guess is that it will never see the light of day again.

Many thanks to all of you who made your voice known. Your input was decisive.

LONG ISLAND LAWMAKER TARGETS

RELIGIOUS SPEECH

A lawmaker from Suffolk County, Long Island is seeking to abridge religious speech. Here is Bill Donohue's response.

April 6, 2022

Hon. Robert Trotta
Suffolk County Legislature
Chair, Ways and Means Committee
59 Landing Avenue
Smithtown, NY 11787

Dear Chairman Trotta:

I am writing to you, and to all the other members of the Ways and Means Committee, about an amendment to the Rules of the Legislature proposed by Bridget Fleming. She has proposed a resolution that would in effect neuter the heart and soul of invocations before the Legislature. The action she took is in response to an invocation given by Msgr. Robert Batule before this body just before Christmas. Full disclosure: He is on the board of directors of the Catholic League.

Msgr. Batule offered a Christian prayer on December 21, wherein he included a prayer for unborn children. He had every constitutional and moral right to do so. Moreover, what he did can hardly be considered novel: it is done all the time. The clergy of all faiths have a tradition of making specific references to various segments of the population and to various issues.

I am the author of two books on the ACLU, and I have also taught First Amendment law to graduate students. Trust me—what Fleming gave as reasons for her resolution are constitutionally flawed. I am referring to Resolution No. 1004-2022, presented on January 3, 2022.

The establishment clause of the First Amendment was not written to guarantee “pluralism among religions in governmental speech and practice.” Madison made it clear that it was written to prohibit the establishment of a national church and to bar favoritism of one religion over another. Moreover, no future court decision buttresses her point.

Fleming cites the Supreme Court decision in *Marsh v. Chambers* as supportive of her position. In fact, it undercuts her stance. She writes that the purpose of this ruling “is to acknowledge widely held religious beliefs, not to advance one particular religious perspective, nor coerce or compel any particular religious doctrine.” She then implies that Msgr. Batule’s invocation violated “the United States Constitution and is therefore impermissible.”

In point of fact, the ruling in the 1983 *Marsh* decision, as written for the majority by Chief Justice Warren Burger, struck down a lower court ruling that improperly invoked the establishment clause. He wrote that opening official deliberations with a prayer “is deeply embedded in the history and tradition of the country.” Most important, nothing the court said came close to saying anything about tailoring an invocation in such a way that it does not “advance one particular religious perspective.”

A more pointed decision by the Supreme Court was not mentioned by Fleming. In the 2014 *Town of Greece, NY v. Galloway*, the high court took up objections by two persons who were offended by the Christian themes of prayer invocations. The words “Lord,” “Jesus,” and “God” were frequently used by Christian ministers before town meetings.

The Supreme Court said such prayers did not violate the Constitution. At the very outset, the high court rejected the contention that a prayer’s content determined its constitutionality. If it were otherwise, it ruled, courts would be converted into “supervisors and censors” of religious

speech, something which itself would violate the First Amendment.

Make no mistake, what Fleming is proposing is exactly what Justice Anthony Kennedy and the majority of Justices said was unconstitutional. Her “remedy” is to require that all prayer invocations “shall maintain neutrality regarding personal beliefs unrelated to the body’s legislative function...”

The idea of a “neutral” prayer is an oxymoron. Prayers are never neutral—they are always normative, and they frequently reflect the personal beliefs of the prayer giver. Most significant, if government personnel were to sit in judgment determining whether a prayer were neutral, they would become the “supervisors and censors” that the Supreme Court clearly rejected.

Fleming’s problem is not simply a misreading of the establishment clause, or a failure to cite Town of Greece: it is her inattention to the other First Amendment provision, namely the religious liberty clause. It ensures freedom of religious expression, the kind that Msgr. Batule exercised. It cannot be said too strongly—the content of his prayer is none of the state’s business. In fact, it reflects his freedom of speech as much as it does his freedom of religion.

It would be in the best interest of everyone for this resolution to be withdrawn. If Fleming persists, rest assured that we are prepared to take this issue to the next level.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

Contact Chairman Trotta: Robert.Trotta@suffolkcountyny.gov

NYC MAYOR RIPS OFF TAXPAYERS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on New York City Mayor Eric Adams' misuse of public funds:

New York City Mayor Eric Adams inherited a mess created by his predecessor, Bill de Blasio. Most New Yorkers had high hopes that he would turn things around. Instead, he is off to a bad start.

New York City has the highest unemployment rate of any city in the nation. It is also witnessing a mass exodus of people to other parts of the country—Manhattan leads the nation. This is driven in large part because of the spike in violent crime, made possible because of morally bankrupt D.A.'s and an insane bail reform law. The high cost of living is also making it impossible for many to live here anymore. To top things off, the public schools are a disaster.

And what is Mayor Adams doing? He is spending the taxpayers' money on billboards in Florida to convince non-heterosexuals who live there to come to New York where they can "say and be whoever you want." As if that is a problem in Florida.

Adams is abusing his office and the trust of the people. He was elected to solve the fiscal crisis in New York City and make our city safe again. Instead, he is inventing problems in other states that he purports to solve. His misuse of public funds is a disgrace.

If he actually thought this through, he would know that one of the reasons why New Yorkers are fleeing in record numbers—in all the five boroughs—is precisely because of the kind of irresponsible leadership that de Blasio offered. He was supposed to fix things, not play games.

Ironically, they are leaving in en masse to Florida, a state with low taxes, low crime rates and good schools. And believe it or not, those who live there can actually “say and be whoever they want.”

Contact Adams: pressoffice@cityhall.nyc.gov

OSCAR “INCLUSION STANDARDS” ARE EXCLUSIONARY

The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences has decided to institute “inclusion standards” governing eligibility for an Oscar, but not for all demographic categories: people of faith are not included.

Below is Bill Donohue’s letter to the president of the Academy.

April 4, 2022

Mr. David Rubin

President

Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences

8949 Wilshire Blvd.

Beverly Hills, CA 90211

Dear Mr. Rubin:

In 2024, the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences will institute inclusion standards for Oscar eligibility. Those standards are based on race, ethnicity, sex, those with disabilities, sexual orientation and gender identity. Noticeably absent is any mention of religion.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex and national origin; sexual orientation and gender identity were later added. Civil rights laws were also extended at a later date to those with disabilities, as well as veterans.

The Academy's criteria cover all of these categories save for religion and veteran status. Though I am a veteran, in my capacity as president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, I am particularly interested in why religion—one of the original categories cited in the 1964 Civil Rights Act—was not mentioned by the Academy.

The Academy is a private organization and is thus not bound by these civil rights laws, so there is no legal issue here. But there is an ethical issue. Why, if the Academy is adopting inclusion standards, did it exclude religion as one of its demographic categories?

It is no secret that Hollywood is a gay-friendly community. Nor is it a secret that it is not religion-friendly. Why, then, would the Academy demand that movie production companies do a better job hiring more "LBGTQ+ people" but not *practicing* Catholics and Protestants? Clearly the former are already overrepresented; the latter are not.

I would appreciate hearing your thoughts on this matter. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

cc: Board of Governors

LYING ABOUT SUPPORT FOR LGBT CURRICULA

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on support for LGBT curricula in the schools:

LGBT activists have quite a tag-team going between pollsters and the media. First, the pollsters present a dishonest survey of public support for LGBT curricula in the schools, and then their allies in the media give Americans the impression that most favor such instruction.

Two such polls recently teed it up for the media to distort the truth even further. Both are being used to discredit the Parental Rights in Education bill signed by Florida Governor Ron DeSantis: it disallows classroom instruction of sexual orientation and gender identity for grades kindergarten through the third grade, and it insists on parental rights.

“A Majority of Parents Are Okay with Teaching on Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation in Schools, a New Poll Finds.” That was the headline of a Yahoo news story about a National Parents Union poll. The headline is deceptive. So is the news story. The headline reads, “Majorities of Parents Support Classroom Instruction about Gender Identity or Sexual Orientation.”

When asked whether classroom instruction about these matters should be allowed in middle school and high school, 31% said it should be allowed but not encouraged, 25% said it should not be allowed, 7% were unsure. When asked if such instruction should be encouraged, just 37% agreed, meaning that the majority were opposed to encouraging such classroom instruction. But one would never know this from reading the story. Keep in mind that the DeSantis bill addresses kindergarten-3rd grade.

When respondents were asked about such classroom instruction in elementary school (the question never mentioned the early grades), only 30% said it should be encouraged. Similar numbers were posted about having students read books about LGBT people.

The results of a Morning Consult poll, taken for an LGBT organization, The Trevor Project, merited a positive story in The Hill, an influential Washington media source. It said the survey showed that a majority of Americans “do not support banning books on LGBTQ+ topics from school libraries or discussions about LGBTQ+ issues from classrooms.”

It should be noted that the DeSantis bill says nothing about classroom discussions—it only addresses classroom instruction. No young student in Florida will be punished for discussing anything.

Also, the DeSantis bill deals exclusively with kindergarten-3rd grade. This poll asks respondents how they feel about LGBT instruction and library books “at school” and “in school libraries.” It is not specific to the early grades.

One of the “Key Findings” cited in the survey is the following: “*Most* adults, including parents, feel that ages 5 through 11 are the most appropriate ages for students to be learning about LGBTQ topics at school (my italic).”

That is a gross distortion of the truth. In fact, 57% of adults, and 58% of parents, said that the most appropriate age would be 12-18. The authors of the poll came to its conclusion because 38% said the most appropriate age was 5-11. Just because that was the highest number given the age levels that respondents were asked to choose from (0-4, 5-11, 12-14, 15-17, 18), that doesn’t mean that *most* adults and parents agreed that 5-11 was the most appropriate age. A plurality is not a majority.

A majority, 55%, said parents should have “the ultimate say”

about whether their transgender child receives gender-affirming medical care. This was not deemed a “Key Finding” and was therefore ignored in the news story.

The average American has no idea what kinds of things are being taught in LGBT curricula and what kinds of books are being made available to students.

For example, I recently wrote about the way the National Association of Independent Schools (NAIS) is promoting the LGBT agenda. The following is what NAIS members are being taught is appropriate for classroom instruction. “Starting in Pre-K we talk about their bodies, the parts that they were born with, about penises and vaginas and whether they make somebody a boy or a girl. But also their feelings, what do they feel like inside, do they feel like a boy or a girl?”

After encouraging kids to question their sex, teachers are told to help troubled students who are contemplating a sex transition to do so. Books are made accessible in the library that show boys performing oral sex on each other.

The average American knows nothing about this and would no doubt be appalled that it is going on *right now* in some schools. To top things off, parents are being shut out—it is being done behind their backs. This is what DeSantis is fighting.

All of this is being done to create a false momentum in favor of the LGBT agenda—the goal is to make those who are opposed to this madness feel like they are the outlier.

We need more governors like DeSantis to stand up to the sexual engineers. We also need more honest surveys and news stories about them.