

BIDEN'S PRO-ABORTION CATHOLIC CABINET

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden's Catholic Cabinet members:

We can tell a lot about a president just by knowing something about his Cabinet picks. This takes on special significance for Catholics when we have a Catholic president.

To begin with, we would expect a Catholic president to be faithful to the teachings of the Catholic Church, especially on life and death matters. We would also expect that any Catholics who are chosen to be in his Cabinet would also be loyal sons and daughters of the Church.

Biden fails these tests. He is the most ardent defender of abortion rights ever to become president of the United States. That obviously means that his policies are in direct contradiction to the teachings of the Catholic Church. For the most part, his Catholic Cabinet picks also reflect badly on him. He has eight Catholics in his Cabinet.

Lloyd Austin is Secretary of Defense. He has no public record on the subject of abortion. Denis McDonough is Secretary of Veterans Affairs. He has an uneven record on abortion, and while he is not a rabid defender of it, he has tilted toward the pro-abortion stance. The other six are all off-the-charts supporters of abortion rights.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services, Xavier Becerra, is one of the most extreme defenders of abortion-on-demand. He is loved by NARAL, the abortion giant, and has previously earned a zero rating from National Right to Life. He has no qualms about supporting partial-birth abortion, and his passion for abortion is so strong that it inspired him to attempt to close down crisis pregnancy centers in California when he was the

state's Attorney General. He is most known for seeking to punish the Little Sisters of the Poor by relentlessly seeking to force them to pay for abortion-inducing services in their healthcare plans.

Jennifer Granholm is Secretary of Energy. When she was Governor of Michigan, she twice vetoed a partial-birth abortion ban and worked with other pro-abortion politicians to loosen abortion restrictions.

Biden chose Samantha Power to head the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). When she was nominated, CHANGE, an international abortion lobby group, congratulated her for her pro-abortion work. Power has not been shy about her dedication to abortion rights.

Gina Raimondo is Secretary of Commerce. When she was Governor of Rhode Island, she championed a law that would allow partial-birth abortions. She also signed a bill that codified abortion protections.

Tom Vilsack is Secretary of Agriculture. When he was Governor of Iowa, he vetoed legislation that would have required abortion facilities to provide women with factual information about abortion risks and alternatives to aborting their child. He opposed consent laws that offered women contemplating an abortion with pictures of fetal development.

The Secretary of Labor is Marty Walsh. When he was Mayor of Boston, he supported abortion-on-demand and taxpayer-funded abortions. NARAL commended him when he sought to crush crisis pregnancy centers.

These are the Catholics who serve in Biden's Cabinet. Most of them work to reinforce each other's animus against the Church's pro-life heritage. Indeed, given the responsibilities that some of them have, they are currently working to ensure that their deadly ideas are infused in their policy decisions.

It looks like Biden decided to double down in his support for abortion by choosing Catholics who would support him in this endeavor. He may fool some by walking around with a rosary in his pocket, but more savvy Americans—not just Catholics—are able to distinguish between posturing and fidelity to one's religious tenets. That's a test he cannot pass.

Today is White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki's last day on the job—she is going to work for MSNBC, which should be a smooth transition.

Contact: jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov

AMERICAN PEOPLE OPPOSE ROE V. WADE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new survey on abortion:

Radio, TV, the internet and newspapers are alive with stories saying that a majority of Americans do not want *Roe v. Wade* overturned. Those reports are totally misleading. While the actual text of the decision does not allow for all abortions, in practice it does: to perform a late-term abortion all the doctor has to do is invoke a “mental health” exception and bingo—he can legally abort the baby.

Importantly, the American people have never been in favor of abortion-on-demand, yet this is what *Roe* allows. Surveys almost never ask respondents if they would support this ruling *if* they knew that it would allow for abortions at any time during pregnancy, and for any reason whatsoever.

The latest survey on this subject, published by the Pew Research Center, is rich in detail. It is so rich that it easily makes the case that the public wants nothing to do with *Roe*. Did those who wrote the report come to this conclusion? Not at all. Indeed, they spun their narrative in a way that suggests most Americans are okay with *Roe*.

The survey, "America's Abortion Quandary," says that "A majority of Americans say abortion should be legal in all or most cases, but many are open to restrictions; many opponents of legal abortion say it should be legal in some circumstances." There are other conclusions that can be drawn from the data, but Pew is reluctant to do so.

"A majority of Americans say they do not agree with *Roe v. Wade*." That would be an accurate conclusion, drawn from the Pew data, though it is not one that Pew prefers to make.

Only 19% of Americans say abortion should be legal in all cases. That means 81% are opposed to what *Roe* allows. That is the real story. But it is not the one the researchers chose to flag. There are other provisions in *Roe* that the public opposes.

The report found that a *majority of abortion supporters*—not just those who oppose abortion—say that "how long a woman has been pregnant should matter in determining legality of abortion." Indeed, this seriously undercuts the narrative that most Americans do not want *Roe* overturned.

Roe allows women to abort their baby in the first 24 weeks. But that is not what the American people want. Pew found that 43% want it to be illegal at 24 weeks, approximately double the number of those who think it should be legal (22%).

Moreover, a *majority of abortion supporters*—nearly seven-in-ten—say that those who perform abortions should be required to notify the parent or legal guardian if the woman seeking the abortion is under 18. That's a limitation that *Roe* does not

honor. In other words, this is another reason why the public is not happy with this decision.

Most telling is a sentence that the Pew authors wrote that seriously compromises its pro-abortion tilt. They concluded that “nearly two-thirds of the public thinks abortion either should be entirely illegal at *every* stage of a pregnancy or should become illegal, at least in some cases, *at some point* during the course of a pregnancy (their emphasis).” That makes the definitive case *against* the ruling in *Roe*.

It should be noted that the Pew researchers only mention the *Roe* decision by name twice; they were descriptive remarks at the beginning of the report. But they had plenty of opportunities to say to respondents, “This is what *Roe* allows,” and then ask specific questions about it.

Pew deserves high marks for its methodology. Its interpretation of its own data, however, reveals a bias—it put the happiest face possible on a survey that more accurately supports the views of pro-life Americans.

SCHUMER’S ABORTION BILL GUTS RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Sen. Chuck Schumer’s abortion bill:

On May 11, Sen. Chuck Schumer will introduce the Women’s Health Protection Act, the most radical pro-abortion bill ever written. It would effectively guarantee abortion-on-demand. It would also gut First Amendment protections for religious liberty by exempting the Religious Freedom Restoration Act

(RFRA).

Schumer epitomizes the Democratic Party on abortion and religious liberty. Not too long ago, the Democratic Party was cautiously pro-abortion. Two days after becoming president in 1993, Bill Clinton said, "Our vision should be of an America where abortion is safe and legal but rare." When Hillary Clinton ran for president in 2008, she repeated this line, adding, "By rare, I mean rare."

Rare no more. There is not an abortion today that most Democrats wouldn't support. Worse, they went from being pro-religious liberty to anti-religious liberty.

On March 11, 1993, less than two months after President Clinton carved out a relatively moderate stance on abortion, Rep. Chuck Schumer introduced RFRA in the House; Sen. Ted Kennedy broached it in the Senate. The final vote: it passed unanimously in the House and the vote in the Senate was 97-3.

Today, Schumer is leading the fight to eradicate the bill he once championed. Ironically, he is now on the side of the three who voted against RFRA in 1993. That puts him in bad company.

Two of them—Sen. Jesse Helms and Sen. Robert Byrd—were white racists. Helms said the 1964 Civil Rights Act was "the single most dangerous piece of legislation ever introduced in the Congress," and Byrd was a former member of the Ku Klux Klan. While Schumer is not a racist, his backward thinking on religious liberty is identical to that of Helms and Byrd.

Commenting on RFRA, President Clinton, who signed the bill, said that the "fundamental right of all people" to "follow our own personal beliefs" and "practice our faith freely and openly" is "essential to our well-being." What Schumer said was even more dramatic.

Schumer spoke from the floor of the House on May 11, 1993,

saying that “We all know that the First Amendment guarantees the right of the free exercise of religion. Traditionally the Supreme Court interpreted that guarantee to mean religious freedom can be infringed only when the government has a compelling interest in doing so.”

He went on to say that a 1990 decision, *Employment Division v. Smith*, changed that tradition, promulgating a new standard where “government only has to show a legitimate interest in order to burden religion.” It was this relatively weak protection that RFRA rectified.

Schumer now thinks that he went too far in promoting religious liberty. In particular, he has a problem with religious liberty whenever it collides with issues of sexuality. His interest in abortion and gay rights clearly supersedes his interest in religious liberty, notwithstanding the fact that the Constitution explicitly mentions the free exercise of religion while saying nothing about abortion and gay rights.

The evolution of Schumer, and the Democratic Party that he epitomizes, has radically turned against life and liberty. It is no longer even a figment of its former self.

Contact Schumer’s chief of staff:
mike_lynch@schumer.senate.gov

BIDEN MUTE ON ANTI-CATHOLIC INCIDENTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden’s reaction to anti-Catholic incidents:

President Biden has now condemned the firebombing of a Christian pro-life office in Madison, Wisconsin, but he did not address this crime as the work of pro-abortion arsonists. They left graffiti outside the building that said, "If abortions aren't safe then you aren't either."

Biden should be as pointed in his condemnation of this hate crime as he is when he talks about right-wing violence. He has no problem blaming all "MAGA" people when right-wing extremists act up, yet he resorts to generic statements when left-wing extremists act up.

Worse, Biden has said nothing about the wave of anti-Catholic incidents that have occurred over the past week. In doing so, he is giving succor to bigots. Here are some examples.

- Outside the Basilica of St. Patrick's Old Cathedral in New York pro-abortion activists held signs and banners that taunted Catholics.

"I'm killing the babies!"

"Abortion is a Gift"

"RIP Jesus, Killed by a 'Woke' Deadbeat Dad"

"We Love Abortion"

"Thank God for Abortion"

"Help Me Abort My Babies"

"God Killed His Son, Why Can't I?"

- In Chicago, pro-abortion activists assembled in a public square holding signs that read "End Catholic Tyranny" and "Abortion On Demand."
- In Denton, Texas, vandals defaced a Catholic pro-life pregnancy center, leaving graffiti that read, "Forced Pregnancy is Murder."
- The pro-abortion group "Ruth Sent Us" tweeted a message to Catholics vowing to "Burn the Eucharist."
- In Boulder, Colorado, pro-abortion vandals struck Saint Mary's Church, smashing windows and spray painting the

church.

- In Los Angeles, pro-abortion fascists interrupted Mass at the Cathedral of Our Lady of the Angels. They shouted at the parishioners and unfurled a large green banner. Disrupting religious services is a federal offense.

It is shameful that our “devout Catholic” president has not said a word about any of these anti-Catholic incidents. Not to comment on what happened in Los Angeles, in particular, is outrageous.

Moreover, Catholics on the Supreme Court are being singled out for harassment. The pro-abortion group, “Ruth Sent Us,” has explicitly called on activists to confront Catholic Supreme Court Justices: they encourage them to invade their privacy by demonstrating in front of their homes, seeking to intimidate them and their families.

This is another example of bigotry, yet Biden can’t bring himself to call it for what it is—rank anti-Catholicism. We Catholics would get more outrage from a non-Catholic president.

Contact Jen Psaki—it’s her last week as White House Press Secretary: jennifer.r.psaki@who.eop.gov

PRO-ABORTION FASCISTS TARGET CATHOLIC CHURCHES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on pledges to attack Catholic churches:

The cops will hopefully be out in force this Sunday to monitor planned attacks inside Catholic churches. A left-wing fascist

group, Ruth Sent Us, is asking its followers to crash Catholic churches on Mother's Day.

Vandals have already struck in Boulder, Colorado, desecrating a church, and pro-abortion lunatics have rioted in Los Angeles.

Ruth Sent Us is named after Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg. While she was an abortion-rights advocate, she also made it clear that the decision to legalize abortion should not have been made by the Supreme Court—it was up to lawmakers to render such a ruling. Moreover, she was never one to promote violence, never mind counsel a Nazi-like attack disrupting Mass.

Thus, Ruth Sent Us is wildly out of step with the thinking of the person they claim to be honoring. In fact, they are dishonoring her legacy.

We will press the authorities to prosecute any attack on a Catholic Church as a hate crime. These thugs need to be stopped in their tracks.

If President Biden does not address this issue, he is aiding and abetting anti-Catholicism.

CELEBRATING MOTHER'S DAY IN ABNORMAL TIMES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on what has happened to Mother's Day:

In normal times, Mother's Day was a time to honor mothers. But these are not normal times. In elite quarters today, there are

those who want to eradicate this special day as we know it. Yes, even Mother's Day has become politicized. It's time for a tutorial on this subject.

Two men cannot have babies. Two women cannot have babies. Only men and women can have babies. This explains why, throughout all of history—up until about a week from yesterday—no one thought this to be controversial. Today it is.

Many men who claim to be married to their boyfriend, and who claim to be parents, are in a quandary over Mother's Day. The children they have adopted are denied the right to be with their mother, so what do these two "fathers" want to do about Mother's Day? They want to cancel it.

In the name of being inclusive—they worship inclusivity—they want us to celebrate "Surrogate and Egg Donor Day." But that is not being inclusive: It excludes sperm donors. Others suggest "Parent's Day." But that doesn't resolve what to do next month when we have Father's Day.

In keeping with the virtue of inclusivity, the ruling class has declared motherhood to be inclusive of men.

Apple recently released a "pregnant man" emoji. Last year, Rep. Cori Bush celebrated Mother's Day by talking about "birthing people," a term coined to be inclusive of men who claim to be pregnant. Similarly, in 2020 Harvard Medical School referred to mothers and women as "birthing people," a clear demonstration of its commitment to inclusivity. Three years ago, the ACLU declared that "Men who get pregnant and give birth are men." Question: Can these men also have a miscarriage?

In normal times, a company like Apple would be laughed out of town, Cori Bush would be sent to the nearest psychiatric ward, Harvard Medical School would be stripped of its accreditation, and the ACLU's top brass would be quarantined. But these are not normal times.

This madness has become so mainstream that men who claim to be mothers are trying to breastfeed their babies. I'm not making this up.

Last year a man who claimed to be the mother of an adopted baby—his boyfriend claimed to be the father—expressed chagrin at being unable to milk the baby. “The baby has been able to latch, but I've not been able to produce any milk.” Nonetheless, he found success in failure. “Being able to even be a part of a process where I'm trying to create milk, it makes me feel very excited.” He's giving new meaning to the term “milkman.”

Nature, however, is stubborn. Consider how various internet sites dedicated to motherhood handle the question of whether women who are pregnant for the first time are entitled to celebrate motherhood. They are actually sane.

Habitatformom says, “Yes, you can celebrate Mother's Day during your pregnancy. Being pregnant means that you are already a mother anyway. You don't need to physically hold the baby in your arms to be considered a mom.” Similarly, Jacqueline Whitmore, an etiquette expert, commented at Romper that “She's still a mother, even if she's not physically holding the baby in her arms.”

Babyprepping says, “Of course [you can celebrate Mother's Day]. You count 100%. That baby inside of you, growing strong and beautiful, has a heartbeat and is your baby.” Pricklymom opines, “No one can deny the fact that you are already a mother. You've spent weeks or months worrying about every little movement of your baby.”

These comments from normal people will not sit well with those who think men can get pregnant, never mind pro-abortion activists.

The world has always had its share of wannabes. In normal times that meant men and women who pined to be someone they

would like to be. Today it means men and women who want to be someone they can never be. Denied by nature, and nature's God, they have embarked on a quest they can never win. So sad.

THE ENIGMA OF MULTIPLE ABORTIONS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on women who have had multiple abortions:

All abortions are tragic, both for the pregnant woman and her baby, but most pro-life people do not lump all women who have had an abortion together, treating them all the same. For example, while we cannot condone it, most understand that a 15-year-old girl who becomes pregnant, and is fearful of telling her drunken and violent dad about it, may elect to have an abortion. They are less understanding of women who have had multiple abortions.

This week on "The View," Whoopi Goldberg said, "Getting an abortion is not easy. Making the decision is not easy. It's not something people do lightly." Who can argue with that? What's strange about her comment, however, is that [she has admitted](#) to having six or seven abortions by the age of 25. Six or seven—she's not sure.

If the decision to abort a baby is "not easy," it appears to become easier for those who have another. That's a serious problem which the media do not cover.

In 2008, 50% of all abortions were done on women who had a prior one. The most recent figure is 45%. This is an enigma. Why would approximately half of all women who have had an

abortion go to a clinic again and again?

Abby Johnson, who was a director at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Texas, described how "Angie," a recidivist, spoke to clinic personnel. "'Could y'all just Xerox my chart and I'll fill in the dates?' She would jest. Once the paperwork was in order, Angie would attempt to banter with the girls in the waiting room. 'It's no big thing,' she assured them. 'I've done it eight times before, and I have no regrets.'"

Irene Vilar's mother committed suicide when she was eight-years-old; her brothers were heroin addicts. When she was a teenager she married a tyrannical 50-year-old professor. She wound up having 15 abortions in 16 years, admitting that women who have had multiple abortions show a certain "recklessness." She was 15 times reckless.

"Mary" had three abortions when she was in her early twenties. After she was pregnant the third time, she wanted to have the baby but her boyfriend did not, so she had an abortion. "I felt like we were committing murder, that I was killing something I wanted."

Dr. E. Joanne Angelo knows what Mary was going through. She is associated with Project Rachel, a Catholic support group that ministers to women—of any faith—who have had an abortion, and are seeking reconciliation. "When a woman finds herself pregnant in a crisis situation, she immediately calculates the date when her child would be born," she says.

"After the abortion she may feel numb, her grief over the death of her child being blunted by her strong ambivalent feelings—her tender feelings for her child, and the defensive denial of these feelings which enabled her to submit to the abortion procedure," Angelo writes. She further observes that "her inner life is often plagued by guilt and shame, nightmares of babies being sucked down tubes or dying in horrific accidents or violent crimes....Some may become

seriously depressed and even suicidal.”

If this condition is commonplace among women who have had one abortion, why is it that at least some women who have had multiple abortions take it in stride?

If, as it appears likely, *Roe v. Wade* will be overturned, the problem of women having multiple abortions will not go away. There needs to be more aggressive intervention on the part of the medical community and the clergy after a woman has had an abortion for the first time.

We need to end the enigma of multiple abortions. That also means we need to be just as aggressive in dealing with the impregnating men. They’ve gotten away with their irresponsible behavior for too long.

BIDEN SAYS START OF HUMAN LIFE IS UNRESOLVED

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the latest commentary by President Biden on abortion:

“*Roe* says what all basic mainstream religions have historically concluded—that the right—that the existence of a human life and being is a question. Is it at the moment of conception? Is it six months? Is it six weeks?”

Those are the latest words of wisdom from President Biden.

What “basic mainstream religions” have to say about when life begins is interesting, but it should not be controlling. What matters is what science says. We have known for a long time that life begins at conception.

People can debate all they want about when “personhood” begins—but be careful lest they slide down the eugenics slope—the ultimate issue is this: If what develops at fertilization proceeds undisturbed, the result many months later will be a baby boy or girl. Just as important, all of the characteristics that constitute the uniqueness of this new life were there from the time of conception. This is Biology 101.

The Catholic Church does not follow the science—it has been well out in front of it. It’s about time our “devout Catholic” president caught up as well. There is no more “question” about when life begins, Mr. President—the answer is there for anyone not living in a state of delusion.

LYING ABOUT ROE v. WADE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue discusses the lies that are still being told about *Roe v. Wade*:

The hysterical reaction of pro-abortion politicians and activists to news that the Supreme Court may overturn *Roe v. Wade* is an index of just how passionate they are in making sure that unborn kids can be legally killed. Leading the charge is our “devout Catholic” president. Biden said that *Roe* “has been the law of the land for almost fifty years, and basic fairness and the stability of our law demand that it not be overturned.”

Truth to tell, Biden has no respect for laws that have been on the books for a long time. He proved that by hailing the *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision that legalized same-sex marriage. Unsettling this “settled law”—which has been around since the beginning of the Republic—didn’t bother him. So why

the sudden interest in preserving a ruling that is much more recent?

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer issued a joint statement condemning those Justices who regard *Roe* to be wrongly decided. They said they “have lied to the United States Senate.” They cited not a single lie. The truth is that they lied about the Justices. In fact, from the very beginning, *Roe* has been based on lies.

Prior to the 1973 decision legalizing abortion, pro-abortion activists told the media that there were five thousand to ten thousand deaths a year owing to abortion. But it was a lie. We know it was a lie because the man who broadcasted about it at the time, Dr. Bernard Nathanson, a practicing abortionist and activist, later admitted that he lied. By the way, the actual number of women who died of an abortion the year before *Roe* was thirty-nine; the figure was published by the Centers for Disease Control.

The pro-abortion industry loves to say that prior to *Roe*, women were prosecuted all over the country for having an abortion. This is another lie.

There are only two cases in which a woman was charged in any state for having an abortion: Pennsylvania in 1911 and Texas in 1922. Since 1922, there have been zero documented cases in which a woman has been charged in an abortion case.

The woman in *Roe*, Jane Roe (whose actual name is Norma McCorvey), was 21 when she became pregnant for the third time. She sought an abortion in Texas. But there was one problem: Texas did not allow for abortions except if the mother’s life was endangered. So she lied. On the advice of her female lawyers, she said she was raped.

Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackmun wrote the decision in *Roe* arguing that “We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins.” This was a remarkable admission. Did he not

understand that this question was central to this issue? The reason why this ruling has proven to be so controversial has everything to do with this question. Moreover, if Blackmun—or anyone else—is unsure when life begins, why not err on the side of caution? Why assume life is not present at conception?

In fact, well before 1973 there was scientific evidence that life begins at conception. Indeed, twenty years earlier James Watson and Francis Crick discovered the structure of DNA, the very material that makes all of us unique human beings. It is present at fertilization—not a day later. Additionally, ultrasound technology was frequently being used when *Roe* was decided.

As important as anything, even distinguished pro-abortion jurists have slammed the decision in *Roe* for being without constitutional foundation.

Those who claim it is constitutionally sound are either ignorant or lying.

Harvard Law professors Archibald Cox, Alan Dershowitz and Laurence Tribe have said the decision was fatally flawed. Even Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said it was lawmakers, not judges, who should decide this issue.

The *New Republic*, a staunch supporter of abortion rights, said at the time that it was not the provenance of the courts to rule on abortion. Washington Post columnist Richard Cohen, another advocate of abortion-on-demand, said that inventing a right to privacy was irresponsible. “Whatever abortion may be,” he said, “it cannot simply be a matter of privacy.”

The biggest lie of all is the claim that abortion doesn’t kill an innocent human being. The Catholic Church has been on the right side of science on this matter all along. We welcome others to the fold.

ANATOMY TEXTS PROVE WOMEN EXIST

Catholic League president Bill Donohue settles the argument over whether women exist:

Women exist. It's true. The controversy is over. Anatomy texts settle the issue.

"Can you provide a definition for the word 'woman'?" This question was asked of Supreme Court nominee Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson during the confirmation hearings. She could not. "I'm not a biologist," she said.

It is hard to believe that as recently as a decade or two ago that this question would even be raised. But we live in strange times. Not only is our newest Supreme Court Justice not sure what a woman is—ironically she was chosen partly because the president thinks she is a woman—lots of well-educated persons are puzzled.

Alia E. Dastagir is a reporter for USA Today. "Scientists, gender law scholars and philosophers of biology said Jackson's response was commendable, though perhaps misleading." They "note that a competent biologist would not be able to offer a definitive answer either."

So who are these people? Rebecca Jordan-Young teaches at Barnard College and claims to be a scientist. She says Jackson was not nuanced enough. "I don't want to see this question punted to biology as if science can offer a simple, definitive answer." But wouldn't we punt to a dentist to explain what a root canal is? For that matter, wouldn't we punt to an auto mechanic to explain what a car is?

Sarah Richardson is a Harvard historian and philosopher of biology, and she believes that science is not best suited to define what a woman is. "As is often the case," she says, "science cannot settle what are really social questions." That's funny. When I was studying for my doctorate in sociology at NYU, I was never taught that sociology was the best suited to know what a woman is. Maybe I missed that class.

Sometimes this issue gets very messy. St. Louis University identifies as a Catholic school, yet last year a student group was investigated by the Office of Student Responsibility and Community Standards because it raised the question in a social media video, "What is a woman?" Why they weren't expelled remains a mystery.

So what do they teach in medical school? Surely no one wants to go to a doctor who doesn't know the difference between a man and a woman. I hate to get technical about this, but guys being treated for prostate cancer don't want to go to a gynecologist.

Anne M. Gilroy is the author of *Anatomy: An Essential Textbook*, Third Edition, published in 2021 by Thieme Medical Publishers. Richard L. Drake, A. Wayne Vogl and Adam W.M. Mitchell are the authors of *Gray's Anatomy for Students*, Fourth Edition, published in 2020 by Elsevier.

These textbooks are among the most widely used by medical students in the United States and abroad. Both clearly identify what a male and female are and what constitutes their biological status. Those who claim that there are sexes other than male and female find no support in these books. Here is what we found.

Thieme's Anatomy: An Essential Text Book, Third Edition

- References to Female: 40
- References to Male: 25

- References to Transgender: ZERO
- References to Intersex: ZERO
- References to Other Sexes or Genders: ZERO

Gray's Anatomy for Students, Fourth Edition

- References to Female: 8
- References to Male: 10
- References to Transgender: ZERO
- References to Intersex: ZERO
- References to Other Sexes or Genders: ZERO

Both books make it clear that there are female bodies and male bodies, and that's it. There is no special transgender body or any of the other pantheon of sexualities or gender identities.

Intersex is a real medical condition where an individual is born with irregular chromosome patterns, gonads, or genitals. In the wake of the passage of the Florida Parental Rights in Education law, left-wing activists and teachers quickly latched on to the notion that young children need to know about intersex because some of the students might have this anatomical anomaly. However, the textbooks did not offer a section on this category, so unusual is this condition.

In other words, those elites who are not sure what a woman is made the right decision not to pursue medicine. They would have flunked out of medical school.