

NASHVILLE MURDERER'S MANIFESTO STILL SECRET

[Bill Donohue](#)

As we begin the new school year, five months after a mass murder at a Christian school in Nashville, the manifesto of the killer has still not been released to the public.

On March 27, 2023, a 28-year-old female, Audrey Hale, who falsely claimed to be a male, shot and killed three children and three adults at a Christian school in Nashville, Tennessee. The transgender person had attended Covenant School and apparently expressed her disdain for it.

Metro Nashville Police Chief John Drake told the media at that time, "There's some belief that there was some resentment for having to go to that school." He was not speculating. We know that she was planning the attack "over a period of months." More important, she left behind a manifesto that sheds light on why she did what she did. But it has not been made public.

According to a spokesman for Tennessee Gov. Bill Lee, it is the FBI and the Metro Nashville Police who are stopping the manifesto from being released. Tennessee Rep. Tim Burchett blames the FBI.

What's the reason for balking? The fear, as expressed by school officials, Covenant School parents, the media, and LGBT activists is that the public may learn the real reasons why Hale did what she did. In other words, if she made vicious anti-Christian remarks, they don't want to deal with the fallout.

School officials and the school's parents understandably want this issue behind them. But no such slack can be cut the media and LGBT activists. Had Hale been a white supremacist, and the

manifesto contained racist statements, is there anyone who doubts that it wouldn't have been released by now? Anti-Christian bigotry is no less invidious.

Metro Nashville Police Department Deputy Chief Mike Hagar has reviewed the unredacted version of the documents, as well as the redacted one, and he "does not believe" the release of the redacted papers would "impede the investigation." Then let's do it.

On August 26, a white racist shot and killed three black people in Jacksonville, Florida. We know all about his bigotry. So why are we still being kept in the dark about the anti-Christian bigotry of a transgender person?

Contact Rep. Tim Burchett's chief of staff:
michael.grider@mail.house.gov

CRITICS OF BISHOP McMANUS FALL FLAT

[Bill Donohue](#)

If professed vegetarians publicly criticized a vegetarian association for insisting that its members follow a vegetarian diet, no one would listen to them. Why is it that when a member of the Catholic clergy insists that his flock follow Catholic teachings he is criticized for doing so by professed Catholics? The difference is the media have a vested ideological interest in creating division in the Catholic Church.

Bishop Robert McManus leads the Diocese of Worcester, and has

done so ably for nearly two decades. He recently issued a policy for Catholic schools that is consistent with Catholic teachings on sexuality, and for this he has been roundly criticized. The logic of his detractors is unpersuasive.

To begin with, the policy on how to deal with homosexual and transgender students is a model of fairness. The first policy initiative is a statement against bullying, harassment and violence. There is also a policy that calls for respecting modesty standards in language, appearance, dress, and behavior. Few find these policies problematic.

“Students may not advocate, celebrate, or express same-sex attraction in such a way as to cause confusion or distraction in the context of Catholic school classes, activities, or events.” This policy has angered some.

Also contentious in some quarters is the policy that insists that “All students are expected to conduct themselves at school in a manner consistent with their biological sex.” This holds for athletics, dress and uniform policies, dances, the use of changing facilities, showers, etc. In addition, all school records will reflect the student’s biological sex.

“In some quarters” these policies are contentious. Which quarters are they? They are most assuredly not among rank-and-file Catholics, the ones who go to Mass regularly and pay the bills. No, it is the dissidents. Not surprisingly, this includes DignityUSA; it has long been at war with Catholic teachings on a variety of issues. Self-identified gay men are also carping. Their fidelity is not to the Church but to a politicized gay agenda.

There are others who have literally gone off the rails. Guillermo Creamer Jr. is a candidate for Mayor of Worcester. No longer a Catholic, he accuses Bishop McManus of embracing “an outdated hate-filled rhetoric.” He cites not a single comment of “hate-filled rhetoric” voiced by the bishop. There

aren't any. He owes Bishop McManus an apology.

Others, such as a local Catholic teacher, David Palmieri, berates the bishop for his "no compromise" policies. Would this extend to the bishop's statement condemning bullying, harassment and violence? Should he be willing to compromise on these acts as well? Similarly, when activist Charles O'Donnell calls out the bishop for issuing an "ultimatum," should McManus be more conciliatory if gay students are beaten up?

Robyn Kennedy is running for a state senate seat. She accuses the bishop of not showing the "love and care" for students she expects. State Sen. Jason Lewis also calls on the bishop to "support the love and inclusion that the Catholic Church teaches." Craig Mortley, a diversity specialist at a branch of the YWCA, says the Church "should be about creating a community of love."

So where is the love for orthodox parents who pay to send their children to a Catholic school that flagrantly violates Catholic sexual ethics? Moreover, if "love" is all that matters, should the bishop allow a brother and sister who love each other, *in an intimate way*, go to a prom as a date?

Misplaced compassion is a serious problem in our society today, and it shines brightly when those who reject the teachings of the Catholic Church selectively invoke it to further their agenda.

Kudos to Bishop McManus. We need more bishops like him. Let him know you agree.

Contact Margaret Comptois at the bishop's office:
mcomptois@worcesterdiocese.org

INCIVILITY IS THE NEW NORMAL

Bill Donohue

The ubiquity of incivility is the new normal.

Walking the streets of New York City these days can be treacherous. It used to be that pedestrians had to be wary of cars, but now they are confronted with bicycles, mopeds, scooters, and skateboards. These folks come out of nowhere, and from all sides.

Now we have the advent of the e-bike industry, the presence of electronically powered bikes that four-year-olds are allowed to drive. Most of these bikes go 20-28 miles per hour. There are an estimated 65,000 e-bikes in New York City and many drive as if they are the only ones on the road. As these bikes proliferate, so do fires: lithium-ion batteries are exploding with regularity.

There have always been reckless car drivers who speed and tailgate. But today we have a large segment of the population that texts and drives almost all the time. Looking at your phone to read or respond to text messages takes an average of five seconds. At 55 miles per hour, that means the driver has traveled the length of a football field, without looking at the road.

“More and More Teenagers Are Coming to School High, N.Y.C. Teachers Say.” That was the headline of a *New York Times* story in May. “Jersey Shore Towns Say State’s Marijuana Law Handcuffs Police and Emboldens Rowdy Teens.” That was the headline of a story by the Associated Press in June.

It’s not hard to figure out what’s happening. They’ve legalized marijuana in New York and New Jersey. In the latter case, this has meant “emboldening groups of teenagers to run amok on beaches and boardwalks, knowing there’s little chance

they'll get in trouble for it." To top things off, the cops have no way of testing erratic drivers for marijuana use, making apprehension difficult.

The surge in fentanyl use makes matters worse. In some cities, it is out of control. We now have the specter of fentanyl being used with xylazine—the animal sedative known as “tranq.” This “zombie drug” is also popular with cocaine users.

Adding to this troubled population is the explosion of migrants, mostly young men. They are now housed in over 100 hotels in New York, and many are sleeping on the sidewalks. Over 100,000 migrants have made their way to New York since the spring of last year, with more than 2,500 arriving each day.

Not far from where the Mets play there is a section of Queens that is being overrun by prostitutes. The hookers are employing children to lure customers, handing out business cards on the sidewalk. Drugs and alcohol are rampant. Meanwhile, New York Governor Kathy Hochul is launching a “pilot program” that would give hookers free medical and dental care.

Teachers are quitting in record numbers, partly because they are rendered impotent in dealing with unruly students. It is not the behavior of disruptive and violent students that is seen as the problem; rather, disciplinary measures are considered the problem.

Concert-goers often get excited about their favorite performers, and sometimes they get out of hand. But today they are more likely to throw objects at musicians, some of which are dangerous.

There has been an explosion in airline passengers who have become totally uncontrollable, endangering everyone on the plane. Fights are breaking out, people are overdosing on alcohol and drugs, emergency exits are being tampered with,

sexual acts are taking place—and little is done about it.

Shoplifting is so out-of-control in New York City that some storeowners are securing ice cream by installing a heavy-duty chain and padlock. Others are locking up freezers so thieves can't steal the ice.

The most serious expression of incivility is violence.

Now the head of the NAACP in Oakland blames “the movement to defund the police, our District Attorney’s unwillingness to charge and prosecute people who murder and commit life-threatening serious crimes, and the proliferation of anti-police rhetoric” for creating these conditions. She names “progressive policies and failed leadership” for these problems.

Why is this going on? The ruling class, as I point out in my book, [War on Virtue: How the Ruling Class is Killing the American Dream](#), no longer believes in holding people accountable for their behavior, and they certainly don't believe in promoting virtue. The word has spread fast—we can do pretty much what we want and the penalties for infringing on the rights of others are minimal.

We have created a culture of incivility, indeed lawlessness. It is not so much narcissism that we are breeding as it is selfishness. When self-absorption is celebrated, appeals to the common good fall on deaf ears.

What former FBI Special Agent, and air marshal, Jonathan Gilliam, has to say about unruly airline passengers is true about other examples of incivility. “They really don't care. And I think you see people treat police officers the same way. This type of stuff is self-centered, self-indulgent behavior is everywhere now. I mean, we see it everywhere.”

He's right. Unless we hold people accountable, and make the inculcation of virtue a priority, this insanity will continue.

THE WAR AGAINST MOMS FOR LIBERTY

Michael P. McDonald

As the fight for parental rights continues to gain momentum, and more importantly scores crucial wins, those in the forefront of this movement have received increased hostility. The most prominent of these groups is Moms for Liberty: left-wing activists have declared war on these moms.

Consider what happened in July at the Moms for Liberty “Joyful Warriors” Summit in Philadelphia. In the weeks leading up to the event, the Philadelphia chapter of ACT UP, a gay activist group with a history of violence, led several protests outside the Marriott demanding that the hotel cancel the event. Protesters “gave speeches, waved trans pride flags, and explained why it was so important to deny Moms for Liberty a space to tout their dangerously homophobic, transphobic rhetoric.”

During the event, protesters held up signs that insulted the group. One referred to them as the “nastiest skank b*tch[es] I’ve ever met.” Another called the group “fascist.” A couple blocks from the convention center, vandals spray painted graffiti on a crosswalk that read “F*ck off Nazi Moms!”

In large part, this vitriol is a direct result of a campaign to tarnish Moms for Liberty by secular progressive activists. This past June, the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC), a radical left-wing organization, added Moms for Liberty to the group’s “hate map.” SPLC’s hate map includes many prominent conservative groups and equates them to the Klan. Additionally, GLAAD, a radical LGBT group, issued a warning

that Moms for Liberty's "advocacy has included calls for book bans, classroom censorship, and bans on teaching about slavery, race, racism and LGBTQ people and history."

While leftist radicals portray Moms for Liberty as a scourge, the reality of the group is much different from the narratives concocted by their foes.

On January 1, 2021, Moms for Liberty, a 501(c)(4) nonprofit organization, was founded by two former and one current Florida school board officials who were all mothers concerned about what their children were learning in schools.

Presently, Moms for Liberty has 285 chapters in 45 states and approximately 120,000 members. While the group does not have a demographic profile of its members, it mainly draws support from parents that are concerned about the state of education in their communities.

Initially, Moms for Liberty focused on the Covid-19 pandemic, particularly the closing of schools, facemask requirements, and vaccine mandates. More recently, members of the organization have taken leading roles in fighting Critical Race Theory and the radical LGBT agenda in the classroom.

As a 501(c)(4), Moms for Liberty is actively supporting candidates in school board races across the country. In 2022, Moms for Liberty chapters endorsed 500 school board candidates. The organization has a 50 percent win ratio nationwide. In its base of Florida, Moms for Liberty has an 80 percent win ratio.

The successful efforts of Moms for Liberty has made them into a powerful organization. For instance, nearly every Republican candidate for the White House has praised these moms, and the candidates have put aside their differences to rally to the group's aid.

At the "Joyful Warriors" Summit, Former President Donald Trump

praised the group claiming it is the best thing “that’s ever happened to America.” He went on to say that “Moms for Liberty is no hate group. You are joyful warriors, you are fierce, fierce patriots.”

At the same event, Florida Governor Ron DeSantis spoke in defense of the group saying, “I see that Moms for Liberty is coming under attack by the left, attack by the corporate media, protests out here in the streets...But I want to congratulate you for that because that is a sign we are winning this fight.”

But even with powerful allies, the enemies of parental rights in education continue to bash Moms for Liberty. Unsurprisingly, one of the favored lines of attacks on these moms is they are “Christian Nationalists.”

Consider that in the spring of 2022, a group called Defense of Democracy was founded with the sole purpose of counteracting Moms for Liberty. One of the founders said the goal of the organization was “to fight back against Christian nationalism.”

Similarly, McMaster University Public Intellectuals Project lamented that the Moms for Liberty advocates “for a White Christian nationalist view of the United States.” Likewise, Americans United for the Separation of Church and State ran a hit piece on Moms for Liberty titled “Mad Moms: A New Christian Nationalist Front Group Claims To Champion Parental Involvement In Public Education” decrying the group’s activities. Meanwhile, op-eds and articles have appeared across the nation lambasting these moms and their supposed ties to “Christian Nationalism.”

This effort to defame proponents of traditional Judeo-Christian values reveals a deep seated animus against people of faith taking an active role in society. Unfortunately, Moms for Liberty has become a target of this line of attack.

Ultimately, the same people seeking to indoctrinate children into supporting leftist causes are openly hostile to people of faith. They seek to eliminate not only parents having a say in their children's education but people of faith taking part in public life. Fortunately, patriots and people of faith, like Moms for Liberty, are fighting back and winning.

SCHOOL YEAR BEGINS WITH RELIGIOUS LAWSUITS

[Bill Donohue](#)

The new school year is beginning with lawsuits to ensure religious liberty.

In Colorado, the Denver Archdiocese is suing the state over strictures in its new universal preschool program that would force Catholic schools to violate Catholic teachings. To be explicit, the archdiocese is saying that Colorado's Department of Early Childhood would mandate that Catholic preschools enroll "LGBTQ people." This cannot be done without violating Catholic teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality.

The archdiocese correctly argues that accepting the children of gay parents "is likely to lead to intractable conflicts" because the Church does not believe in same-sex marriage. The Church also rejects gender ideology, the idea that the sexes are interchangeable. Ergo, to accept students who have "transitioned" to the opposite sex is contradictory to its professed beliefs.

In short, Colorado's new preschool program does not provide for religious exemptions, and is therefore the subject of the

lawsuit.

In California, Orthodox Jewish families are suing the state for excluding religious schools from public funding for young people with disabilities. The state's Education Code allows funding for "nonpublic, nonsectarian schools," but provides no money for religious schools. Three Orthodox Jewish families are suing, insisting that their disabled children have religious needs that cannot be met in traditional public or private schools.

Catholic parents who have children with disabilities are also at risk. At the federal level, Congress has long committed funds for the disabled, knowing that their needs require special attention. Those needs should not be exclusionary of religion.

The secular vision of morality, which is entertained by the ruling class, is intolerant of religious liberty. State officials know that the courts are much more religious friendly than they are, making these lawsuits unnecessary. It just goes to show the zealotry that imbues in them.

This is a never-ending battle for our First Amendment right to religious liberty.

REVEALING DATA ON EDUCATION AND RELIGION

[Bill Donohue](#)

Survey research on the same subject, conducted by different survey houses, generally offer similar results. For varying

reasons, the findings may differ, but rarely is there a dramatic difference. Even less common is to find totally contradictory results. This appears to be the case with a recent report that consolidates 15 years of research published by the Cooperative Election Study.

Ryan Burge teaches political science at Eastern Illinois University and his analysis of the data leads him to conclude that “People with higher levels of education are less likely to identify as atheist, agnostic or nothing in particular when it comes to religion.”

Having written on this subject for decades, I was startled to read this: almost all surveys find just the opposite, which is to say the most highly educated are the least religious, and the most likely to be non-believers.

Other aspects of Ryan’s analysis—the more educated attend church at higher rates than the less educated and married persons attend more than the unmarried—is consistent with previous research. It’s the education variable that is inconsistent.

In 2014, Psychology Today cited evidence that allowed it to conclude that “The more education a person receives, the more likely they are to become an atheist.”

In 2017, the Pew Research Center found that overall, “religious levels of education *are* linked with lower levels of religious commitment by some measures, such as belief in God, how often people pray and how important they say religion is to them (its *italic*).” Interestingly, this pattern did not hold for Christians.

The same survey revealed that “college graduates are considerably less likely than those who have less education to say religion is ‘very important’ in their lives.” Furthermore, “Higher educated Americans also are less inclined than others to say they believe in God with absolute authority and to pray

on a daily basis.” And when it comes to atheism, “college graduates are more likely than others to describe themselves as atheists and agnostics.”

In 2023, Pew published a study that showed that the most educated were significantly more likely to say that it is not necessary to believe in God to be moral.

Data show that this is a worldwide phenomenon. For example, in 2020, Pew showed that there was a big gap between the wealthier countries, which tend also to be the best educated, and those in emerging economies on measures of religiosity (e.g. beliefs and practices). To wit: the latter are considerably more religious.

An analysis of the “20 Most Religious Countries in the World,” published by Yahoo/Finance on August 14, revealed that 17 of the most religious countries in the world are in Africa; the other three were Afghanistan (#8), Indonesia (#9) and Guatemala (#16). “Europe and America have generally less religious people,” it found.

Anomalies exist in every aspect of life, including medicine and survey research, and this appears to be the case with the Cooperative Election Study. This study aside, the overwhelming evidence shows that there is an inverse relationship between education and religiosity.

DECONSTRUCTING PRIVILEGE”

“WHITE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The political, educational and corporate world are flush with workshops and seminars on “white privilege.” Launched mostly by men and women who are white and affluent, they epitomize the very attribute that makes them recoil.

The person most responsible for advancing the notion of white privilege is Peggy McIntosh; at 88, she is still a revered figure among left-wing activists. In the 1980s, she made a name for herself writing about the horrors of “white privilege,” but it wasn’t until more recent times that her contribution became mainstream. Her main argument is that white people are reluctant to admit that their status is the result of “unearned advantages” over others.

McIntosh is not content to see “white privilege” in terms of class alone; she adds a racial component. For example, she does not talk about “black privilege” or “Asian privilege,” though there are countless examples of each. In her world, only white people can be “privileged.”

Nor does she distinguish between white people who wait on tables and the non-white millionaires whom they serve—they are simply thrown into the same bin with Elon Musk. In short, white women who clean the toilets of Oprah Winfrey are privileged, but Oprah is not.

“My schooling gave me no training in seeing myself as an oppressor, as an unfairly advantaged person, or as a participant in a damaged culture.” McIntosh does not identify whom she oppressed or why she did so. That is too bad, because if this is an accurate account, that would make her a wicked person, and likely a criminal.

If there are “unearned” advantages, it stands to reason there must be advantages that are earned. But she never says a word about them. That’s because in her mind, all *white* advantages are “unearned.” This would include those who came from nothing, worked hard and succeeded.

The most specific instances of white privilege that McIntosh identifies were listed in a 1989 article she wrote. Here are a few examples.

"I can if I wish arrange to be in the company of people of my race most of the time."

Perhaps she is not familiar with the Chinese. Unlike other Asians, no matter where they live in the world, they *choose* to segregate, preferring to live in Chinatowns. So much for "living with one's own kind" being an example of "white privilege."

"If I should need to move, I can be pretty sure of renting or purchasing housing in an area which I can afford and in which I want to live."

Are we to believe that Nigerians, who are among the most educated and wealthy of all Americans, are denied this choice? The average white person couldn't tell the difference between a black person from Nevada and a black person from Nigeria, so how can it be that Nigerians have no problem living where they want?

"I can go shopping alone most of the time, pretty well assured that I will not be followed or harassed."

This has nothing to do with race—it is entirely a function of economics. Black middle-class suburbanites do not live in fear of crime—lower-income blacks do.

"I can take a job with an affirmative action employer without having co-workers on the job suspect that I got it because of race."

Let's be honest. When a presidential candidate says to the world that I am only going to pick a "woman of color" as my running mate, and I will only pick a black woman to be on the Supreme Court, why is it so surprising that people think this

way?

What typically drives people like McIntosh to talk about white privilege is guilt.

Born Elisabeth Vance Means, her father was a trained scientist who became the head of Bell Laboratories electronic switching department. He owned and sold patents on many lucrative technologies, and amassed a small fortune in doing so. This enabled him to raise his daughter in a plush New Jersey suburb, a town where the median income was four times the national average.

Sounds like there was nothing “unearned” about his status—he earned every penny. But for her, things were different.

She attended George School, which today costs about \$50,000 a year to attend; \$73,000 for boarders. She then went to a famous finishing school, Radcliff, and from there she attended another private school, the University of London. She received her Ph.D. in English from Harvard. When she married in 1964, her wedding was highlighted in the *New York Times*’ social register.

As William Ray put it, “In other words, Peggy McIntosh was born into the very cream of America’s aristocratic elite, and has remained ensconced there ever since.” Another author who tracked her life, Graham Stewart, aptly noted that she lived “a pampered existence and had so little contact outside her Harvard-Radcliff bubble that she assumed all whites enjoy the same advantages as her...”

Guilt can immobilize some people, but in McIntosh’s case it stimulated her to indoctrinate white people, convincing them of their “unearned advantages.” To say she exploited her status with precision would be an understatement. Indeed, she is in a class of her own.

THE MAD QUEST FOR WOMEN PRIESTS

[Bill Donohue](#)

If those pushing for women priests were to learn that only women who are loyal to the teachings of the Catholic Church were to be ordained, they would oppose it. Dissidents have long hated Mother Angelica and Mother Teresa, as well as orders of nuns such as the Sisters of Life. Make no mistake, their mad quest for women priests is nothing but a mad quest for power.

On August 6, Pope Francis closed the door on women priests once again. When returning from World Youth Day in Lisbon, Portugal, he was specifically asked why, if the Church is open to everyone, does it not ordain women and support gay marriage? "The Church is open to everyone but there are laws that regulate life inside the Church," he said.

Two days later, a magazine that once supported Joseph Stalin, *The Nation*, published a piece arguing for women priests. The author cited the heroics of Victoria Rue, a champion of women priests. She is a classic advocate for this cause.

Rue has had two abortions, which helps to explain why she is a rabid advocate of abortion rights. She even considers herself to be a priest. Which raises the question: If that is the case—if this is a do-it-yourself religion—why bother lobbying to change Church teachings? But deep down, she knows she is no more a priest than a man who claims to be a woman is a woman. There appears to be no limit to delusional thinking these days.

The upcoming Synod on Synodality will draw more dissidents to push for women priests, gay marriage, etc. One of the groups promoting this agenda is the Association of U.S. Catholic Priests. It is a group of malcontents, dissident priests unhappy with Church teachings on an array of issues. They met recently in San Diego, in what were dubbed "listening sessions."

One of the priests, Fr. Kwame Assenyoh, made it clear that he had had it with listening. He called on those in attendance to start implementing some of their ideas right now in their parishes. "We should not wait for Rome to come out with a big book before we start doing things." Others urged everyone to follow the Germans, who want to Protestantize the Catholic Church. Ironically, the dissident Germans are pushing the faithful out the door. Not exactly a blueprint for success.

Ruth Fitzpatrick died in July. Almost no one ever heard of her, but there was one newspaper—and only one—in the entire world that ran an obit on her. The *New York Times*.

What was so special about this 90-year-old woman who died that inspired the *Times* to write a 1200-word obit on her, when every other media outlet ignored her? She spent her life pursuing the mad quest for women priests. She was so confident that the Church would give in to her pipe dream that she once said women priests would become a reality by 2000.

The Catholic Church, beginning with its unparalleled reverence for Our Blessed Mother, has done much to secure standing for women. This partly explains why women attend Mass more than men, and by a significant margin.

The few who continue to carp are mostly disaffected old ladies, nuns and priests, and those who have completely lost the faith, if not their minds. They are a sorry crew, and one best ignored, even by the *New York Times*.

FBI PROBE OF CATHOLICS BIGGER THAN BELIEVED

Bill Donohue

The following letter was sent to Rep. Jim Jordan today. Please contact his communications chief, Russell Dye: russell.dye@mail.house.gov

August 10, 2023

Hon. Jim Jordan
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
2056 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-3504

Dear Chairman Jordan:

Yesterday, your letter of August 9 to FBI Director Christopher Wray was made public. We are just as disturbed as you are to learn that the FBI's probe of Catholics was never confined to one field office in Richmond. From the trove of documents you received, it is now known that the FBI's Portland Field Office and the Los Angeles Field Office were also involved in this unseemly investigation.

The new documents, some of which have less redactions than the initial batch, provide evidence that Wray's comment on July 25 that the FBI's actions were limited to "a single field office" is not true. This calls into question Wray's forthrightness, and it also begs the question: What else does the FBI know about this matter?

Your request for more documentation, especially with regard to

communications between these three field offices is much appreciated. But given that the FBI has proven that it has not been transparent about this matter, Wray needs to explain why.

We also need answers to questions I raised in my letter of July 26 to you.

On what basis did the FBI conclude that these Catholics ["Radical-Traditionalist Catholics"] warranted a probe? Do they have a history of violence? If so, where is the evidence? If not, why were they singled out?"

On what basis did the FBI decide it was necessary to enlist "mainline Catholics" to spy on their fellow parishioners? Where is the evidence that ordinary practicing Catholics pose a security threat to the United States or to other law-abiding Americans? How common is it for FBI agents to infiltrate houses of worship—of any religion—employing "tripwire sources"?

Thank you for pursuing this issue. We stand ready to cooperate in any manner you desire.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

UNDERVALUING THE ROLE OF CULTURE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The role of government, the economy, and social institutions

have an enormous impact on our daily lives. Most of us understand the role that lawmakers, business leaders, and the family play in determining our wellbeing, but often underappreciated is the role that culture plays. Yet it is culture—the norms and values that serve as life's guideposts—that ultimately have the greatest affect on our lives, as well as on the other three sectors of society.

Values, the ideas of right and wrong, and norms, the standards of right and wrong, are found in the religious teachings that mark any given society. In fact, religion is the heart of culture, and it matters not a whit when and where in history: it's universally true.

To be sure, secular norms and values also may play a role in determining cultural outcomes, and this is especially true in the most developed world. No matter, it is culture, not the political, economic, or social institutions, that is the most influential force determining the makeup of individuals and society.

Why, then, is culture undervalued? It depends, to a large extent, on one's political predilections.

Conservatism, I would argue, consists of the three "M's": markets, missiles and morality. A market economy has proven to be far superior to the socialist model; missiles are necessary for national security; morality is fundamental to the ordering of the good society. Unfortunately, for many conservatives, especially libertarians, the latter "M" is not taken seriously. This is not a good sign—it smacks of self-absorption.

Liberalism these days has turned sharply left, and with it has evolved an animus against religion. The contempt shown by contemporary liberals for our Judeo-Christian heritage is stunning. Having become militant secularists, they see that heritage as an obstacle to their liberation.

These secularists dominate our institutions. Indeed, they comprise the ruling class. It is they who are trying to transform our culture by pushing critical race theory and gender ideology, the two most pernicious cultural ideas of our age.

Critical race theory holds that all white people are irredeemably racist and that every racial disparity is a reflection of racism. Never mind how insulting and inaccurate this is, it is the reigning dogma of the ruling class. Gender ideology holds that men and women can change their sex as easily as they can change their clothes. This is not only absurd, it expresses a deep-seated hostility to science.

There are some encouraging signs on the horizon. During the pandemic, moms learned how culturally corrupt many schools had become. Instead of teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, many schools played the radical race and gender game, belittling white students and abetting young people to consider changing their nature-determined sex.

Fortunately, mothers started running for school boards, and founding organizations like Moms for Liberty. This kind of social activism has also been felt outside education, even affecting beer sales, e.g., Bud Light.

We need to get back to basics. In other words, we need to stop with adopting the norms and values of the secularist woke culture and repair to our religious moorings.

In my latest book, [War on Virtue: How the Ruling Class is Killing the American Dream](#), I detail the many ways in which the elites who run our institutions have moved away from our founding principles, and the virtues that have served our society so well.

Virtue is a good habit. A culture that does not appreciate the saliency of virtue is one that will not succeed. Regrettably, the elites that run our institutions are failing in this

regard. Instead of nurturing virtue, they are denigrating it.

Cultures can change—there is no iron law of history. It is up to the people in a free society to hold its ruling class accountable and to demand change, when necessary. When our culture decomposes, everyone loses, including, ironically, those responsible for the collapse.