

TWO ANTI-CHRISTIAN CASES BEFORE THE COURTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on two important religious liberty cases:

There are two religious liberty cases before the federal courts that have much in common: (a) both evince a clear animus against Christianity, and (b) they emanate from the most militantly secular states in the nation, Oregon and Washington.

The Oregon case will be appealed to the Supreme Court; the Washington case will be decided in the spring by the high court.

In 2013, the Court of Appeals in Oregon ruled that Aaron and Melissa Klein, who owned a bakeshop in Gresham, discriminated against a lesbian couple, Rachel and Laurel Bowman-Cryer, when they refused to make a wedding cake for them. The evangelical couple did so on religious grounds, citing Leviticus for support.

The lesbians filed a complaint with the Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industries. It said the Christians violated Oregon's accommodations statute barring discrimination based on sexual discrimination. The panel ordered them to pay \$135,000 in damages. The bakery owners appealed to the Oregon Court of Appeals in 2016, but they lost again. Then they appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 2019, the high court vacated the ruling and sent it back to the state court of appeals for reconsideration. It cited its ruling in a similar case, *Masterpiece Cakeshop*, (which was decided favorably to the religious liberty side), for review.

On January 26, 2022, the Oregon appeals court told the Bureau

of Labor and Industries to reconsider its order fining the Christian couple. It said that the state agency “acted non-neutrally” against them. But it insisted that the couple was still guilty of discriminating against the lesbians.

Attorneys for First Liberty Institute, joined by former White House Counsel C. Boyden Gray, will appeal this ruling, arguing that the same agency that showed an anti-Christian bias should not be allowed to try this case one more time. They maintain that the appeals court should have put an end to this case once and for all.

The appeals court showed cowardice when it said the state agency “acted non-neutrally.” This sanitized term is a ruse: it would be more accurate to say that flagrantly anti-Christian remarks were voiced by some on the panel.

The lawyers for the Christians contended that the panel’s “administrative prosecutor disparaged” their client, labeling their objections a mere “excuse” for discrimination. They also unjustly compared their clients’ objections to cases involving “physical violence, prolonged sexual harassment, and religious coercion.” The bakery owners were even enjoined from “speaking about their religious beliefs, despite the lack of any basis for such a gag order.”

The Washington case involves a football coach, Joseph Kennedy, who huddled with players for a prayer on the 50-yard-line after games at Bremerton High School, outside of Seattle.

When he was asked by school officials not to lead the players in a prayer, he complied. When he decided to take a knee and say a silent prayer with the players, the school objected again, saying students could see him praying. Finally, the school banned prayer altogether.

The school said that if he wants to pray he should do so in a janitor’s closet or the press box; this way no one would construe his behavior to be a government-endorsed event. He

refused, citing his First Amendment rights. The school fired him.

Kennedy sued and twice lost before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Ninth Circuit ruled that public speech of “an overtly religious nature” is forbidden, arguing that doing so gives the impression that the government is endorsing religion. Kennedy’s First Liberty attorneys charged that the Ninth Circuit was now saying that “even *private* religious speech by teachers and coaches violates the Establishment Clause (*italic in the original*).”

Kennedy appealed to the Supreme Court but the justices declined the case; they asked the lower courts to review it. Now the Supreme Court has decided to hear the latest appeal.

Jeremy Dys, the First Liberty attorney for Kennedy, argued that the Ninth Circuit ruling sets a dangerous precedent. It would call into question whether “a public-school employee has a constitutional right to engage in brief, quiet prayer *by himself* (his *italic*).”

Furthermore, if this ruling were to stand, it would mean that a teacher who bowed his head before a meal in the school cafeteria, or wore a crucifix or yarmulke, could be fired for giving the appearance of government endorsement of religion.

Americans United for Separation of Church and State president Rachel Laser, who represents the school board, frames the issue in a patently dishonest way. “No child attending public school should have to pray to play school sports.” She’s right about that, but it is a red herring: No student is being compelled to pray as a condition of playing sports in any public school in the nation.

These two cases are driven by a hatred of Christianity, and that is why they have been banging around in the courts for so

long. The totalitarian left, which occupies a sizeable presence in Oregon and Washington (home to the crazed 2020 Portland and Seattle riots), must be stopped if liberty is to prevail.

REIMAGINING PELOSI'S RE-ELECTION SPEECH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Rep. Nancy Pelosi's re-election speech:

Democrats are good at "reimagining" things. They want us to reimagine the police force, healthcare, the environment, etc. I'd like to reimagine House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's re-election address by offering a mock Q&A.

Q: Madam Speaker, you said you want to thank your VIP's—your Volunteers in Politics—for giving you "the privilege to represent our city and our San Francisco values in the Congress."

Could you please explain why such San Francisco values as allowing homeless men to defecate in the streets—your city is known for its "Poop Patrols" (they clean up after their mess)—should be adopted by the Congress?

Q: You said that "When people ask me, 'What are the three most important issues facing the Congress,' I always say the same thing: Our children. Our children. Our children." You added that it is their "health" that matters most.

Could you please explain how you can square the health of children as your top priority with your passionate love for

abortion rights? If unborn children are not children, then what are they?

Q: You said that when you first entered the Congress, “In terms of health, my first words on the floor of the House were to fight against HIV/AIDS.”

Could you please explain why your city became such a hotbed for AIDS, and whether San Francisco values had anything to do with it? The Mormons in Salt Lake City didn’t have this problem, and isn’t that because their values are diametrically opposed to yours?

Q: You said that by “Working together we passed the Affordable Care Act.”

Could you please explain why a “devout Catholic” like you is bragging about a bill that sought to sabotage the existence of the Little Sisters of the Poor?

Q: You said that among the most pressing issues we face is, “Educating the next generation to succeed in safe schools with 21st century skills.”

Could you please explain how our schools are expected to be safe when the Democrats are working overtime to undermine school security and law enforcement nationwide? And could you explain how poor African Americans and Hispanics—who desperately want school choice, including an expansion of charter schools—can be expected to succeed when Democrats work to deny them this opportunity?

Q: You end by saying, “Our democracy is at risk because of the assaults on the truth.”

Could you please explain how you can say this with a straight face? After all, you never tire of telling us that we need to accept as truth the out-and-out lie that males who identify as female are, *ipso facto*, female.

Q: If you and the Democrats can reimagine the human species, would you please do us a favor and reimagine San Francisco values?

Contact Pelosi's chief of staff:
terri.mccullough@mail.house.gov

MEDIA BLACKOUT OF ANTI-CATHOLIC ATTACKS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on recent pro-abortion attacks on the Catholic Church:

On the rare occasion when a pro-life advocate acts irresponsibly, the media are all over it. By contrast, just recently there were two examples of pro-abortion advocates acting irresponsibly, and the media responded with a big yawn.

As we reported last week, on January 20, the anti-Catholic outfit, Catholics for Choice, used a light projection to beam pro-abortion messages on the facade of the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C.; the event was a prayer vigil before the annual March for Life that was held the next day.

We have now learned that on January 22, the anti-Catholic outfit, New York City for Abortion Rights, projected "God Loves Abortion" and other vile slogans on the exterior of St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City. Supporters of the group shouted obscenities at pro-life Catholics entering and exiting the Cathedral.

Both of these shell groups are on the losing side of the

abortion issue. Over the past few decades, more and more Americans have been moving in a pro-life direction, and the pro-abortion activists know it. They also know that the Supreme Court may overturn *Roe v. Wade* in June.

This accounts for why the New York City group wants to engage in a confrontation. "The approach of non-confrontation which many feminist organizations have pursued in response to this onslaught [of pro-life victories in state legislatures and the courts] has unfortunately been a failing strategy. Now, more than ever, we need a fighting grassroots movement." They are just itching for a confrontation.

There have been a few legal challenges to light projection protests, but so far no court has ruled in favor of them. They are not seen as trespassing or in violation of nuisance statutes, nor have they resulted in economic harm. Therefore, they are seen as protected speech.

The media have a professional obligation to cover events like the ones in D.C. and New York City. Their reticence has more to do with their politics than their ethical obligations.

In a larger story on the March for Life, the New York Times and the Washington Post made mention of the desecration of the Basilica, but neither covered the assault on St. Patrick's Cathedral. None of the other newspapers covered anything about either event, and all the TV broadcast networks and cable news channels were equally silent.

Last week we asked our email subscribers to contact Catholics for Choice. This week we are requesting they contract the New York outfit.

Contact NYC For Abortion Rights: nyc4abortionrights@gmail.com

IN DEFENSE OF POPE BENEDICT XVI

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on news stories regarding the role of Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI in the clergy sexual abuse scandal:

Ten years ago, Bill Keller, former executive editor of the New York Times, wrote an op-ed in the newspaper about me. He said I was a strong defender of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger who, he accurately said, “used to be known as ‘God’s Rottweiler.’” Ratzinger is now Pope Benedict XVI, and Bill Donohue is the Rottweiler’s Rottweiler.”

Not sure whether Keller meant that as high praise or not, but I’ll take it.

Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI is back in the news, and it is not flattering. He is being accused of not taking action against four molesting priests when he was archbishop of Munich and Freising from 1977 to 1982. Benedict defends himself against these accusations.

The news comes after the publication in German of a 1,900-page independent audit of the Munich archdiocese between 1945 and 2019.

It is important to note that the investigation was not something that government authorities commissioned—it was done at the behest of the Church. No other institution in Germany, religious or secular, has ever asked a law firm to probe its record regarding sexual misconduct.

It is also important to note that attorney Martin Pusch, who

is also an author of the report, cannot be certain that Benedict's account is wrong. He explicitly said "we *believe* that this is not so (my italic)."

Of the four cases, two involve priests who were sanctioned by the courts but were permitted to do pastoral work. One was convicted in another country and was allowed to work in the archdiocese. Most of the media attention focuses on Peter Hullermann, a homosexual priest predator.

Regarding the Hullermann case, in his 82-page response to questions posed by the investigators, Benedict initially said he had no recollection of being at a 1980 meeting about the priest. He has since apologized for making a "mistake," saying that an "editing error" inaccurately conveyed that he was not there. The files document that in this meeting, no decision was made to transfer Hullermann.

In 1979, Hullermann was accused of sexual abuse with a postpubescent boy in Essen. After he was convicted, he was transferred to Munich for therapy. After the therapy, he was transferred to another parish. Who made that decision? It wasn't Benedict: it was Fr. Gerhard Gruber, the vicar general. Gruber admits that he, and he alone, was responsible, explaining that he never told Benedict (who was then known as Cardinal Ratzinger).

So what's the problem? Benedict, we know, approved the transfer, but that's about it. We know that his office "was copied on a memo" about Gruber's decision, but even the New York Times in 2010 admitted that such memos were routine and "unlikely to have landed on the archbishop's desk."

Ratzinger left the archdiocese in February 1982 to head the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. In August 1982, Hullermann was reassigned to Grafting and in 1986 he was convicted of sexually abusing boys while he was there. Benedict was long gone.

If Benedict is guilty of anything, from what we know so far, it is that he did not always act like the “Rottweiler” he is accused of being. When he learned of a priest who was an exhibitionist, but who never physically abused anyone, he did not treat him the way he should have. He should have seen this as a red flag—normal men don’t act that way.

In all the news stories on this issue, never once do therapists come in for criticism. Yet they played a big role in persuading elites in every sector of society of their powers to transform miscreants, especially in the latter part of the 20th century. There was no one they couldn’t “fix,” or so they thought. Their role was pivotal in the decision of elites, including bishops, not to crack the whip.

The Germans have also been duped by charlatan therapists. In 2020, Germany showed how “progressive” it is when it announced that sex offenders would be allowed to visit prostitutes in brothels as part of their “treatment.”

It should also be known that Germany has no mandatory reporting law governing the sexual abuse of minors.

Bild is Germany’s biggest tabloid. It is known for running articles questioning whether Benedict covered up sex crimes. Three months ago its editor, Julian Reichelt, had to step down after allegations that the publisher tried to cover up the findings of an investigation into his sexual misconduct and bullying.

For the record, no one in the Church has done more to stem clergy sexual abuse than Benedict. It was he who took the initiative to issue a document barring men with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” from entering the priesthood. He was hated by “progressives” long before this, but this decision made him their biggest enemy.

In the first year of his pontificate, Benedict removed the notorious serial molester, Fr. Marcial Maciel Degollado,

founder of the Legionaries of Christ, from ministry. Significantly, he defrocked some 800 molesting priests from 2005 to 2013.

This is hardly the first time that Benedict has been treated unfairly. He is the scourge of the left, both in and out of the Catholic Church.

ASSESSING GOV. HOCHUL'S FIRST FIVE MONTHS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue looks at New York State Gov. Kathy Hochul's record thus far:

New York State Gov. Kathy Hochul has now been in office for five months. It's time to assess the issues that are of interest to most Catholics, as well as to many of the faithful of other religions. Among those issues are abortion, sexuality, crime, drug abuse, education and religious liberty.

On these issues, Hochul merits an "F."

Hochul is an Irish Catholic, and her disgraced predecessor was an Italian Catholic. It would be hard to find a more extreme advocate of abortion-on-demand than Andrew Cuomo, though Hochul is giving him a good run for the money.

When Texas passed a restrictive abortion law last year, Hochul could have said nothing about it—it had nothing to do with New York. But she not only condemned the law, she invited Texans to come to New York—offering to have New Yorkers pay for their trip—where they can abort their children for free.

"For women in Texas, they need to know: we will help you find

a way to New York and we are right now looking intensely to find what resources we can bring to the table to help you have safe transport here and let you know there are providers who will assist you in this time of your need." Sending an Uber was not ruled out.

Hochul is also a big fan of the sexually confused. Last week she announced that male prisoners who claim to be a woman can opt to be housed with women inmates. The women jail birds were not asked what they think—just the men. So much for women's rights.

Her budget directive on this issue smacks of mind control.

"No employee of the department shall misgender any individual in the care or custody of the department by intentionally referring to someone, including but not limited to, a transgender, gender nonconforming, nonbinary or intersex person, using a word, pronoun or form of address that does not correctly reflect the gender with which they identify."

In other words, employees will be punished if they tell the truth.

Last summer, when Hochul was Lt. Gov., she said that a surge in violent crime in Buffalo was due to illegal guns, not bail reform. Thus did she sanction the policy of letting violent criminals off easy. This explains why, when she became governor, she picked State Sen. Brian Benjamin as her Lt. Gov. He supports "Defund the Police."

In her State of the State address, Hochul said nothing about bail reform as a driver of serious crimes, focusing exclusively on gun safety measures. When asked about the "catch and release" tactics that have allowed countless dangerous men to assault and kill innocent New Yorkers, she said she would talk to the new mayor about it, never offering an idea of her own.

The Catholic League's headquarters is located across from Penn Station, a dumping ground for homeless men, deranged drug addicts and hardened criminals.

Hochul's answer to the drug problem is to throw in the towel: she signed into law a bill that makes it legal for addicts to shoot up anywhere they want, sharing their filthy heroin needles with others. These zombies will only get into trouble if they don't wear a mask.

In her State of the State presentation, Hochul spoke about the need to improve SUNY and CUNY, the state and city institutions of higher education. She said not a word about elementary and secondary schools, as if they don't exist.

In her budget, she awarded the public schools, which nonwhites are abandoning as fast as they can for charter schools, a 7.1 percent increase in funding; charters got an increase of 4.7%. An editorial in the New York Post accurately said that she "threw New York's charter schools a bone in her budget plan." Yet she has the gall to say she stands with African Americans and Hispanics.

Hochul's State of the State speech said not a word about religion, religious liberty or houses of worship. But she did allot three pages to discuss the rights of transgender persons.

When Hochul was Lt. Gov., she was in charge of Western New York's regional reopening (following Covid restrictions). In Phase 1, she allowed most workers to go back to work. Among those she still kept under tight wrap were religious New Yorkers—their houses of worship were still under severe restrictions.

On August 18, 2021, Gov. Hochul signed into law a vaccine mandate for healthcare workers, allowing for religious and medical exemptions. Literally eight days later, she took away the religious exemption. Catholics and Jews, who comprise the

vast majority of New Yorkers, were thrown under the bus.

Hochul postured herself as a moderate. She is not. When it comes to the issues of abortion, sexuality, crime, drugs, education and religious liberty, she is a left-wing extremist.

She is not operating solo. Her biggest backers are the titans of the real estate industry. Indeed, they own her. Some things never change, at least in New York.

Contact Jeff Lewis, Hochul's chief of staff:
jeffrey.lewis@exec.ny.gov

ANTI-CATHOLIC ASSAULT ON D.C. BASILICA

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on what happened in D.C. on the eve of the March for Life:

An anti-Catholic outfit, Catholics for Choice (CFC), did not go to the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C. last night to observe Catholics attending a prayer vigil ahead of today's March for Life. No, they went to sabotage the event. They projected pro-abortion slogans on the Basilica.

San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone, one of the leading pro-life leaders in the Catholic Church, referred to the assault as a "desecration," further branding it as "diabolical."

CFC is led by a lesbian activist, Jamie Manson. She is commanding a sinking ship at CFC and is trying anything to jump start it. Last year she explained her new strategy. "We

have to talk back to the anti-choice movement in religious language. Because they're using religious language."

In other words, her idea of using religious language is to disseminate pro-abortion messages at a Catholic pro-life event. That would be like using racist language at a pro-racial justice rally. Moreover, it is not accurate to suggest that pro-life Catholics exclusively use religious language to get their point across: they also use the lexicon of biology.

CFC has no members. It is entirely funded by the pro-abortion establishment. The Ford Foundation has been its most consistent source of funding, extending back decades. It also receives huge grants from The Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation (Warren Buffett is a big fan of abortion), the Hewlett-Packard Foundation, and, of course, George Soros' Open Society Foundation. Without the ruling class, CFC would fold.

The media, which are overwhelmingly pro-abortion, ignored what happened, just as they will ignore the throngs at the March for Life. It's who they are.

Contact Darren Walker, president of the Ford Foundation:
d.walker@fordfoundation.org

WHAT'S BEHIND THE BOSTON FLAG CASE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on oral argument before the Supreme Court on the Boston flag case:

It is legal to burn the American flag in Boston (and elsewhere), and it is legal to display the flags of Communist

nations in front of Boston's City Hall, but it is illegal to raise a Christian flag in the same spot. That may be changing once the Supreme Court rules on this case in June.

The justices recently heard oral argument on this case, and it didn't go well for Boston officials. The position put forth by Douglas Hallward-Driemeier, representing Boston, appeared lame. Even some liberals on the high court seemed unimpressed.

A closer look at what he said is troubling: it suggests that either city officials are badly educated on the First Amendment, or they harbor an animus against Christianity.

City officials in Boston are used to people making requests to fly celebratory flags outside City Hall. For example, Gay Pride flags are flown. Most of the requests, however, are to fly the flag of a foreign nation.

Boston granted 284 consecutive requests until it finally said no to one. It said no to a man who wanted to fly a "Christian flag" (it bears a Latin cross).

For the justices, the key issue was clear cut: either the flagpole represents a public forum where private parties can express themselves, or whether raising these flags conveys government endorsement of their message. If it's the former, then city officials cannot deny the Christian flag from being flown; if it's the latter, they can.

The lawyer for the city argued that Boston would be endorsing Christianity if it allowed the Christian flag to be flown. He admitted that religious symbols are inscribed on some nation's flags, but city officials believed that was different: the flag's message was about the nation, not religion. But was he right to say that the establishment clause of the First Amendment prohibited the flying of a Christian flag?

Justices Elena Kagan, Brett Kavanaugh and Neil Gorsuch all indicated that it may be a "mistake" to see this issue as a

violation of the establishment clause, and that if that is the case, then it ends the discussion.

“Congress shall pass no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” The latter clearly says that the government cannot stop the free exercise of religion. The former, according to Boston city officials, means that flying the Christian flag outside City Hall is tantamount to government endorsement of it.

Are there really two clauses here, serving two different ends? That is what the city of Boston believes. But to the Framers, the two clauses serve to facilitate one end: religious liberty. That being the case, there is no need to “balance” one against the other, and it is wrong to see them as oppositional, as if they were written to cancel each other out.

The article “an” is important. It takes on more meaning when we understand what Madison, who wrote the First Amendment, said about it. By “an establishment of religion” he meant a national church, such as the Church of England. In addition, he said, government could not show preference for one religion over another. That was it.

From the oral argument, it is possible to deduce that Boston officials are using the establishment clause as a ruse: it may be that they are simply against the public expression of religion.

Justice Samuel Alito noted that the original Boston policy on flag flying did not list any reasons why a request could be denied. After the Christian flag was denied, it was decided not to grant requests for flags that were “discriminatory, inappropriate or religious.” Alito charged that in doing so, “you’ve reverse engineered.”

“We want to create an environment in which everyone feels included.” That is what the Boston attorney said. But by

denying a Christian flag, does that not send a message that Christians are not included?

The city's lawyer also said, "Our goal is to foster diversity by celebrating the communities within Boston." Justice Clarence Thomas jumped on this admission, saying, "You mentioned diversity several times, and what I don't understand is your definition of diversity because it would seem to me that Christians in Boston would be a part of that diversity calculus."

The Boston case was made harder when several justices said the city's policy amounted to "viewpoint discrimination."

What happened during oral argument is commonplace these days. The words "diversity and inclusion" roll off the lips of those on the left as a mantra. They mean nothing. They mean nothing because they rarely seem to apply to those who hold to traditional moral values. If anything, they are used as a weapon against them.

In 1963, the Supreme Court, in *Abington v Schempp*, ruled that "the State may not establish a 'religion of secularism' in the sense of affirmatively opposing or showing hostility to religion." Seems apropos.

The generous interpretation of this case is that Boston officials need to get up to speed on the meaning of the First Amendment. A less generous one suggests that their real goal is to censor the public expression of Christianity.

HOW THE ROCKEFELLERS TEED UP ROE v. WADE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue explains the role of the Rockefellers in legalizing abortion:

Fifty years ago, "The Rockefeller Commission Report on Population Growth and the American Future" was published. One year later, it got what it wanted when the U.S. Supreme Court legalized abortion. It is important to understand the role of the ruling class in making *Roe v. Wade* possible.

The process began on July 18, 1969 when President Richard Nixon established a body to examine the effects of population growth on America's future. On March 27, 1972, John D. Rockefeller 3rd, chairman of the Commission, transmitted the Final Report to the president and the Congress.

The plea to legalize abortion was a foregone conclusion: the commission was stacked with pro-abortion members. In 1967, the chairman, John D. Rockefeller 3rd, was the recipient of Planned Parenthood's highest honor when he accepted the Margaret Sanger Award; the award was named after the white supremacist founder of Planned Parenthood.

John D. Rockefeller 3rd followed in the footsteps of John D. Rockefeller Jr. "Junior," as he was called, provided funding for eugenics, giving money to the Germans. Some of it was put to use by the Nazis.

The Commission staff was headed by Dr. Charles F. Westoff. He was a member of the American Eugenics Society and Planned Parenthood's National Advisory Council. One of the Special Consultants was Daniel Callahan, a pro-abortion eugenicist who tried desperately to convince Catholics of the merits of abortion and eugenics. When he failed he quit the Church.

In chapter 11, "Human Reproduction," the Final Report did not hide the pro-abortion sentiments of the Commission. "A few of the members of the Commission are opposed to abortion." It also said "the majority" are not.

The number-one population problem in the early 1970s, the Commission said, was "unwanted births." It admitted that only "one percent of first births were never wanted." So where's the problem? It found that "nearly two-thirds of all sixth or higher order births" were unwanted. That sounds plausible but that hardly constitutes a crisis. How many women, even back then, had six or more kids?

It has been historically true that those who can least afford to have children tend to have the most, and vice versa. So it figured that the Commission would find that "Unwanted fertility is highest among those whose levels of education and income are lowest." This, they said, leads to psychological, economic and health problems. "The Commission believes that all Americans, regardless of age, marital status, or income, should be enabled to avoid unwanted births."

The solution to this alleged problem was to (a) allow minors to receive contraception information and services (b) eliminate restrictions on sterilization and (c) liberalize state abortion laws. Regarding the latter, much of its reasoning was based on faulty information.

The Commission maintained that there were between "200,000 and 1,200,000 illegal abortions per year in the United States." In fact, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that in 1972, "130,000 women obtained illegal or self-induced procedures, 39 of whom died." In other words, the Commission's estimates were way off base, and so were the horror stories about all the women who died in "back-alley" abortions.

The Commission was also wrong when it contended that "with the

increasing availability of contraceptives and improvements in contraceptive technology, the need for abortion will diminish." We now know that following *Roe v Wade* both contraceptive use *and* abortion rates increased dramatically.

If there is one demographic segment of the population that the Rockefeller Commission believed was a problem, it was African Americans.

The Report said that "if blacks could have the number of children they want and no more, their fertility and that of the majority white population would be very similar." The goal could not be more plain: get blacks to stop reproducing. What they need, the Report said, was greater access to "the various means of fertility control."

Some of the Commission's members cited Planned Parenthood's efforts to meet this goal. Mission accomplished: It was reported in 2020 that Planned Parenthood locates 86% of its abortion clinics in or near minority neighborhoods. Though blacks are 13% of the population, they account for one-third of all abortions.

At one point in the Final Report it says, "We share with our fellow citizens an abiding concern for the sanctity of all human life," and therefore "we appreciate the moral decisions involved in abortion." It hastened to add that it shares "a deep commitment to individual freedom and social justice," making clear that this issue was paramount.

The Commission obviously did not have "an abiding concern for the sanctity of all human life," for if it did it would not argue for the legalization of abortion. It should be noted that in 1963, Planned Parenthood actually admitted that "An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun."

Abortion has always been one of the ruling class' preferred methods of solving "the urban problem." The Rockefellers epitomized this WASP solution. It teed up *Roe v. Wade* 50 years

ago, making it easier for Supreme Court Justices to rationalize its abortion-on-demand ruling.

ASSESSING BIDEN'S FIRST YEAR

Catholic League president Bill Donohue assesses President Biden's first year:

January 20 marks President Biden's first year in office. We leave it to others to assess his record on the economy, COVID, our southern border, foreign policy and other issues. On the policies that matter most to us—the life issues and religious liberty—he has failed.

We have links to three reports: President Biden's [first day in office](#); his reversal of President Trump's [religious liberty policies](#); and the extent to which his policies [departed from Catholic teachings](#).

President Trump issued one executive order on his first day in office; Biden issued seventeen. Most of what Biden addressed were policies governing regulatory matters, ethics in government, immigration, racial discrimination, climate change, student loans, evictions, and COVID. The one that got our attention was his policy on workplace discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity.

The latter is of concern to us because of its religious liberty implications. As often happens these days, sexual orientation and gender identity collide with religious liberty interests. We argue that priority should be given to religious liberty. Unlike sexual orientation and gender identity, religious rights are explicitly mentioned in the Constitution. Biden disagrees, maintaining that this First Amendment right

should take a back seat to sexual orientation and gender identity.

On January 20, 2021, Biden's executive order on this subject not only affirmed his commitment to non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity—never even implying that they may eviscerate competing religious liberty claims—it went so far as to say that children “will not be denied access to the restroom, the locker room, or school sports.”

Translated this means that boys in the public schools will be allowed to compete against girls in sports and shower with them. All they have to do to qualify is lie about their sex.

On day one, the Biden administration issued a new form for those who want to contact the White House. It was geared to the sexually confused, namely to those who think they belong to the opposite sex: they can choose whatever pair of pronouns they want, “she/her” or “he/him.”

The new form also allows someone to choose “they/them.” Nothing was said whether those who consider themselves to be two persons should have a right to cast two votes in an election. If they were denied, would this not be a clear case of gender discrimination?

We tallied eighteen abortion policies enunciated by Trump that were overturned by Biden in his first year; twelve policies on religious liberty were reversed; and six policies on sex (or what they erroneously call gender) were overridden.

Trump is not a Catholic; Biden identifies as one. Indeed, Biden considers himself to be a “devout Catholic,” and carries rosary beads to prove it. Yet in 2021, we found sixty-nine instances where his policies departed from Catholic teachings.

Most of the departures involved issues such as abortion, transgender rights, and religious liberty. For example, Biden

became the first president to declare that the public should pay for abortion—all abortions. He insisted that transgender persons should be a protected class, even to the point of forcing Catholic doctors and hospitals to violate their conscience by performing sex-transition surgery. He also rolled back the religious exemptions afforded faith-based programs.

Biden's Secretary of State, Antony Blinken, ordered an end to the "Commission on Unalienable Rights," a panel that had been instituted by his predecessor, Mike Pompeo. Why? He said this stellar document overemphasized religious liberty.

We would be lying if we thought that 2022 will be any better. It is one thing to be indifferent to the life issues and religious liberty, quite another to be hostile to them.

NO EQUITY FOR CATHOLICS AT NBC

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest episode of the NBCUniversal show, "Saturday Night Live" (SNL):

"Pope Francis said this week that getting vaccinated against Covid is a moral obligation especially since priests work so closely with kids."

That is the latest anti-Catholic remark aired on SNL.

The writers could have chosen to make a nasty joke about blacks, but that would have violated its policy on "Diversity, Equity & Inclusion." It could have made a nasty joke about Asians, but that would have violated this policy. It could

have made a nasty joke about transgender persons, but that would have violated this policy. It could have made a nasty joke about homosexuals, but that would have violated this policy. It could have made a nasty joke about the disabled, but that would have violated this policy.

So it chose to nail Catholics, and that is because they are not covered by this policy.

“We stand for everyone. We believe that a diverse, equitable and inclusive company is a more effective company, leading us to approach diversity as a driver for business growth and innovation.”

That is the opening statement issued by NBCUniversal on its policy governing “Diversity, Equity & Inclusion.” It is also a lie. Its policy only covers “injustice and inequality against any race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, or ability.”

Why are religious groups left out? Because the company obviously doesn’t value them. And why were Catholics the butt of the joke, and not some other religious entity? Because SNL writers hate Catholics. No other reason is plausible. That explains why they have been bashing Catholics for decades.

It’s so odd. The scandal in the Catholic Church is long over and it was largely caused by homosexual priests. But SNL wants the public to believe that nothing has changed, and it sure doesn’t have the guts to make homosexuals the butt of its jokes. So it chooses to smear all priests.

Contact Scott Weinstein, co-producer, SNL Weekend Update:
scott.weinstein@nbcuni.com