

ANTI-CATHOLIC SCHOOL OFFICIAL MUST BE FIRED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an anti-Catholic school official:

Jeremy Boland is the Assistant Principal of Cos Cob Elementary School in Greenwich, Connecticut. He must be fired immediately.

There is no place for an admitted bigot in education, whether the school is private or public. He has stated—the evidence is indisputable—that he would never hire a Catholic. Had he said he would never hire an African American, they wouldn't still be thinking about what to do with him.

Boland made his admission in a video filmed by a Project Veritas journalist. He oversees the hiring of teachers. After saying he prefers to hire “progressive” teachers because they are “more savvy about delivering the Democratic message without ever having to mention their politics,” he was asked about hiring teachers who are religious.

Boland: *“I’m not a huge expert on religion, but Protestants in this area [of Connecticut] are probably the most liberal. But if they’re Catholic—conservative.”*

Veritas Journalist: *“Oh, so then what do you do with the Catholics? If you find someone is Catholic, then what?”*

Boland: *“You don’t hire them.”*

Veritas Journalist: *“So, would you never hire a Catholic then?”*

Boland: *“No, I don’t want to...Because if someone is raised hardcore Catholic, it’s like they’re brainwashed. You can never change their mindset.”*

Dr. Toni Jones, Superintendent of Greenwich Schools, says she is going to do a “full investigation.”

There is no role for an admitted anti-Catholic bigot in any school in the nation. What makes this case a legal slam dunk is that Boland is not simply spewing anti-Catholic vitriol, he is in charge of hiring and has explicitly said he would not hire Catholics. That is illegal.

If justice is not done by Dr. Jones, and other school officials, the Catholic League will pursue every legal challenge available.

Contact: toni_jones@greenwich.k12.ct.us

THE MORAL STATE OF AMERICA

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on some recent surveys on religion and morality:

The moral state of America is in deep trouble. That’s not an opinion—it’s what the American people believe.

In March, a Marist poll, conducted for Deseret News titled, “Faith in America,” found that 72 percent of Americans think the nation’s moral compass is pointed in the wrong direction.

In June, a Gallup poll revealed that a record-high 50 percent of Americans rated the overall state of moral values as “poor,” and another 37 percent said it was “only fair.” The public is also pessimistic about the future: 78 percent say morals are getting worse.

Why is this? While the surveys did not tap this measure directly, the Gallup poll asked respondents to name the most

important moral problem in the country today. It was open-ended, i.e., they did not select from a list of moral issues—they simply voiced what they believed to be the most important one.

Six issues garnered a double-digit response. “Consideration of others” topped the list, followed by “racism/discrimination,” “lack of faith or religion,” “lack of morals,” “sense of entitlement,” and “lack of family structure.” These responses in 2022 were compared to those in 2012.

Ten years ago, “consideration of others” was not even mentioned, and “racism/discrimination” was barely cited. Regarding the latter, given the steady drumbeat emanating from the media, the schools and the corporations that America is irredeemably racist, it is hardly surprising to learn that racial matters have deteriorated. We reap what we sow.

When we pair “consideration of others” with a “sense of entitlement,” we have a strong indictment of radical individualism. Selfishness and narcissism are commonplace: from texting while driving to character assaults online, our society has been badly coarsened. The “Me Society” that Tom Wolfe talked about in the 1970s has never been more pronounced.

What about the other three issues? “Lack of faith or religion,” “lack of morals,” and “lack of family structure” make for an interesting cluster. The first and last are not effects of a moral breakdown—they are causes of it.

The American people intuitively know that religious beliefs and practices are an important ingredient in the formation of a moral society. The same is true of families where there is a father and a mother. In fact, the data bear them out—religion and intact families matter greatly.

The Marist poll found that 70 percent of Americans believe in God (more than half citing God as described in the Bible), and

that figure jumps to 85 percent if we include those who believe in a higher power. The Gallup poll found that 81 percent of Americans believe in God, down significantly from 1944 when the figure was 98 percent.

This is not a coincidence: The increase in secularism accounts for our moral slide. The public knows it.

A Rasmussen poll taken in March found that 60 percent of voters think people who live according to their religious beliefs are good role models for the rest of us to follow; only 14 percent did not believe this; 26 percent weren't sure.

The American people know that our moral compass is going in the wrong direction, and they also know that the declining role of religion has something to do with it.

When the Judeo-Christian ethos that has undergirded our society enervates—it used to form the heart of our moral code—it perpetuates a condition where our moral compass is directed more by individual whim than sacred tenets. That is a recipe for disaster.

MEET THE NEW WHITE SUPREMACISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the racism of white liberals:

Blacks need not fear right-wing white supremacists—there are too few of these crazies to matter—but they need to fear well-educated white liberals. They have become the real white supremacists.

If we define white supremacists as white persons who believe in the inherent inferiority of blacks, members of the Klan come to mind. But white liberals should also come to mind. That is because they don't believe blacks have the ability to raise themselves up by themselves.

White liberals have given up on equal opportunity. This explains why they are constantly dreaming up ways to mandate equality. In short, they have given up on blacks.

On June 1, the California Task Force to Study and Develop Reparations Proposals for African Americans issued its Interim Report. It is the most comprehensive summary of liberal white supremacy available. Here are some of their proposals.

1) Black deadbeat dads will no longer be held accountable for their behavior. The panel recommends that the state "eliminate past-due child support owed to the government for non-custodial parents." What about collecting interest on child support that is past due? It's been eliminated. This is a big win for irresponsible black men and a big loss for black women.

2) All blacks in California should be allowed to send their children to any college they choose free of charge. If more black males are being cited for disciplinary problems, that is going to end. Racial equity means "racially equitable disciplinary practices." This is a big win for black Hollywood actors and professional athletes—their kids can go to college free of charge—and a big loss for well-behaving black students.

3) Putting more cops in high-crime neighborhoods is discriminatory. That is the obvious takeaway from the proposal which seeks to "eliminate the over-policing of predominantly Black communities." The big winners are the criminals and the big losers are the vast majority of law-abiding black Americans.

4) Blacks are entitled to free health care, regardless of how much money they make. Moreover, it must be “cost-free high quality” care. The big winners are the hospitals which will be reimbursed by the government and the big losers are the taxpayers.

5) Reparations must be offered in the form of cash payments to close the racial wealth gap. The big winners are blacks whose ancestors owned slaves and the big losers are blacks whose ancestors were enslaved, possibly by another black person.

This program is a textbook example of the way well-educated white liberals think about blacks. The paternalism is racist in intent and effect, reflecting the kind of thinking that assumes blacks are inherently inferior and cannot succeed without the benign intervention of whiteness.

This is the happy face of white supremacy in 2022. Get used to it or, better yet, be prepared to fight it.

GEORGE SOROS' LEGACY OF BIGOTRY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on George Soros' attacks on religion:

Few persons have done more damage to free societies than George Soros, the Hungarian-born billionaire. Yet in left-wing circles, the 92-year-old is regarded as a hero. That may have something to do with the fact that his Open Society Foundations have been greasing them for decades. Less well known is his record of bigotry.

Soros is known as a “self-hating Jew.” As a young man in Hungary he became a Nazi collaborator. In a “60 Minutes” interview, Soros admitted that he helped confiscate property from Jews. He told Steve Kroft that he never regretted doing so. When asked if this was difficult, Soros said, “Not, not at all. Not at all.” Stunned, Kroft said, “No feeling of guilt?” “No” came the reply.

The hatred that Soros has for Israel is indisputable. He funds groups such as Bend the Arc, a far-left Jewish group that supports anti-Semites such as Rep. Ilhan Omar and Rep. Rashida Tlaib. He also throws considerable money at the BDS movement (boycott, divestment and sanctions) which is trying to bankrupt Israel. By funding Amnesty International and the Human Rights Watch, he is instrumental in branding Israel an “apartheid” racist state, the two bodies promoting this cause.

Soros has a long history of supporting anti-Catholicism. Catholics for Choice is the oldest anti-Catholic “Catholic” entity in the modern era. Though no organization has given it more money than the Ford Foundation, Soros’ foundations have not been miserly. This letterhead has a history of lying about the Church’s official teaching on abortion.

In January, Catholics for Choice vandalized the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C. At a prayer vigil that was held there before the March for Life, the Soros-funded entity desecrated the Basilica by using light-projecting technology to post anti-Catholic messages on it.

When President Obama was in power, the atheist billionaire threw his weight behind Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United, two Catholic front-groups founded to manipulate Catholic voters.

Both of the two anti-Catholic “Catholic” groups were founded in 2005, following the defeat of John Kerry the year before.

Kerry lost to President George W. Bush in part because of the “values voters,” mostly Catholic and evangelical Protestants who stood for traditional values. Soros wasn’t happy with these traditionalists, or the outcome, and sought a corrective by establishing phony Catholic groups to alter the political landscape.

It was a stealth campaign to end all stealth campaigns. There was nothing Catholic about either of these entities, but they gave the impression to the public that one could be a Catholic in good standing and oppose the Church’s teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality. In 2016, they came crashing down.

That is when the Wikileaks revelations became public. Leaked emails showed that John Podesta, Hillary Clinton’s campaign chairman, sought to create mutiny in the Catholic Church by funding Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United. One of Podesta’s associates, Sandy Newman, said there was a need for a “Catholic spring,” and that the goal should be to “plant the seeds of the revolution.” Made possible, of course, with Soros’ money.

There is one other aspect to this story worth mentioning. After Obama was elected in 2008, the IRS contacted me to say that the Catholic League was under investigation for violating IRS strictures for non-profit organizations. After the probe was finally finished, we received a slap on the wrist. I promised the IRS official I would not stop hammering pro-abortion anti-Catholic politicians, and that he should inform his superiors of my pledge.

More important, I told him that I knew who was behind the attempt to destroy me. Just before the 2008 election, a CNN staffer sent me copies of a long document detailing news releases I had sent that allegedly violated IRS rules. She did this because the person who sent it to her tried to get me kicked off TV; he sent the document to validate his request.

When the IRS complaint was sent to me before Thanksgiving in 2008, I quickly concluded that it looked amazingly like the document forwarded to me by the CNN employee. It was sent to her by Catholics United.

In other words, Soros was behind the attempt to silence the Catholic League. He lost. It's too bad he hasn't lost more often—his legacy of hate has done much harm.

JAMES CARROLL CAN'T GIVE IT UP

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest attack on the Catholic Church by James Carroll:

He needs to let it go, but he can't. Hating the Catholic Church is not merely a pastime for James Carroll, it is his life. He quit the priesthood many moons ago, but the divorce has been messy. Catholicism continues to haunt him.

A quarter century ago, in 1997, Carroll wrote a piece for the New Yorker, "The Silence," that tore into the doctrine of papal infallibility, the teaching that Jesus is the means to salvation, and the role of Pope Pius XII during the Holocaust. Now he's back—choosing the New Yorker as his home again—claiming we have too many Catholics on the Supreme Court, among other things.

Carroll claims that "five Catholic Justices on the Supreme Court" are "undermining not only basic elements of American democracy, such as the 'wall of separation,' but also the essential spirit of Catholicism's great twentieth-century renewal," which, he makes plain, is the Second Vatican

Council. It's not easy to get so much wrong in the matter of so few words.

Not sure whether Carroll considers Sonia Sotomayor to be a Catholic—she is one of the six Catholics on the high court—or whether, in his mind, her support for abortion rights makes her a role model for all Catholics. No matter, he mentions that Neil Gorsuch, who is an Episcopalian, was raised and educated as a Catholic, making him almost as bad as John Roberts, Samuel Alito, Clarence Thomas, Brett Kavanaugh and Amy Coney Barrett.

Carroll does not cite a single instance which would support his unfounded conclusion that these Catholics don't believe in what he considers to be the heart of the First Amendment. If he knew anything about constitutional law, he would know that the First Amendment provisions regarding the free exercise of religion, as well as the so-called establishment clause, were written by Madison to safeguard religious liberty from state encroachment. The "wall" metaphor is nowhere mentioned.

Carroll's ignorance of jurisprudence is telling. Unlike legislators, who are entitled to allow their own views, whether they be religious or secular, to inform their pronouncements on the law, judges have a different charge: their job is to interpret the law as crafted by those who wrote it.

Thus it is mindboggling for Carroll to criticize the Catholic Justices for their lack of fidelity to Vatican II—that would be the furthest thing from their mind. They have no obligation, one way or the other, to honor or trash it.

Carroll has a long history of attacking Catholic teaching on birth control and abortion, casting these moral strictures as being anti-women. Too bad he doesn't tell us how birth control liberated women—it sure liberated men—or how abortion is good for women.

He is most off-base with his criticisms of abortion. He argues that the Church's teaching against abortion began in 1869 when Pope Pius IX located ensoulment at conception. He is wrong.

"Since the first century the Church has affirmed the moral evil of every procured abortion. This teaching has not changed and remains unchangeable." The Catholic Catechism's statement is based on historical fact.

The Didache, the first catechism, declared in the first century that "You shall not murder... You shall not procure abortion, not destroy a newborn child." In 197, Tertullian wrote, "To prevent birth is anticipated murder; it makes little difference whether one destroys a life already born or does away with it in its nascent stage."

Carroll's Catholic heroes are Joe Biden and Nancy Pelosi. His only complaint is that they do not explicitly reject what science and the Catholic Church know to be true, namely that human life begins at conception. Nonetheless he sees in them a harbinger of the Catholic Church's future.

Carroll never learns. The Catholic Church he has long envisioned has never taken root.

On October 15, 1990, he wrote in People magazine that the radical Catholic group, Call to Action, was attempting to get 100,000 signatures demanding that the Church change its teachings on sexuality, adopting the dissident agenda. "I'll be surprised if they don't make it," he said.

A year later, on November 11, 1991, the New York Times ran a story on what happened. "The 100,000 signatures," the paper said, "have proven hard to obtain." It concluded, "To date, the group has received about 21,000."

It's not easy being James Carroll. Too bad he just can't give it up.

MEDIA-HYPED ABORTION HORROR STORIES

The following article was written by the Catholic League communications director Michael P. McDonald:

We generally assume that the press will provide fair and accurate information on subjects of great importance. Sadly, the only “press” the media really seem to care about is supporting the full-court press of the woke mob to advance its progressive agenda. This has become obvious in how the media have chosen to cover the subject of access to abortions, particularly in states that have enacted life-saving legislation to defend the unborn.

On the heels of the Dobbs decision, the media have run numerous horror stories meant to highlight the plight of women. The headlines might not be as blunt as the sex education teacher in “Mean Girls” who declares “You will get pregnant and die!” However, that appears to be the sentiment of the reporting.

Since the end of June, the media have provided an incessant barrage of stories to convince the public that with the reversal of Roe women face a clear and present danger. Here is a sampling of their reporting:

June 24, 2022—“Nearly 100 Years Later, a Family Remembers an Illegal Abortion That Ended in Tragedy” by Deena Prichap, NPR:

With the *Dobbs* ruling just that day, it was too soon to have current tales of woe about women not having access to abortion. However, Prichap decided to open the archives to tell the tale of a woman who died in the 1920s because she

chose to get a back-alley abortion. Pritchep wonders if this tale from the past will soon be repeated as abortion access becomes more restricted.

July 1, 2022—"Patients Head to Indiana for Abortion Services as Other States Restrict Care" by Shari Rudavsky and Rachel Fradette, Indianapolis Star:

The Star's reporters recount the tale of a 10 year-old girl from Ohio who became pregnant after an illegal immigrant living with the family raped her. At the time, the identity of the father was unknown. This story went on to make international headlines, and even President Joe Biden cited this story for why women need access to abortion.

July 18, 2022—"After New Abortion Laws, Some Patients Have Trouble Obtaining Miscarriage Treatment" by Pam Belluck, The New York Times:

Belluck warns that the surgical procedures and medications to manage miscarriages are identical to those used in abortions. As a result, hospitals are failing to provide women who miscarry with adequate medical care because doctors fear running afoul of laws intended to restrict abortion access. To highlight this sad situation, Belluck relays the tale of a woman who had a miscarriage and was sent home with instructions only to return to the hospital if she bled profusely enough to fill a diaper. While this is a tragic tale, it should be noted this was not a result of a pro-life law, but rather the choice of the hospital and doctors involved.

July 18, 2022—"Abortion's Illegal in the Catholic Majority Philippines, So More Than a Million Women a Year Turn to Other Options" by Heather Chen, CNN:

Chen compares apples and oranges by comparing states in America that restrict abortion access to the Philippines where abortion is practically banned. It is true that some Filipino

women may consider an abortion because they face many health challenges during their pregnancies, but it is also true many people in the Philippines face health challenges daily because it is a developing nation and access to modern medicine is limited. The same problems present in the Philippines are not present in the United States. Nevertheless, Chen portrays the nation, noting it is rooted in the Catholic faith, as a warning for what the United States will become in a post-Roe world.

July 19, 2022—"Why Is the Right Forcing Women Who Miscarry to Suffer" by Michelle Goldberg, The New York Times:

A woman had to travel to Michigan to receive care for her ectopic pregnancy meanwhile a woman in Texas developed a uterine infection because she could not get an abortion after she miscarried. These are the sordid anecdotes that Goldberg presents to her readers insisting that laws designed to protect the unborn are to blame for the suffering of these women.

July 19, 2022—"Pregnancy Often Traumatic for Young Girls, Experts Say" by Stephanie Nolen, The New York Times:

Drawing inspiration from the 10 year-old girl featured in the Indianapolis Star, Nolen examines the serious harm that a young girl can experience if she becomes pregnant. To make this point, though, she has to turn to evidence from developing countries where child-brides are culturally acceptable. While the health outcomes for these girls are poor, so too are the health outcomes for most people living in developing countries. Nolen is making a false comparison. In developed countries with modern medicine most of these risks can be minimized. Further, since child-brides are not part of our culture, most of the concerns about young girls getting pregnant could be minimized with a strong focus on abstinence.

July 19, 2022—"No Room for Religious Liberty in Abortion

Debate? Since When Are We a One-Faith Nation?" by Jill Lawrence, USA Today:

Lawrence begins by telling the story of Savita Halappanavar, a 31 year-old woman who died from complications related to her pregnancy in Ireland in 2012. She then pivots to say that restrictions on abortion will curtail the religious freedoms of people who do not share a Catholic or Christian perspective on when life begins. Of course, the science is clear that life begins at conception, and even if some religions permit abortion, Lawrence does not identify a major religion that accepts it as a tenant of their faith.

July 19, 2022—"Louisiana Woman Forced to Endure 'Painful' Labor to Deliver Nonviable Fetus" by Khaleda Rahman, Newsweek:

A woman in Louisiana was unable to get an abortion after she miscarried. Rather than perform the procedure, her doctors made her endure hours of labor, according to Rahman. The woman is suing along with several abortion providers in the state to stop the enforcement of Louisiana's limits on abortions. Of course, the law in question would not have prevented her doctors from managing her miscarriage.

July 19, 2022—"Women are Being Forced to Deliver Nonviable Fetuses Because of Abortion Bans" by Paul Blest, Vice:

Not to be out done, Blest not only tells his readers the same story of the woman in Louisiana and the 10 year-old from Ohio, but he also relays the tale of a woman in Texas who had to undergo three ultrasounds and wait two weeks to get care to manage her miscarriage.

July 24, 2022—"Interstate Abortion Travel Is Already Straining Parts of the System" by Margot Sanger-Katz, The New York Times:

As states implement laws restricting abortion access, women have taken long arduous journeys to obtain these procedures.

The state most inundated with these “abortion-seeking refugees” is New Mexico. Massive influxes of women from Texas and other states has caused the wait time to increase to three weeks to get an appointment. According to Sanger-Katz, this is the beginning of a national trend that ultimately will limit abortion access even in states that do not value the life of the unborn.

July 28, 2022–“States with Abortion Bans Are among Least Supportive of Women and Children” by Emily Badger, The New York Times:

Badger notes that states that prevent women from seeking abortions are typically Southern, poor, and have fewer resources. So not only do these states force women to have their children, but they also do nothing to care for these poor women after motherhood is foisted upon them.

August 16, 2022–“Florida Court Says Teen Isn’t Mature Enough to Get an Abortion” by Arek Sarkissian, Politico:

A pregnant 16 year-old girl, who does not live with her parents, sought to get a waiver from the court to circumvent Florida’s parental notification law. The court denied her request deeming her not mature enough to make the decision. While the court may revisit the issue in the future, the slant Sarkissian takes is that a conservative court in a conservative state is foisting an unwanted pregnancy on a minor.

While these macabre tales would sound fitting for an anthology of gothic horror stories, the media have presented them as grounded in truth. In reality, there are glaring holes in each story, but this is part of the radical pro-abortion faction’s strategy to convince America that any limitations placed on their butchery will cause untold levels of suffering.

An honest look at the facts paints an entirely different picture. Limiting access to elective abortions has practically

no impact on women's health. For instance, of the 23 states with abortion-restricting laws that can now be enforced after the Dobbs ruling, every state has an exemption for the life of the mother. Additionally, no state has laws that would prevent a medical professional from providing miscarriage management or caring for a woman who has an ectopic pregnancy.

A deeper dive into why women get abortions reveals that most of the horror stories presented by the media are anomalies and do not even come close to constituting the majority of abortions. In a 2004 survey, the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute found that four percent of abortions were related to concerns regarding maternal health. An additional three percent were procured for "possible problems affecting the health of the fetus." Taken as a whole, approximately seven percent of abortions were for medical reasons. Victims of rape constituted less than half a percent. In other words, even according to the pro-abortion camp, over 92 percent of all abortions have nothing to do with the horror stories cited by the media.

However, the media do not let the facts get in the way of a good ghost story. As we get into the Fall and election season, look out for an increase in volume and intensity of these horror stories.

SHIOW FALLS DIOCESE'S NORMS ON SEXUALITY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on guidelines issued by the Diocese of Sioux Falls on sexuality:

The Diocese of Sioux Falls has issued a policy on human

sexuality that is fair, yet firm, and in complete agreement with Catholic moral theology and social teachings. Bishop Donald E. DeGrood has the wisdom and courage not to duck the hard questions that such a policy entails, especially these days.

In a time when sexual engineers in government, the schools and the healthcare industry are busy promoting the virtues of sexual reassignment surgery for young people—all in the name of transgender rights—it is refreshing to see a senior member of the Catholic Church directly confront the mythologies that gender ideology entertains.

More important, Bishop DeGrood has alerted school administrators, teachers, coaches and guidance counselors of their obligation to remain faithful to Catholic teachings in a time when those who do so are subjected to insult and abuse.

“All persons have inherent human dignity and are thus deserving of innate respect as a person. Bullying, harassment, or threats or acts of violence against any student based on that student’s perceived sex, same-sex attraction, or perceived gender identity, will not be tolerated.”

Those are the first words of the policy on human sexuality. They reflect the centrality of Catholic teachings on the human person, and they make clear that while transgender ideology will not be countenanced, no student, regardless of his sex or perceived sex, will be treated unfairly.

Unfair critics of this policy will seize on some of the more specific parts of it. “Students may not advocate, celebrate, or express same-sex attraction in such a way as to cause confusion or distraction in the context of Catholic school classes, activities, or events.” Similarly, “Students may not advocate, celebrate, or express transgenderism in such a way as to cause confusion or distraction in the context of Catholic school classes, activities or events.”

Other parts of the policy that will be criticized by some include the following. "Students are to wear only those uniforms and conform to all dress codes in accord with his or her biological sex." Boys can only use bathrooms for boys. Ditto for girls. Everyone will use the correct pronouns when referring to boys ("he," "him," etc.) and girls ("she," "her," etc.). Boys cannot play girls' sports, and vice versa.

Bishop DeGrood's commonsensical policy is accompanied by a well-written letter he released on August 4. "Some people have come to accept transgender ideology out of a wish to express affirmation or tolerance for others. Insofar as this is motivated by the innate desire to love others, it contains a seed of goodness. But at the same time, there are serious concerns around what transgender ideology claims or teaches."

The next sentence is critical. "Given the relatively brief period it has been part of our human experience," he says, "there is also a seeming lack of regard for transgenderism's consequences for individuals and the human family."

Yes, transgenderism is an ideology: it is a pernicious set of ideas that denies the biblical truths about male and female.

The bishop pulls no punches about it. Gender ideology "asserts that men can become pregnant and women can become fathers. It also teaches that a person might not be a man or a woman at all but might be a blend of both, or neither. It variously asserts that one's gender might be wrongly 'assigned' at birth and also that it may be 'fluid' and change throughout one's life."

Not only does this mean the adoption of a distorted vocabulary to refer to transgender persons, the bishop says, it may mean "using surgery or drugs to 'affirm' one's asserted transgender identity. These can include powerful drugs to stop normal pubertal development in adolescents, hormones to spur the development of cross-sex secondary sexual characteristics in

post-pubescent aged youth or adults, and/or surgeries to one's face, torso, or reproductive organs to give the appearance of being the opposite sex."

The wording is precise and a much needed antidote to the reigning madness on this subject.

Kudos to Bishop DeGrood. Not only is his policy a model for every diocese, it is a model for every school in the nation, public or private. Let him know your support.

Contact Renae Kranz, director of communications:
rkranz@sfcatholic.org

COLLAPSE OF A COMMON CULTURE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the changes in our culture:

When I was growing up on Long Island, we had ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS and three local channels on TV. I later learned that having seven channels was actually a high number compared to other parts of the country. This meant that most Americans pretty much watched the same news shows, and while differing views were commonplace, we could all agree on what the news of the day was.

Today we still get news from the big three—ABC, CBS, and NBC—but they carry far less weight than in the past, with far fewer people watching them. Many prefer to get their news from cable TV, but the people who watch Fox News and Newsmax, which appeal to conservatives, seldom watch CNN or MSNBC, which appeal to those on the left, and vice versa.

The big difference is not the slant—it is the news stories

that are not covered. For example, CNN and MSNBC will not cover news stories that upset its liberal viewers, the result being that their audience is often in the dark about major events (e.g, the bogus Russian collusion story, Hunter Biden, etc.).

It used to be that families disagreed over the news of the day. Now one side doesn't know what the other side is talking about.

It's not just news stories that have changed. The proliferation of TV channels and social media platforms means we don't watch the same entertainment shows. As a youngster, I remember that nearly everyone watched the Jackie Gleason show, "The Honeymooners," as well as the Ed Sullivan show, the number-one entertainment program. Now some watch rappers while others watch the rodeo.

In the late 19th and early 20th century, families were big, houses were small and cars were few, if non-existent. Now families are small, houses are big and cars are everywhere.

Think of the row houses in big cities at that time. There was no TV and no air conditioning. So where did everyone go during the summer? They hung out outside on the stoop, the sidewalk and the street. All the neighbors knew each other and the kids played ball and other games while adults partied and had a few cold ones. They actually talked to each other. There was no need to schedule a "block party"—they happened spontaneously every weekend.

Now family members have several rooms to isolate from each other. They don't have to be outside in the heat; they can stay inside in the AC and watch TV, play video games and engage in social media, all by themselves. They don't have to talk to anyone.

How sad. What we are witnessing is the collapse of a common culture. People get their news and entertainment from a

multiplicity of sources, and are content to absorb themselves on their phones. They must have their phones—all the time.

There are other problems. Email is a fast and effective way to communicate with others about everyday matters, but it is a lousy way to communicate when it comes to serious issues. It is easy to misinterpret someone when the issue is a hot one.

When we are with someone, we can pick up on facial expressions, body language and the like, and we have an opportunity to get instant clarification. This is not true of email correspondence, which is why we often come away hurt. It is easy to be mistaken. Did he really mean what I think he meant? Did she not get back to me because she's angry at me? It is so easy to mistake the sentiments of someone when we are not with them.

In other words, there is no substitute for face-to-face interaction. That takes time and effort, but it's worth it, especially when the issue is sensitive.

Gen Z (1997-2012) is the youngest segment of our adult population. The "zoomers" are known for many things, but none is more disturbing than the high degree of loneliness that so many are experiencing. It is a major problem, and it affects girls worse than boys. Indeed, social media is a big generator of loneliness among young girls.

When I was a kid, if I saw someone walking down the block with ear phones talking to himself, I would be tempted to call the asylum. Now I look away. Similarly, when I was young and took a train or bus, people spoke to those near to them. Now they speak to someone no one can see on their phone. And because we are a captive audience, we all have to hear the conversation of these narcissists.

No wonder we are a divided people. We don't have anywhere near the same common experiences. We have plenty of autonomy, but the underside is we lack a sense of community. Unfortunately,

when that goes, much is lost.

HOMOSEXUAL ROOTS OF CLERGY ABUSE STILL DENIED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new report on clergy sexual abuse:

The Jesuit magazine, *America*, has done some very important work, but when it comes to understanding clergy sexual abuse, it has failed miserably. The latest example of this is the piece by Michael O'Loughlin. It is an uncritical look at a report issued by professors from the Jesuit-sponsored Santa Clara University, Julie Hanlon Rubio and Paul J. Schutz; the report was funded by Fordham University, a Jesuit school.

Those who are familiar with the interpretation of the scandal as espoused by the Catholic left will find nothing new in the report. Sexual repression and clericalism caused the crisis and homosexuality has nothing to do with it. It is thrice wrong.

Why is it that in the 1950s, when the Church was much less open about matters sexual—"repressed" according to its critics—there was practically no sexual abuse of minors? Why is it that when the lid came off in the 1960s, and especially the 1970s, many of the seminaries turned into dens of iniquity? That's when the scandal exploded.

Clericalism, or an elitist strain among the hierarchy, may explain why some bishops enabled the molesters, but it has nothing to do with why some priests became molesters. Enabling bishops are to molesting priests what drug lords are to drug

addicts—they facilitate the problem. But if there were no molesters or addicts, there would be no enablers.

So who were the molesters? We know from the John Jay studies on this issue that 81 percent of the victims of priestly sexual abuse were male and that 78 percent were postpubescent. It matters not a whit that many homosexual priests who molested young men do not identify as homosexual; what matters is their behavior, not their self-perception.

We need to end this game—and that is what it is—a game of dodge ball played out by those who are either delusional or dishonest. When adult men have sex with young men, that is called homosexuality. It is not pedophilia, and it certainly isn't heterosexuality.

In my book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*, published last year by Ignatius, I make it clear that being a homosexual does not cause someone to molest anyone. But there a link, what sociologists call an intervening variable, and that is emotional and sexual immaturity. Homosexual men are much more likely to be psychologically and sexually stunted. It is this which allows them to be attracted to adolescents.

America magazine has misled us before on this issue.

In 1993, it published an article by Father Andrew Greeley who speculated that there were “well in excess of 100,000 victims” of priestly sexual abuse. The John Jay social scientists, who looked at abuse between 1950 and 2002, concluded the real number is 10,667. Why was Greeley so far off? Because he *assumed* that on average there were fifty victims for every abusing priest. The correct number is one.

No problem can ever be fixed if those who profess an interest in doing so live in a comfortable state of denial. They need to be shaken from their comfort zone and finally look reality in the face.

BEWARE OF TRANSGENDER PSYCHOLOGISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the need to be wary of transgender psychologists:

Boston was the epicenter of the clergy sexual abuse scandal in the Catholic Church, and now it is the epicenter of child abuse again, although this time it is the medical profession that is the culprit.

Gender Multispeciality Service (GeMS) is part of Boston Children's Hospital. The unit is known as one of the most advanced and prominent institutions of its kind in the United States that provides sex-reassignment operations on children. If we were serious about combating the sexual abuse of minors, we would shut it down.

A psychologist who works there, Kerry McGregor, claims that "most of the patients that we have in the GeMS clinic actually know their gender, usually, around the age of puberty. But, a good portion of children do know as early as, seemingly, from the womb."

What she said is not simply wrong—it is impossible.

Children do not decide their gender—culture does. Gender is a sociological term meaning the appropriate roles for males and females as determined by the culture we are born into.

Notice the tentativeness of her remarks. A "good portion of children"—a quarter, half, more?—know "as early as, seemingly, from the womb" their gender. "Seemingly"?

So apparently unborn children not only know their sex, they

know whether they are satisfied with it. But how does she know that human beings she cannot interview—they cannot yet talk—are content with being a boy or a girl? Got to give her credit for one thing: If kids are that smart at that age, abortionists should be prosecuted for murder.

There's more. McGregor holds that some children choose their gender [which they really can't] "as soon as they can talk." What's that? "They might say phrases, such as 'I'm a girl' or 'I'm a boy' or 'I'm going to be a woman' or 'I'm going to be a mom.' Kids know very, very early."

That's funny, the first word out of my daughter's mouth was "Dada"; it is easier to say than "Mama." Looks like my kids were not an anomaly.

A survey last year asked over 11,000 parents what their baby's first words were. Here are the 15 most common:

1. Dad (or Dada, Daddy, Papa, etc.)
2. Mom (or Mama, Mommy, Mum, etc.)
3. Hi (or Hiya, Hey, Heya, Hello)
4. Buba (or Bub or Baba)
5. Dog (or Doggy, Puppy)
6. Ball
7. No
8. Cat (or Kitty)
9. Nana
10. Bye
11. Duck
12. Ta (or Tata)
13. Baby
14. Uh oh
15. Car

"I'm a boy" or "I'm going to be a mom" never made the cut, nor did "I'm going to be an astronaut." But perhaps McGregor meant they "seemingly" made such pronouncements

Love, she says, is “the biggest protector” against “negative mental health effects such as depression, suicidality, anxiety that we worry about for our gender diverse kids and young adults.” It is always good for parents to love their children, but she does not say why these children are more likely to be depressed or suicidal, for if she did it would blow up the narrative that these children are just like ordinary kids. They need help. What they don’t need is tampering with their bodies.

Dr. Paul McHugh and Dr. Lawrence S. Mayer are two well-respected psychiatrists who are experts in this field. They concluded that the idea that “a person might be a man trapped in a woman’s body,” or vice versa, “is not supported by scientific evidence.” So why subject children to this kind of “treatment”?

In the video where McGregor made her comments (it has since been taken down), she addresses parents who have children with gender dysphoria, and in doing so she unwittingly falls into a trap of her own making. She made reference to children whose gender is “other than the one that they were assigned at birth.”

Wait a minute! Forget the fact that gender is never assigned—it is biologically determined by the father—how could it be possible for gender to be assigned at birth when she previously told us that “a good portion” of babies “in the womb” know what it is? She can’t have it both ways.

The results of a big survey of psychologists was recently published in *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. It found that “80 percent of respondents said yes to [having] broad mental health difficulties,” and that “a little under half” admitted to being diagnosed by a professional. That says it all.

There are, of course, many competent psychologists. However,

parents need to exercise caution before selecting a psychologist to treat their children about any malady, never mind gender dysphoria. Some of them may just drive them crazy.