

THE RADICAL NATURE OF LENT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Lent:

Those who observe Lent are not known as cultural radicals, yet they clearly qualify as such.

Repenting for our sins is common practice for Catholics during Lent, though it is not understood—may even be the object of scorn—by secularists. Many of them do not believe in the existence of sin, never mind making reparations for it. Even more countercultural is the Lenten practice of self-denial.

In a society marked by self-absorption, nothing could be more extreme than self-denial. The idea that we should deny ourselves what we want rings hollow with narcissists, many of whom are secularists. They are the true children of Humanist Psychology.

Abraham Maslow posited that we all have needs, some of which are basic, such as food and water and feeling safe. At the top of Maslow's hierarchy of needs is self-actualization, the idea that we owe it to ourselves to be self-fulfilled.

Not surprisingly, his work was celebrated in the 1960s and 1970s, the two most culturally corrupt decades in American history. It was in the 1970s that Tom Wolfe coined the phrase the "Me Society," and Christopher Lasch wrote *The Culture of Narcissism*.

Carl Rogers, another humanist psychologist at this time, wrote that self-actualization means we are all arbiters of our own truth, and only by acting on our feelings can we be truly human. He argued that rebellion against traditional moral norms, as found in Christianity, was good for the individual and society.

Maslow and Rogers helped destroy people's lives. In fact,

Rogers destroyed an entire order of nuns in Los Angeles, the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The naive nuns followed his advice by questioning the norms and values they had committed themselves to, and wound up totally deracinated.

Maslow and Rogers got it all wrong. They never understood the Lenten precept that self-denial can be liberating. By giving of ourselves to Jesus, and to others, we experience real self-actualization, not the one steeped in self-absorption. Selflessness has its own rewards.

Selflessness also pays significant social dividends. Mother Teresa could not have comforted so many of the sick and dying had it not been for her selflessness. Had she been self-absorbed, no one would have benefited from her care. There are many other persons who have also yielded great social dividends by sacrificing for others, though they are not publicly known.

Who were the men and women who risked their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust? They were not secularists—they were people of faith.

Samuel P. Oliner, and his wife, Pearl M. Oliner, are the authors of *The Altruistic Personality*, a book about who risked their lives to save Jews during the Holocaust. These two non-believing Jewish sociologists interviewed nearly seven hundred persons, comprising rescuers, nonrescuers, and survivors in several countries in Nazi-occupied Europe.

They found there was a significant difference between rescuers and nonrescuers when it came to accepting “the importance of responsibility in maintaining their attachments to people.” They learned that “More rescuers were willing to give more than what they might necessarily receive in return.”

Catholics and Protestants who were imbued with their faith were the most likely to rescue Jews. Pearl Oliner explained why Catholics had the best record. They were “significantly

marked by a Sharing disposition." In short, these Catholics embodied the "altruistic personality."

Who were the least likely to rescue Jews? The self-absorbed. The Oliners concluded that "self-preoccupation," or the tendency to focus on oneself, not others, was the principal reason why they failed to act. "In recalling the values learned from their parents, rescuers emphasized values relating to self significantly less frequently than nonrescuers." It was the "free spirits," the self-actualization types, who balked when it came to helping Jews.

Regrettably, our society is more self-absorbed now than ever before.

Lent is delightfully different. It signals an awareness that there is much more to this world than "me," and that self-giving is a national treasure, not simply a personal attribute. We need more Lenten cultural radicals, not less of them.

REP. MALINOWSKI BELITTLES PARENTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wrote to a New Jersey Democratic congressman about some recent remarks he made about the parents of schoolchildren.

March 15, 2022

Rep. Tom Malinowski
1318 Longworth
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Rep. Malinowski:

You recently addressed the issue of parental involvement in education (I have seen the video), and it is disturbing, to say the least. Parents across the nation are rightfully concerned about attempts to induce children to question their sexual identity, often behind their backs.

The evidence is indisputable. Yet you took the opportunity at a recent town hall meeting to berate these parents, portraying them as part of a “fringe group.” You are sadly mistaken—they are genuinely concerned about the wellbeing of their children. Contrary to what you say, they are not part of some highly politicized movement: They are part of a grassroots effort to demand accountability in the public schools.

Your decision to brand these parents as “book banners” is scurrilous. Instructing young children on sexual practices, and showing them graphic depictions of men having sex with men, is not education: it is indoctrination of a very sick kind. You cannot claim ignorance—there are more than a few of these books being used in public schools.

You also belittled parents who have serious problems with boys competing with girls in girls’ sports. How can it be that a man like you, who has demanded rights for women in Afghanistan, be so complacent about the denial of women’s rights at home? You must also know that these boys who compete in girls’ sports are allowed to use the same locker and shower facilities. Have these girls no privacy rights?

Your district is approximately one-third Catholic. Perhaps you can ask a local pastor if you can talk to your Catholic constituents, telling parents who object to sexual engineering in the schools what you really think of them.

Please rethink your position. At the very least, save us your scorn.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

Contact his chief of staff: colston.reid@mail.house.gov

WHY LIBERALS LOVE MASKS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why support for mask wearing depends on one's politics:

Why do liberals love masks? There is no debate about the evidence, only the reasons for it.

Peter J. Pitts is a former Food and Drug Administration associate commissioner and a visiting professor at the University of Paris Medical School. He lives on the upper west side of Manhattan, the most left-wing neighborhood in New York City. He has a gripe: Why are his neighbors so obsessed with masks? Worse, "they don't want me to take mine off either. And they're aggressive about it. Withering stares and cutting comments."

What Pitts experienced is more than anecdotal evidence: it is an accurate reflection of contemporary liberal thought and behavior.

On March 10, New York Times writer David Leonhardt analyzed data on mask wearing along ideological lines. "Mask wearing remains far more common in liberal communities than conservative ones," he concluded. That's why liberals are still not going to restaurants in cities such as New York, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, San Francisco, Portland, Oregon, and Cambridge, Massachusetts; restaurant traffic is at least

40 percent below prepandemic levels.

Similarly, a Morning Consult/Politico poll that was recently released found that 71% of Democrats said local leaders should continue to encourage vaccinations and masks in indoor spaces; less than half of Republicans agreed.

It is easier to find a college student burning an American flag than a mask. They love masks. That's because most are liberals, and almost all of them are taught by left-wing professors. Again, the evidence is indisputable.

A College Pulse survey of college students released last September found that eight in ten favored mask mandates for indoor settings. Just last month, dozens of students walked out of class at the University of Nevada, Reno to protest the repeal of the mask mandate. Nearly 1,700 students signed a petition demanding a reinstatement of the mandate.

But why? Why do liberals love masks?

The same liberals who love mask mandates are quick to insist on "bodily autonomy" when it comes to risky sex practices, abortion and drugs. They don't want to be told about restrictions on those behaviors. But when it comes to mask mandates, their interest in "bodily autonomy" ends, and not just for them—for everyone.

College students are known for being anti-authority, which helps to explain their disdain for cops and the clergy. Yet they bow to the authority wielded by campus administrators and faculty.

How to explain these apparent inconsistencies?

Sex is fun. Drugs are fun. Liberals reason that the risks outweigh the fun. The same is not true of mask wearing: no one is deprived of fun by wearing one, and it may keep us healthy, without which there can be no fun.

Cops and the clergy pass judgments on conduct that many college students find unobjectionable. Professors promote postmodernist ideas that are seen as nonjudgmental—there is no such thing as truth and we should be free to experiment with our bodies—notions that facilitate the prospects of fun.

It is narcissism that best explains their selective interest in “bodily autonomy,” and their selective attitude towards authority figures, not some principled philosophical predilection. Liberals also tend to be statist who are comfortable with big government, while conservatives tend to be anti-statists. This helps explain the different postures with regard to mask mandates.

If there is something about liberalism that accounts for the narcissistic strain in many of its adherents, it is the liberal fixation on individual rights, and the relative absence of interest in individual responsibilities. Rights free us to do what we want; responsibilities burden us. The former is attractive to narcissists, not the latter.

The ideological split on mask mandates is a microcosm of the larger divide between liberals and conservatives. Their respective leanings would not matter if our society were not so polarized, but because it is, they matter greatly.

Of course, one way to stop the polarization is get our eyes off of ourselves and on to others. But that is not a very liberal idea.

TWITTER CEO ASKED TO EXPLAIN

HIMSELF

The following letter by Catholic League president and CEO Bill Donohue to Twitter CEO Parag Agrawal is timely and entirely warranted.

March 10, 2022

Mr. Parag Agrawal
CEO, Twitter
1355 Market St. Ste. 900
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Mr. Agrawal:

You and I are in a different line of work, but we share one thing in common: we both oppose hateful speech and conduct. In my case, I am mostly concerned about hateful speech directed at Catholics.

I am writing to you because I do not understand why those of us who publicly acknowledge the fact that there are only two sexes, one male and one female, is considered hateful speech by Twitter. This is simply a pedestrian observation, one that also happens to be grounded in science.

Yet Twitter recently suspended the personal account of a woman candidate for a senate seat in Missouri, Vicky Hartzler, because she tweeted, "Women's sports are for women, not men pretending to be women." She was referring to a male University of Pennsylvania swimmer who claims to be a woman and is allowed to compete in women's sports.

Twitter has sanctioned at least three other persons who have made similar comments.

"The Twitter Rules" defines "Hateful conduct" as follows: "You may not promote violence against, threaten, or harass other people on the basis of race, ethnicity, national origin,

caste, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, religious affiliation, age, disability, or serious disease.”

That sounds reasonable. Could you please identify what Ms. Hartzler said that violated this policy? She obviously did not promote violence against, threaten, or harass anyone. So on what basis was her account suspended?

Telling the truth can be painful, but as Catholics we are called to do so.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

Contact: paraga@twitter.com

BIDEN’S TWISTED IDEA OF WOMEN’S RIGHTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden’s idea of women’s rights:

On March 8, the White House released a “Fact Sheet” celebrating the first anniversary of the administration’s Gender Policy Council. What it chose to celebrate would not please many women.

There are 33 initiatives that the Biden administration has undertaken on this subject, and many have little to do with women, per se. Heralding an increase in the minimum wage is one thing; listing it as an example of championing the cause of women is quite another. More important, those executive

orders or policies that speak exclusively to women are highly politicized: they speak only to a small subset of women. Worse, some are clearly anti-women.

Women who are married with children are almost completely ignored: only one of the 33 listings addresses them. Women who homeschool their children are totally ignored—they merit no commentary. Among those initiatives that target women, there are 5 on abortion and 10 on the growing smorgasbord of LGBTQI+ people, not all of whom are women, and not all of whom even exist.

Why are women who work at home not included in all but one of these 33 initiatives? Because from the very beginning of the feminist movement, they have not only been dismissed by activists, they have been treated with contempt.

The Biden team took their cues from the French feminist Simone de Beauvoir. A bisexual, whose favorite bed partner was Jean-Paul Satre, she confessed in 1976 that “No woman should be authorized to stay home to raise her children. Women should not have that choice, because if there is such a choice, too many women will make that one.”

That pretty well sums up the totalitarian impulse that has guided so many feminists. Having the “right to choose” has never meant the right of a married woman to choose working at home; it has only meant the right to choose an abortion.

Some of the policies touted by the Biden administration cannot seriously be considered pro-women’s rights; more accurately, they are anti-women.

Women’s rights are not enhanced by denying them the right to compete exclusively against biological females in women’s sports: they are retarded. Similarly, women’s rights are negated when they are forced to give up their privacy rights when sharing shower facilities and locker rooms with naked men.

Yet this is what Biden wants. To be specific, the Equality Act, which would permit these negations of women's rights, is listed as a civil rights achievement in the document. So is the Equal Rights Amendment, which was killed by *women*, not men, decades ago.

The Biden administration's idea of women's rights is as twisted as it is dishonest. Instead of only consulting radical feminists, gay activists and other sexual engineers for advice, it would be so nice if they simply listened to what ordinary housewives and working moms have to say about their "liberating" schemes. Then they can seek out the + persons, whoever they are, for consultation.

Contact Jennifer Klein, co-chair of the White House Gender Policy Council: jennifer.l.klein@who.eop.gov

WHY RELEVANT RELIGIONS ARE IRRELEVANT

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why some religions are losing members faster than others:

The surest way to kill a Western religion is to change its teachings to mirror those of the dominant culture. The data are clear: The more relevant a religion's teachings become, the more irrelevant the religion is.

People want to join a group or an organization because there is something special about it. This is as true of fraternities and sororities as it is religions. If there is nothing special about them, why bother?

Regarding Catholicism, it is not the most orthodox dioceses or orders of priests and nuns that are in trouble; it's the least orthodox. Evangelical Protestants are not in dire straits the way mainstream Protestant denominations are. In fact, evangelicals and Pentecostals are the fastest growing Christian denominations in the world. Similarly, Orthodox Jews are witnessing an uptick in members; the Conservative and Reform branches are declining.

In other words, orthodoxy attracts; heterodoxy repels.

One person who knows this better than most is Juhana Pohjola. He is on trial in a "free" country for being a Christian. To be specific, he is a Finnish Lutheran bishop who has been accused (along with a former political leader in Finland) of a hate crime for publicly professing the biblical teaching on marriage. Both face up to two years in prison.

Not surprisingly, Bishop Pohjola has been quite critical of the extent of which Finland has bowed to militant secularism. His most poignant comments, however, are reserved for the secularization of Christianity in his home country. The Lutheran Church, he says, has taken its cues from secular society.

"Unfortunately it did not have the strength to be faithful to its own confession and calling in the society and go against the cultural and anti-Christian tide. But it followed more the voice of people (*vox populus*) than God in his revealed Word (*vox Dei*). The lack of clear confession of Christ Jesus, sin and grace and questions of natural law like sanctity of life and marriage have made the established church *more and more irrelevant and meaningless in the public arena and everyday life among the people* (my italics)."

Ditto for all Western religions. Instead of resisting the morally debased dominant culture, they have succumbed to it. There is no virtue in Christian religions playing copy cat

with postmodernism. The denial of truth—that there is an objective reality based on what nature and nature's God has ordained—is at the heart of the crisis in Christianity in the West.

It is this denial of truth that allows some to deny that there is a human being inside a pregnant woman. It is the denial of truth that allows some to deny that marriage was founded exclusively for one man and one woman, the only two people who can naturally create a family. It is the denial of truth that allows some to deny our status as a man or a woman is fixed and unalterable.

Denying the existence of truth is not only a violation of our Judeo-Christian ethos, and therefore morally wrong, it is also a recipe for self-destruction. We either stick to our principles, as found in the natural law, the Ten Commandments and (for Catholics) the Catechism, or we become so trendy that we become invisible.

SHAMELESS CUOMO EXPLOITS BLACK CHURCH

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Andrew Cuomo's latest ploy:

People go to church on Sunday to pray, commune with God and to be inspired. They don't go to be pandered to by politicians, especially disgraced former politicians. Yet that is exactly what former New York Governor Andrew Cuomo did yesterday at a Brooklyn black church.

Everyone in New York knows Cuomo is trying to stage a

comeback. Indeed, last month he spent \$369,000 of his \$16 million war chest on trying to resurrect his image. Now he is exploiting black churchgoers.

At God's Battalion of Prayer Church, Cuomo shamelessly played the victim card. He blamed the Democratic Party, "prosecutorial misconduct," the media, and the "cancel culture" for his woes, falsely claiming that he has been "vindicated." He did not say why he didn't have the courage to stay in office and fight for his vindication, owing, no doubt, to the fact that he was ready to be impeached.

Cuomo made much hay out of the decision by five district attorneys not to press charges against him after he resigned. The fact is most of them said they found the charges against him to be credible, but that there wasn't sufficient legal grounds to convict him. He never addressed the allegations by five women.

They accused him of kissing them on the lips without their consent, groping them, making inappropriate comments and seeking to intimidate them. Lindsey Boylan, a former high-ranking official who worked for him, accused him of creating "a culture within his own administration where sexual harassment and bullying is so pervasive that it is not only condoned but expected."

In 2019, Cuomo signed legislation to combat sexual harassment in the workplace.

"There has been an ongoing, persistent culture of sexual harassment, assault and discrimination in the workplace, and now it is time to act. By ending the absurd legal standard that sexual harassment in the workplace needs to be 'severe or pervasive' and making it easier for workplace sexual harassment claims to be brought forward," he said, "we are sending a strong message that time is up on sexual harassment in the workplace and setting the standard of equality for

women.”

By setting the bar so low, Cuomo unwittingly cooked his own goose.

Cuomo also had the audacity to claim victim status for his discredited brother. He said Chris was fired because CNN was “in the middle of a merger and afraid of the cancel-culture mob.” He failed to mention that his brother compromised his obligations as a professional journalist by shilling for him, and that a report on his conduct was submitted to CNN by an investigative law firm. Immediately following that, he was accused of sexual misconduct.

Perhaps the most revealing aspect of Cuomo’s speech at the black church was his insistence on wanting to “tell my truth.” He should have been asked to leave at that point.

Truth is not an opinion: it is an objective reality. Truth does not vary from one person to another—there is only one truth. For a “former altar boy” like Andrew Cuomo to profess in a house of God that truth is relative shows how arrogant and un-Christian he is.

New Yorkers have had it with the Cuomos. It’s time they got the message and quietly slipped away.

Contact Andrew Cuomo: info@andrewcuomo.com

BIDEN’S ORWELLIAN LANGUAGE ON SEXUALITY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden’s State of the Union remarks:

President Biden's State of the Union address was mostly about the Ukraine-Russia war, the economy, Covid, and energy. That's understandable given that these issues are paramount. Some, like New York Times columnist Charles Blow, criticized Biden for not mentioning blacks even once. A more serious criticism was Biden's use of Orwellian language to describe matters sexual.

We all know that abortion means the killing of an unborn baby, but almost none of those in the pro-abortion camp likes to say such things. Biden addressed this issue by saying, "Folks, advancing liberty and justice also requires protecting the rights of women."

He did not mean the right of women to be free from sexual harassment in the workplace, or the right of women to exclusively compete with other women in women's sports (which he rejects). He meant the right to abort their child.

"The constitutional right affirmed in *Roe v. Wade*, standing precedent for half a century, is under attack as never before." He never said what that right was. Nor did he say why, when the issue of gay marriage was before the courts, he supported overturning two centuries of standing precedent.

"If you want to go forward not backwards, we must protect access to healthcare; preserve a woman's right to choose—and continue to advance maternal healthcare for all Americans."

In other words, aborting babies is healthcare. That itself is Orwellian. He never tells us what the woman is choosing to do. To put it differently, what is the object of the verb "choose"? Why can't he say what it is?

Saying things such as "Maternal healthcare for all Americans" is total nonsense. Maternal healthcare cannot possibly be for men, so why not simply say, "maternal healthcare for women." That's because in his mind, sex is not an objective reality—there are men who believe they are a woman, so to

speak about “maternal healthcare for women” would leave these sexually confused men out.

This teed up his remarks on “our LGBTQ+ Americans.” We know the L stands for lesbian, the G stands for gay, the B stands for bisexual, the T stands for “transgender” (there really are no such persons—there are only men and women), the Q stands for queer (a classic redundancy), but no one knows who the + people are. Someone needs to ask him about this at a press conference.

Biden said he wants to sign the Equality Act, the most radical, anti-nature, anti-religious liberty piece of legislation ever proposed. Among other things, it would do away with privacy rights—hurting women more than men—and it would force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions.

Anyone who thinks we are exaggerating should read what Kara Dansky has to say about the Equality Act. She is a self-described “radical feminist,” and the author of *The Abolition of Sex: How the “Transgender” Agenda Harms Women and Girls*.

“What all this means is that if the Equality Act is enacted, any man will be able to gain access to any women’s restroom, changing room, or locker room in all public accommodations, which includes all restaurants, bars, movie theaters, sports arenas, and recreational areas. Grown men will be able to enter areas that are intended to be restricted to women and girls across the country.”

If Americans knew what the Equality Act entailed, they would be overwhelmingly opposed to it. Hence the need to speak about it in a deceitful manner.

Biden ended his comments on this subject by invoking God. Speaking about so-called transgender persons, he said “I’ll always have your back as your President so you can be yourself and reach your God-given potential.”

He is seriously wrong. Sexually confused boys and girls who want to “transition” to the opposite sex do so because they don’t want to be themselves—they want to be something they’re not.

Worse, to say that God’s creatures can reach their potential by rebelling against their God-given nature is to say that the necessary corrective to God’s design is genital-mutilating surgery. That is borderline blasphemous.

Biden’s deceptive language is deliberate. He does not want the American people to ponder exactly what his sexual policies mean. His rejection of nature, and nature’s God, is all the more sick given his self-proclaimed “devout Catholic” status.

We’ve contacted Jen Psaki a lot, so let’s contact her Deputy Press Secretary, Andrew Bates: andrew.j.bates@who.eop.gov

COURT CHECKS NAVY’S ANTI-RELIGIOUS BIAS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Navy’s anti-religious bias:

In recent years, the armed forces has done a very poor job protecting the religious liberties of men and women in uniform. When it comes to granting religious exemptions from the Covid-19 vaccination, the Army and the Navy have the worst record. The good news is that the Navy got its anti-religious bias checked this week by a federal court of appeals.

There have been approximately 16,000 requests by members of the armed forces for a religious exemption from the vaccine, a

mere 15 of which have been approved. The Air Force has approved nine of them; the Marines have granted six. No one in the Army or Navy has been approved.

Regarding the Navy's flat-out denial of religious exemptions for anyone, the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled on February 28 that "Defendants have not demonstrated 'paramount interests' that justify vaccinating these 35 plaintiffs [which include Navy SEALs] against COVID-19 in violation of their religious beliefs." More than 99% of active-duty members of the Navy have been vaccinated.

It is not as though the Navy does not believe in exemptions from the vaccine—it's just that it has a problem with those seeking an exemption on religious grounds. For example, regarding active-duty members, the Navy has approved at least 10 permanent medical exemptions, 259 temporary ones, and 60 administrative exemptions (e.g., in cases involving time in service until separation or retirement).

Why the animus? Why is the Navy (and the Army) opposed to granting religious exemptions? Their hostility is as immoral as it is unconstitutional.

As the Supreme Court has noted, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) of 1993 affords "greater protection for religious exercise than is available under the First Amendment." Indeed, the only way the Navy can succeed in its quest to deny religious liberty is to prove to the courts that it has a "compelling governmental interest" in invoking its rule. But that has been undercut in this instance by its willingness to grant exemptions on secular grounds.

Unfortunately, elites in the military, following the elites in virtually every other sector of society, have been infected with the woke virus: they have become captive to the politically correct mavens who are steering the dominant culture. It certainly wasn't this way when I was in the Air

Force in the late Sixties.

We need real men in high stations in the armed forces. Real men stand their ground when bombarded with propaganda—they don't cave to invidious changes in the culture.

Let the Department of Defense Public Affairs Office know of your concerns. I'm sure they would like to hear from you.

Contact: osd.pentagon.pa.mbx.ce-public-inquiries@mail.mil

TWITTER CENSORS FREE SPEECH AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Twitter's censorship of free speech:

Every sane person in the country knows that we cannot switch our sex. Men cannot become women, and women cannot become men. This is not debatable—nature has settled the issue. To be more exact, we cannot change our chromosomal makeup. Not even those who work in Silicon Valley can do that.

Those who work at Twitter disagree. Worse, they will punish anyone who disagrees with them. Their latest victim is [Vicky Hartzler](#), a candidate for a U.S. senate seat in Missouri. Last month she tweeted, "Women's sports are for women, not men pretending to be women." For that, and that alone, Twitter suspended her personal account.

Hartzler was referring to the case of Lia Thomas, the male University of Pennsylvania swimmer who is unfairly allowed to compete against women. He claims to be a woman, which is manifestly false, but that is considered dispositive at Penn.

He also walks around naked in front of women in the locker room, and the women can do nothing about it. So much for women's rights.

Moreover, when the women complain, they are told they have no right to ostracize him. So the victimizer is now the potential victim, and those who have been victimized have no rights. If common sense and common decency were operative, he would be arrested for indecent exposure and the administrators would be fired.

It's time for the Congress, and the federal courts, to intervene. This kind of madness must end, and the fascistic response by Twitter must be checked.

It's not just the elites at Twitter who have gone off the deep end. The Associated Press is billing the story as, "Twitter Suspends US Senate Candidate for Hateful Conduct." Wrong. What she said was as truthful as it was pedestrian. To top things off, speech is not conduct. So AP is wrong twice.

We stand with Pope Francis who calls gender ideology "demonic."

*Contact Vijaya Gadde, Twitter's General Counsel:
vijaya@twitter.com*