

# DO DEMOCRATS HAVE A PENCHANT FOR VIOLENCE?

[Bill Donohue](#)

There are extremists in both the Republican and Democrat parties, and some support violence to achieve their goals; this is true even among some self-described independents. But the enthusiasm for violence is clearly more popular among Democrats.

In a large survey recently released by the Chicago Project on Security & Threats, which is affiliated with the University of Chicago, researchers tapped hot button issues for Republicans and Democrats, seeking to measure support for violence. For Republicans, the issue was Trump; for Democrats it was abortion.

The report, "Dangers to Democracy," found that 6.8 percent of Americans agreed that "the use of force is justified to restore Donald Trump to the presidency." Among Republicans the figure was 9.5 percent. It also found that 12.3 percent of Americans agreed that "the use of force is justified to restore the federal right to abortion." Among Democrats, the figure was 16.4 percent.

The Democrats were also the more likely than Republicans to favor using violence to attain other goals.

One in four Democrats (25.6 percent) say "the use of force is justified to protect the voting rights of Black Americans and other minorities." But when it comes to using force "to prevent the teaching of CRT [critical race theory] in schools," far fewer Republicans (14.6 percent) were inclined to violence.

Among Democrats, 16.3 percent are in favor of using force

“against the police to prevent police brutality against Black Americans and other minorities.” When Republicans are asked if the use of force is justified “to preserve the rights of whites,” 9.9 percent agree.

The inescapable conclusion is that Democrats are more comfortable endorsing violence to accomplish their goals than Republicans are in achieving their ends.

It is striking that neither the authors of the report, nor the media who covered this story, decided to highlight this conclusion. Indeed, an article by The Hill on the survey only mentions Republicans who support violence over the treatment of Trump, never mentioning that hot button issues for Democrats elicit more support for force.

Why are Democrats more supportive of violence than Republicans? They are the party which adopts the most aggressive forms of political persuasion. They favor direct intervention, including blocking traffic, shouting down conservatives on campus, free speech gags, and unauthorized street demonstrations. Not surprisingly, they are the party that was supportive of the violence committed by Antifa and Black Lives Matter. They are also the party of abortion.

Sometimes it’s not hard to connect the dots.

---

# LIONIZING SINEAD IS UNWARRANTED

[Bill Donohue](#)

Sinead O’Connor is being lionized for her “bravery” in ripping

up a picture of Pope John Paul II on "Saturday Night Live" in 1992. Her fans are commending her for calling attention to clergy sexual abuse. The reaction has been effusive.

"She was proved right" says Harvard Law School instructor Alejandra Caraballo. Brenna Moore, who teaches theology at Fordham, called her "a kind of prophetic truth-teller." America magazine senior editor James T. Keane wants to know "when are we going to apologize to her?" Indeed, there is a Facebook page called, "Apologize to Sinead O'Connor NOW."

If a Martian landed today and read this he might well conclude that Sinead was a scholar who commanded great prescience. In fact, she was a troubled soul who was badly educated (I know because I debated her on TV). She was no more a "truth-teller" than are her fans who have written on this subject.

The truth is that anyone who talks about clergy sexual abuse and refuses to tell the truth about the oversized role played by homosexuals is either ignorant or dishonest: they were responsible for 8 in 10 cases of molestation. And they got away with it because of the gay subculture that orchestrated the cover-up. All of this is detailed in my book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*.

The Associated Press (AP) has an embarrassing article on Sinead. It cites as authoritative the pro-Sinead remarks of David Clohessy, the man who once headed the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP). He had to leave in disgrace. As I show in my book, he was shown to be an utter fraud. I am delighted that the Catholic League played a major role in his ouster.

AP reports that Clohessy was in his early 30s when Sinead pulled her "SNL" stunt. It says that "he had only recently recalled the repressed memories of the abuse he suffered." Never mind that the idea of "repressed memory" has been

thoroughly discredited—no serious psychologist defends it anymore—Clohessy has said that his memory of what allegedly happened to him was jarred when he and his fiancée were watching a Barbra Streisand movie. That would do it.

Michael McDonnell is quoted in the AP article speaking favorably about Sinead. He is identified as the “interim executive director” of SNAP. Poor Mike has been the “interim director” for quite some time now. The reason he is still “interim” is because SNAP does not exist anymore. It’s nothing but his cell phone.

AP also cites comments by Jamie Manson, the lesbian head of an anti-Catholic pro-abortion group, Catholics for Choice. Manson said that when Sinead ripped up the picture of the pope she was “feeling a call to the priesthood at the time.” Now if a male Catholic activist said he once felt called to be a nun, wouldn’t it make sense to call the mental health hotline?

Molly Olmstead at Slate wrote a beauty. She goes after Pope John Paul II for his “role” in covering up the scandal. The link she provides is to a story by National Public Radio saying the pope was aware of accusations against homosexual predator, and former cardinal, Theodore McCarrick.

The pope should have listened to New York Archbishop John Cardinal O’Connor. He had McCarrick’s number and explained in detail to the Vatican why he was alarmed. Instead the pope was persuaded by two high-ranking Vatican officials who took McCarrick’s side. He heeded the wrong advice, but this is not the same as instituting a cover-up.

Olmstead resurrects fictitious tales about the Magdalene Laundries, where Sinead stayed, so she can bash the Catholic Church. As I recount in my monograph, “Myths of the Magdalene Laundries,” data contained in what is known as the “McAleese Report” demonstrate that these homes for wayward girls that were run by nuns were not anything like its harshest critics

have alleged. No one was imprisoned, forced to stay or engage in slave labor. Not a single woman was sexually abused by a nun. Not one. It is all a lie.

It is true that Sinead was sexually abused. But not by a nun—it was her own mother who molested her. So it was hardly surprising that her father decided that she would be better off being taken care of by the nuns.

Olmstead says that “Bill Donohue of the Catholic League led the public charge against O’Connor back in 1992,” I would have been happy to do so, but I didn’t become president until 1993.

---

## **SINEAD O’CONNOR DEAD AT 56**

[Bill Donohue](#)

Irish singer Sinead O’Connor has passed way at age 56.

In her better years, O’Connor sold millions of record albums, winning a Grammy for her work.

She became an overnight sensation in 1992 when she appeared on “Saturday Night Live” and ripped up a picture of Pope John Paul II. Her antics, often controversial, were condemned not only by rank-and-file Catholics, but by celebrities such as Madonna and Frank Sinatra.

The “SNL” stunt was uncalled for, but it was her advocacy of violence that was more disturbing. In 2011, she warned Pope Benedict XVI not to come to Ireland, saying that if he did there would be a “f\*\*\*in bloodbath.”

O’Connor was also delusional, perhaps a reflection of her drug habits. In 1999, she announced that she had become a priest;

she even wore priestly attire. She described herself as Mother Bernadette Mary and claimed the authority to say Mass and administer the Sacraments.

When I was asked about this, I told *The Star* she “must be hallucinating. Next week, she’ll be a Buddhist monk. The week after, maybe she’ll turn into an Orthodox rabbi. She is no more a priest than I am a camel. The woman is obviously certifiably crazy.”

I once debated her on Larry King’s CNN show on the subject of clergy sexual abuse. The discussion floundered when I mentioned that most of the victims were postpubescent, meaning that it was homosexual priests, not pedophiles, who were the offenders. She asked, “What does postpubescent mean?”

O’Connor was a victim of child abuse and her travails were long standing. In 1997, she admitted, “I’ve been a very troubled person.” So true. She had at least two abortions, suffered from mental health issues, and contemplated suicide; her son killed himself last year at 17.

May she find peace at last.

---

## FBI REPLIES TO JORDAN—MORE ANSWERS NEEDED

[Bill Donohue](#)

We sent the following letter to Rep. Jim Jordan today (we urge you to contact his communications director, Russell Dye: [russell.dye@mail.house.gov](mailto:russell.dye@mail.house.gov)).

July 26, 2023

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

Dear Chairman Jordan:

In my letter of July 24, emailed to you that day, I asked that you follow through in your pursuit of having FBI Director Christopher Wray submit documents you requested regarding the agency's probe of Catholics. You did just that: On July 25, he handed over documents pertaining to this issue. It is reported that your team will now review the documents and then decide what to do next.

I commend you for your work. Finally, Catholics have someone who listens to their concerns and acts on them.

In Wray's July 25 letter to you, he asks the House Judiciary Committee not to publicly disclose information in the documents without prior consultation with the FBI. I trust you will act prudently. In your review of the documents, I would like to raise some questions relevant to this inquiry that are of importance to the Catholic community. It is my hope that the FBI will release information that satisfies my concerns.

We know from a January 23 internal memo that the FBI's Richmond Field Office was conducting an investigation of "Radical-Traditionalist Catholics," particularly those who prefer the "Traditional Latin Mass." At least one undercover agent was involved.

*Question 1: On what basis did the FBI conclude that these Catholics warranted a probe? Do they have a history of violence? If so, where is the evidence? If not, why were they singled out?*

In your April 10 letter to Wray, you comment on FBI documents

you received on March 23. What you said about the FBI's probe of "mainline Catholics" was especially disturbing.

"The FBI similarly noted two other opportunities to engage in outreach with religious institutions in the Richmond area, citing a desire 'to sensitize the congregation to the warning signs of radicalization and enlist their assistance to serve as suspicious activity tripwires.' This outreach plan even included contacting so-called 'mainline Catholic parishes,' and the local 'diocesan leadership.'"

*Question 2: 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 your efforts. If there is anything the Catholic League can do to be of assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

cc: Christopher Wray

---

# **ANTI-CATHOLIC BIGOTS ATTACK**



# LEONARD LEO

[Bill Donohue](#)

Leonard Leo, co-chairman of the Federalist Society, and the man most responsible for shepherding through President Trump's appointments to the federal bench, including three Supreme Court Justices, is being attacked by anti-Catholic bigots in his hometown in Maine, simply because left-wing extremists object to his work.

The protesters, who are doxxing Leo by showing up at his house in Northeast Harbor, are not content to object to his jurisprudential philosophy. No, they are viciously attacking his Catholicism.

On July 22, protesters carried signs denouncing his religion and pledging to run him out of town. Leo, who is a member of Opus Dei, a traditional Catholic organization in good standing in the Church, was condemned for his membership in the group.

Anti-Catholic banners read, "Rosaries Off Ovaries," and a recently created website depicted him as a Ku Klux Klan member (the Klan was anti-Catholic, as well as anti-black and anti-Jewish). His Catholicism was also targeted on social media. He was called a rapist and accused of violating women's uteruses.

This is what happens when civility breaks down and demagoguery triumphs. The population control crowd, beginning with Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger, has a long history of anti-Catholicism. Today's iteration is even more virulent, and in some cases, such as with Antifa and Jane's Revenge, anti-Catholic bigots turn violent, especially when the issue of abortion is prominent.

What happened to Leo should be condemned by all men and women, independent of what side they choose on the subject of

abortion.

Anti-Catholic bigotry, and angry protests outside the home of a public person, have no legitimate place in public dialogue. But to those who can't marshal a plausible defense of their abortion politics, resorting to bigotry comes naturally to them.

---

# TIME TO REIN IN FBI OVER CATHOLIC PROBES

**Bill Donohue**

We sent the following letter to Rep. Jim Jordan today (we urge you to contact his communications director, Russell Dye: [russell.dye@mail.house.gov](mailto:russell.dye@mail.house.gov)).

July 24, 2023

Hon. Jim Jordan  
2056 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-3504

Dear Rep. Jordan:

On July 17, in your role as House Judiciary Chairman, you said you notified FBI Director Christopher Wray that he had until July 25 to turn over requested documents pertaining to the agency's probe of orthodox Catholics; he has heretofore not fully complied with two subpoenas issued earlier this year. The deadline is tomorrow at noon. If he does not comply with your request, it is important that you follow through with your pledge and hold him accountable.

On April 11, 2023, I wrote a letter to Wray, copying you, about my concerns over this issue.

“We know from previous disclosures that the FBI was probing ‘Radical-Traditionalist Catholics’ (RTCs). To this day, we have not seen any evidence that they are a threat to anyone. Now the FBI has upped the ante, going after ‘mainline’ Catholics and dioceses.

“On February 9, I made public my concerns about the FBI’s interest in RTCs. ‘What’s next?’ Will it be a war on ‘Catholics who are orthodox?’”

My hunch that there would be a war on orthodox Catholics came true.

This is totally indefensible. It smacks of religious profiling and opens the FBI door to monitoring traditional Catholics, simply because they are loyal sons and daughters of the Catholic Church.

I commend you for your leadership on this matter. If Wray does not meet the deadline, I implore you to “take action” against him, as you said you would do.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

cc: Director Christopher Wray, Federal Bureau of Investigation

---

# ANOTHER JESUIT-RUN SCHOOL TANKS ON FREE SPEECH

[Bill Donohue](#)

For the past several years, the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) has published a survey on the status of free speech on college campuses. In my [remarks](#) on the 2021 study, I pointed out that three Jesuit-run institutions—Fordham University, Boston College and Marquette University—were listed among the worst in the nation. In the 2022-2023 survey, another Jesuit school, Georgetown, was rated #200. Only three schools out of a total of 203 were rated worse; Columbia University was dead last.

Georgetown shows such contempt for free speech that it merited a special section in the study. Three specific cases, all very serious, were cited.

In 2022, Ilya Shapiro was suspended over a tweet thread in which he criticized President Biden's pledge to nominate a black woman to the Supreme Court. Dean William Treanor issued a statement denouncing the tweets, insisting that Georgetown is committed to "inclusion, belonging, and respect for diversity." [Note: Treanor said nothing about Georgetown's commitment to academic freedom.] Shapiro was eventually reinstated, but the damage was done; he subsequently resigned.

In 2021, Sandra Sellers was fired over a viral video in which she was unknowingly recorded talking to her colleague, David Batson, about the relatively poor performance of black students in her class. Dean Treanor condemned the two of them, pledging commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion. Batson later resigned following the backlash.

In 2021, Timothy Wickham-Crowley made jokes in class that evoked racial stereotypes and for dropping the n-word when

reading aloud from a course textbook. He was investigated by the Office of Institutional Diversity, Equity, and Affirmative Action. While it was determined that his conduct was not “severe or pervasive,” he was no longer asked to teach again.

These incidents say nothing about the way students, especially conservative students, feel about freely expressing their thoughts on campus. But Georgetown didn’t earn a lousy rating on the basis of muzzling the free speech of faculty alone.

It should be pointed out that Georgetown’s fidelity to Catholic teachings has long been questioned. It has two pro-abortion clubs on campus: H\*YAS for Choice for undergraduates, and Georgetown Law Students for Reproductive Justice. It has no racist clubs on campus—nor should it—but it has no problem allowing pro-abortion clubs. For liberals, racism is clearly more offensive than child abuse in the womb.

As I said with regard to Fordham, Boston College and Marquette, the time has come for these schools “to have a campus-wide forum on the root causes of Jesuit intolerance for freedom of speech.” Georgetown needs to do the same.

---

## **FREE SPEECH ON CAMPUS: JESUIT-RUN SCHOOLS DO POORLY**

**Bill Donohue**

The Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) has published the results of a comprehensive survey of over 37,000 students at over 150 colleges and universities; the survey was taken in 2021. [The 2022-2023 survey results were subsequently released.]

The subject of the survey is the extent to which freedom of speech is honored on college campuses. The findings are not sanguine, and this is particularly true of Jesuit-run schools.

The overall state of free speech on campus is not good. Here are a few examples found in the survey.

- More than 80% of students reported self-censoring their viewpoints at their colleges at least some of the time.
- More than 50% of students identified racial inequality as a difficult topic to discuss on their campus.
- Two-thirds of students (66%) say it is acceptable to shout down a speaker to prevent them from speaking on campus.
- Almost one in four (23%) say it is acceptable to use violence to stop campus speech.

As I've long said, there is more free speech allowed at your local pub than there is at your local college campus. This proves it. Moreover, whatever happened to the "peace loving" reputation of college kids—almost one in four say it's okay to violently attack someone who says something disagreeable.

Marxism in practice, of course, has a long trail of bloodshed, and it is Marxism, in its cultural iteration, that is popular on college campuses these days. It's not hard to connect the dots.

Of the 154 colleges listed in FIRE's 2021 Campus Free Speech Rankings, the five schools with the best free speech rating, are, from top to bottom:

Claremont McKenna  
University of Chicago  
University of New Hampshire  
Emory University  
Florida State University

The five worst, beginning with the worst, are:

DePauw University  
Marquette University  
Louisiana State University  
Boston College  
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

FIRE awarded Rensselaer Polytechnic its lifetime censorship award.

It may surprise some to learn that sixteen of the twenty schools that scored the lowest are private institutions, while sixteen of the twenty highest free speech institutions are public institutions.

Some other surprises include schools like the University of Mississippi weighing in at #11, while Harvard was near the bottom at #130; Princeton was #135.

Most people would expect the results to be the opposite, given the prestige of Harvard and Princeton. Maybe the Ivies would benefit by hiring faculty such as University of Mississippi law professor Ronald Rychlak (he is a member of our board of advisors): he co-founded and chaired The Declaration of Independence Center for Study of American Freedom at Ole Miss. Maybe they can hire him so he can “reeducate” the professoriate.

Regarding Catholic institutions, none were in the top twenty. In fact, none were in the top one hundred. But there were three among the worst: Fordham was tenth from the bottom (#145); Boston College was fourth from the bottom (#151) and Marquette was second to last (#153). All three are Jesuit-run institutions.

While Fordham is a disgrace, it is clear from reading the report that Boston College and Marquette are much worse. Free speech is so under fire at Marquette that the FIRE gave it special mention.

“For two years running—in 2015 and 2016 (for the years 2014 and 2015)—FIRE named Marquette one of the ten worst colleges for free speech because of its attempts to revoke the tenure of Professor John McAdams and then terminate him. It took more than three years, but McAdams ultimately won his lawsuit against the university and was reinstated to his faculty position in the fall of 2018.”

What did McAdams do that made a faculty panel recommend sanctions against him? He complained when a graduate instructor tried to muzzle the free speech of a conservative student. In November 2014, McAdams criticized Cheryl Abbate for telling a student she would no longer tolerate his position objecting to gay marriage in her ethics class. McAdams was subsequently fired. He sued.

In July 2018, Marquette said it would comply with a court order from the Wisconsin Supreme Court to reinstate McAdams. Abbate was not just a graduate student—she was paid as an instructor by the university.

It was the free speech of McAdams that was endangered, not Abbate’s. Indeed, she was the one who was guilty of stifling free speech, and by a student who defended the Church’s teachings on marriage at a supposedly Catholic university!

Previously, in 2014, the Catholic League criticized Marquette for telling employees at an “anti-harassment” training presentation that merely voicing objections to gay marriage may be considered discriminatory; they were urged to report such offenses. At that time, I raised the following question. “Would they bring the pope up on charges following a speech on marriage?”

What’s going on at these Jesuit schools? Why are they breeding such intolerance? The time has come for those who run Fordham, Boston College and Marquette to have a campus-wide forum on the root causes of Jesuit intolerance for freedom of speech.



---

# CLERGY                      SEXUAL                      ABUSE DISAPPEARING

[Bill Donohue](#)

The clergy sexual abuse scandal in the Catholic Church has long been over and now it is practically non-existent. To be sure, there continues to be a tiny fraction of the clergy who are offenders, but it has long since been of the magnitude of a scandal. But don't look to the media to tell you this. And don't take my word for it—just consult the data.

On p. 41 of the recently released *2022 Annual Report on the Implementation of the "Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People,"* it lists data on credible allegations against the clergy made between 2004 and 2022:

- 2 percent occurred or began in the 2000s
- 1 percent occurred or began in the 2010s
- Less than 1 percent occurred or began between 2020 and 2022

In short, contemporary news reports about priestly sexual abuse *are almost always about alleged offenses that took place decades ago* (the 1970s was the worst decade). Quite frankly, as we have known, and as this report makes plain, almost all the abusers are either dead or have been thrown out of ministry.

The *2022 Annual Report* considers allegations made between July 1, 2021 and June 30, 2022. It found that there were 16 allegations made by minors during that time, seven of which were substantiated. That means that of the 52,387 members of the clergy (34,344 priests and 18,043 deacons), .013 percent

of them had a substantiated allegation made against him.

Importantly, in the first half of 2022, the number of *allegations*—(not *allegations that have been substantiated*)—was zero. This should have been highlighted by the authors of the report.

There is no organization in the nation, where adults regularly interact with minors, which has a better record than this. This includes religious as well as secular institutions.

The audit fielded allegations extending back to the 1930s. Almost all of the victims were male (82 percent of diocesan/eparchy priests, and 83 percent of religious order priests). Moreover, the majority of the victims were postpubescent (10 years of age and over).

The conclusion should be obvious to those not living in a state of denial: most of the molestation was done by homosexuals, not pedophiles. When adult males have sex with postpubescent males, that is called homosexuality. The offending priest may consider himself not to be a homosexual, but that subjective opinion does not change the truth. He may consider himself to be a woman, but that has no bearing on reality.

In the period under review, most of the 16 allegations were made by females. This indicates that the crackdown on homosexuals in the priesthood has been successful. The heyday of the scandal was between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s; this was also the period when the Church dropped its guard and allowed homosexuals to thrive in some seminaries and in the priesthood.

Credit must be given to Pope Benedict XVI who instituted a policy that discouraged men with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” from applying to the priesthood. Fortunately, Pope Francis has continued this commonsensical policy. Together with the reforms established by the bishops in the United

States, this explains why cases of molestation have crashed.

This is good news. But for many reasons, those in and out of the Catholic Church, are reluctant to flag it. That's too bad. We will.

To learn how the scandal unfolded, see my book, [\*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes\*](#); it is available on Amazon.

---

## DISNEY STILL REELING FROM BLOWBACK

[Bill Donohue](#)

Bob Iger has been hanging around Disney seemingly forever, and every time he quits, he re-retires (he's done so at least three times).

When he left as CEO in 2021, he managed to become executive chairman, keeping an eye on his successor, Bob Chapek. Last November, Chapek was shown the door, and Iger jumped back in the saddle as CEO again. He was supposed to retire at the end of 2024, but now that date has been extended to December 31, 2026. He definitely has a grip on the Disney board.

In 2021, Iger's total compensation was \$46 million, more than double what he earned the previous year. His new contract includes an annual bonus equal to 500 percent of his annual salary. Disney chairman Mark Parker says he's worth every penny of it. But is he?

Iger has been busy cutting costs: 7,000 employees lost their job, saving Disney \$5.5 billion. The bread and butter of

Disney has long been TV (which includes ESPN), but its earnings have taken a major hit. Iger is banking on revenue from streaming services, but that isn't working out too well: it is losing subscribers, and the streaming division has lost more than \$10 billion since it launched its flagship service Disney+ in late 2019.

Disney movies are tanking at the box office. "Elemental," the Pixar film with a "non-binary" character, posted a budget of \$200 million *before* publicity costs; the only question left is how big a hit it will take. Its first weekend box office receipts of \$29.5 million was Disney's worst-ever opening weekend tally. It is estimated that it needs to make \$400 million in order to turn a profit. Good luck on that.

Hopes were high at Disney for "The Little Mermaid" and "Indiana Jones and the Dial of Destiny," but no longer. In both cases, some trendy elements were added, but the public didn't bite. By contrast, consider how well some other Disney movies have done.

"Raiders of the Lost Ark"

Budget	\$18 million
Box Office	\$390 million

"Temple of Doom"

Budget	\$28 million
Box Office	\$333 million

"The Last Crusade"

Budget	\$48 million
Box Office	\$474 million

"Kingdom of the Crystal Skull"

Budget	\$185 million
Box Office	\$790 million

*Grand Total:*

Budget	\$279 million
--------	---------------

Box Office

\$1.987 billion

Even the famous Disney parks are not lighting up the sky; traffic is way down. Hollywood Studios had the third-slowest day on July 4 in the past year, not exactly a good omen moving forward. The Magic Kingdom park, famous for its long lines, is now a short wait. One reason for this is the ever-increasing cost of tickets. Families are fed up.

Shareholders are also not happy with Disney's performance. Its share price is trading at around \$90 or less, the worst outcome in a decade. Two years ago shares were \$190. Since Iger's return, Disney's stock is down 2 percent. Worse, Disney is sky-high in debt, owing \$45 billion. This is not sustainable.

It is more than increasing costs that are plaguing Disney: a series of bad decisions, offending Americans who hold to the traditional moral values that Walt Disney represented, are to blame. By pushing the gay and trans agenda, it has turned off parents across the country.

The Catholic League's award-winning documentary, "Walt's Disenchanted Kingdom," debuted in January and has been seen by millions of viewers; it is available on several platforms, including [Amazon Prime](#). It details how the once family-friendly giant turned against its base by getting in bed with left-wing activists and educators.

I have been clashing with Iger for decades, extending back to the mid-1990s when Disney bought out ABC; he was the head honcho. He presided over a whole lot of anti-Catholic fare.

Iger is partly to blame for this sorry outcome. It remains to be seen if Disney will shed its woke brand of politics and get back to normal. If it doesn't, it will get what it deserves.