GARLAND'S STUNNING IGNORANCE OF JANE'S REVENGE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Attorney General Merrick Garland's comments yesterday:

It was not a good day for U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland. He got his clocked cleaned by several members of the Senate Judiciary Committee. His failure to stem the tide of violence against pro-life Americans, many of whom are Catholic, is not debatable.

As Sen. Mike Lee pointed out yesterday, there have been 81 violent attacks on pro-life crisis pregnancy centers, and 130 attacks on Catholic churches, but only two persons have been charged. Yet the Department of Justice (DOJ) has brought charges against 34 non-violent pro-life protesters. This is purely a function of politics. There is no other rational explanation for such a glowing disparity.

No domestic terrorist group has been more vocal and active in violently attacking pro-life individuals and institutions than Jane's Revenge. They have claimed responsibility for at least 18 violent attacks on pro-life centers since the leak of the Supreme Court decision that overturned *Roe v. Wade*.

It is bad enough that Garland's DOJ has been missing in action in prosecuting Jane's Revenge, it is mind-blowing to learn that Garland claims not to have known who they are until yesterday!

Here is what Sen. Marsha Blackburn said to him yesterday. "You told me earlier that you didn't know who Jane's Revenge is. They are all over Twitter." Garland did not contest what she attributed to him.

Assuming he is not lying, why is it that no one on his staff

ever bothered to apprise him of Jane's Revenge? It's not as though he hasn't been contacted about their violence.

On June 10, 2022, Sen. Marco Rubio wrote to Garland about "radical pro-abortion groups, like Jane's Revenge, that have relentlessly targeted pro-life centers, groups, and churches with arson, vandalism, and violence due to their pro-life views."

On June 15, Rubio again wrote to Garland about Jane's Revenge, saying they have now "doubled-down on its commitment to violence, threats and intimidation, writing that the 'leash is off' and it is now 'open season' on any pro-life group that refuses to close its doors."

On June 16, 2022, Sen. Tom Cotton said Garland should resign over the DOJ's failure to deal with Jane's Revenge violence. "Houses of worship and pro-life pregnancy centers are under attack."

On June 17, 2022, I wrote to Garland. "We have witnessed a rash of vandalism against Catholic churches, firebombings of crisis pregnancy centers (many of which are run by Catholics), Masses being interrupted, illegal protests outside the homes of Catholic Supreme Court Justices, and an attempted murder of one of the Catholic Justices. While there are several groups involved in these attacks, none is more dangerous than Jane's Revenge.

"Jane's Revenge is a domestic terrorist group, par excellence. Recently formed, it brags about blowing up crisis pregnancy centers. Worse, it is calling for a 'Night of Rage' on the day the Supreme Court is expected to overturn *Roe v. Wade*."

I ended by asking him to take "aggressive action" against Jane's Revenge.

Even though Rubio, Cotton and I independently alerted Garland to Jane's Revenge, he appears positively clueless as to who

they are. His ignorance is stunning.

Sen. Cotton is right—Garland should resign. If he doesn't, he should be impeached.

Contact Kristen Clarke, Assistant AG: kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov

---

NYC MAYOR ANGERS SECULARISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on remarks made by the mayor of New York:

New York City Mayor Eric Adams angered secularists yesterday when he spoke at an interfaith breakfast event. After his closest aide, Ingrid Lewis-Martin, introduced him as someone who "doesn't believe" in separation of church and state, her boss took the stage and said, "Ingrid is so right." "Don't tell me about no separation of church and state. State is the body. Church is the heart. You take the heart out of the body, the body dies."

Adams continued this line of thought, saying, "I can't separate my belief because I'm an elected official." He then made an observation that was just as contentious. "When we took prayers out of schools, guns came into schools."

As expected, this didn't sit well with left-wing secularists and their religious next of kin. Rabbi Abby Stein, who is an LGBT activist, said Adams' remarks were "unhinged and dangerous." Donna Lieberman of the New York Civil Liberties Union, a militant secular organization, said his comments left her "speechless."

Fabien Levy, a spokesman for Adams, said that Adams was merely trying to show that faith guides his actions. That is no doubt

true. Adams has been in office long enough for us to know if he was literally attempting to abridge the First Amendment rights of New Yorkers.

It is paradoxical, to say the least, to hear left-wing activists hyperventilate over Adams' speech. The fact is there is a very real threat to separation of church and state these days, and it is coming from organizations like the ACLU: they are using the state to encroach on the rights of the faithful. It is not the church that is busy abridging the rights of the state; it is the other way around.

When secularists like the ACLU lobbying for the Equality Act—which would allow the state to tell Catholic doctors and hospitals that they must perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgeries—they are showing their contempt for separation of church and state.

While it is too facile to contend that when prayer was banned in the schools, guns came in, it is nonetheless true that over the past half century the schools have become radically secularized, triggering a series of social problems. So Adams' more general point merits attention.

It is also interesting to hear the ACLU whine over Adams' remarks about separation of church and state when it *never* criticizes Adams, or other black public officials, when they take to the pulpit and make blatantly political speeches in churches when running for office.

Similarly, none of these secularists, who are usually big fans of diversity, bothered to criticize Adams for his guest list of speakers. He is a Protestant, and those invited to speak were Jewish, Buddhist and Muslim leaders. In a city that is heavily Catholic, why was no Catholic leader invited to speak?

If Adams wants to win the support of churchgoing New Yorkers, he needs to step up to the plate and take on those school officials and teachers who are trying to sexualize children:

they have no right to invite students to question their nature-determined sex status. That is a true violation of the religious rights of their parents. First Amendment anyone?