

MOTHER'S DAY CAN BE TRICKY FOR LGBT CROWD

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how Mother's Day is being handled by the LGBT crowd:

How do two homosexual men, who tell their adopted children that they are their fathers—which is patently untrue—tell these kids that they can't celebrate Mother's Day?

How do two lesbians, who tell their adopted children that they are their mothers—which is patently untrue—explain to these kids that they can celebrate Mother's Day with both of them, knowing full well that their friends have one mom (and a real one at that)?

When it comes to Mother's Day and Father's Day, LGBT parents and kids are in a dilemma. Many resort to lying.

Riverview Elementary School in Snohomish, Washington has cancelled Mother's Day and Father's Day. Why? Such events, school officials reason, act as "triggers" for students. What about gay pride events at the school? They're okay. They have even scheduled a drag show for children.

The U.S. Census Bureau reports that Snohomish is a Seattle suburb populated mostly by "well-educated," wealthy white people. So typical. It's almost always rich white people who have stayed in school for too long—they are not necessarily well-educated—who succumb to radical ideologies. So it is not surprising that they would want to censor Mother's Day and Father's Day.

Most African Americans, Asians and Hispanics will not cancel these days, and neither will working-class whites—just the affluent left-wing white people with college or graduate school degrees.

News stories about two strange celebrities caught in the Mother's Day quagmire were published May 9.

Marcia Gay Harden bragged that "my children are all queer." She was quite detailed about her achievement. "My eldest child is nonbinary. My son is gay. My youngest is fluid." Given the status of her "nonbinary" and "fluid" children, how can she be certain that they will celebrate Mother's Day with her? After all, they may decide that she is really their father.

Charlize Theron is equally proud of her transgender daughter, who is really her son. She is also big into drag. She recently praised men who dress as women. "We love you queens." She then threatened to retaliate against those who disapprove. "I will f*** anybody up who's trying to f*** with anything with you guys." Brilliant.

Theron has never been married, and she likes it that way. She has been in relationships with many men, including Ryan Reynolds, Stephen Jenkins, Sean Penn and Stuart Townsend. "I never wanted to get married. It was never something important to me." I,I,I. Never a reference to whether it might be important to her child to have a father. Perhaps she'll celebrate Mother's Day by bringing her kid to a drag queen show.

Those pushing transgenderism—the bizarre ideology that falsely claims we can switch our sex—are not interested in tolerance. They want affirmation, and that is not something they are entitled to. Indeed, they should be denied.

Politics should never color Mother's Day, but those in the forefront of the LGBT movement won't back off. Neither should we. This is a culture war that has nature on our side. So they can't win.

THE TWO FACES OF GOLDMAN SACHS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a legal development involving Goldman Sachs:

“Goldman Sachs is proud of its long record of promoting and advancing women and remains committed to ensuring a diverse and inclusive workplace for all our people.”

When a Goldman Sachs executive said that this week, she knew it was a lie.

Jacqueline Arthur’s statement was issued following word that Goldman Sachs had finally settled a lawsuit filed in 2010 claiming discrimination against women; the case was scheduled to go to trial next month. The financial behemoth shelled out \$215 million to settle the case brought by women plaintiffs. It also agreed to allow “independent experts” to advise them on how to treat women fairly.

In short, it is precisely because Goldman Sachs does not have a “long record of promoting and advancing women” that it had to fork over the dough.

That’s not the only thing that is unprincipled about Goldman Sachs.

On its website, it has a section called, “Diversity and Inclusion.” On p. 3, it says, “Goldman Sachs believes when women lead, everything changes.” It is too early to say if that is true: the lawsuit was filed by women who worked there as an associate or vice president in the management and securities divisions.

It is risible to read about Goldman Sachs bragging about its support for the Equal Rights Amendment: the Wall Street firm wound up in court precisely because it has a history of discriminating against women in the workplace.

What does abortion have to do with running Goldman Sachs? Nothing. But this is one women's right it supports anyway. Last year, as part of its Diversity STEM summer program, it hailed students for showing interest in "abortion rights."

This raised an interesting question: How sympathetic is Goldman Sachs to religious liberty?

As it turns out, it isn't. It is an advocate of the Equality Act, which would not only penalize Catholic doctors and Catholic hospitals for not performing abortions and sex-reassignment surgeries, it would—in an unprecedented move—exempt itself from the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the landmark religious liberty legislation signed by President Bill Clinton.

Typing "diversity and religion" into the search engine of Goldman Sachs yields 13 results, all of which are perfunctory entries. But the website is more detailed, and much more extensive, when "diversity and transgender" are entered (there are 31 such results).

Entering "diversity and sexual orientation" is even more popular; it merits 66 entries. The most popular is also the most perverse: there are 376 listings for "diversity and women."

It gets better.

When "school choice" is entered into its search engine, up pops an article about its annual Analyst Impact Fund. The 2019 article is in reference to a \$250,000 first prize given to Days for Girls. The goal of this group is to provide increased access to menstrual care and education in developing

countries.

Even more revealing is what happens when “religious liberty” is entered. The title of the piece is called, “Goldman Sachs Signs Amicus Brief Supporting Marriage Equality.”

The ruling class, as I point out in [*War on Virtue: How the Ruling Class is Killing the American Dream*](#), is not on the side of Americans who hold to traditional moral values. Just the opposite. Count Goldman Sachs among them.

WHY ARE YOUNG PEOPLE SO LONELY?

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why young people are so lonely:

“All the lonely people
Where do they all come from?
All the lonely people
Where do they all belong?”

Those questions raised by the Beatles have never been more urgent.

All the surveys show that young people are the loneliest people in the nation.

In a recent poll by the Institute of Politics at Harvard Kennedy School, it was found that nearly half (47 percent) of 18-to-29 year olds (Generation Z) reported “feeling down, depressed, or hopeless,” and a quarter of them (24 percent) have had thoughts that they would be “better off dead, or hurting themselves in some way at least several days in the

last two weeks.”

The poll further disclosed that 44 percent have been bothered by loneliness at least several days in the last few weeks; 46 percent reported “little interest or pleasure in doing things”; and 55 percent said they felt “nervous, anxious or on edge.”

This is consistent with the findings of a 2019 survey conducted by Cigna. It found that a “loneliness epidemic” had gripped the nation. This obviously had nothing to do with Covid, as the lockdowns had yet to happen.

“Unfortunately,” the researchers said, “it seems that the younger generations are feeling this the most. The study found that Loneliness scores [based on the UCLA Loneliness Scale] rose among the younger generations, with the youngest generation, Gen Z, feeling the loneliest.” Millennials were the runner-ups.

We know from many studies that the most lonely people are also the least religious, and vice versa (see my book, [*The Catholic Advantage: Why Health, Happiness and Heaven Await the Faithful*](#)).

In a study taken last year by the Survey Center of American Life of the American Enterprise Institute (AEI), it concluded that “Generation Z is the least religious generation yet.” Indeed, 34 percent of them are religiously unaffiliated. Moreover, 18 percent identify as either agnostic or atheist (split evenly between the two). “In contrast, fewer than one in 10 (9 percent) baby boomers and 4 percent of the silent generation [those in their eighties and nineties] identifies as atheist or agnostic.”

Not surprisingly, the AEI study also found that Generation Z was the most likely to say they were lonely, followed by Millennials.

The Cigna study revealed that social media is driving much of this mental health problem. "Gen Z and Millennials were identified as the loneliest generations and social media is thought to be the main contributing factor of loneliness in these younger generations." That's because they spend more time on social media than any other generation.

"Gen Z spends less time with their friends face-to-face and more time online and on social media. As we know from decades of research, people who interact with others face-to-face are less likely to be lonely. Recent research suggests that those who spend more time on social media, in contrast, are more likely to be lonely."

Virtually all of the research in this area shows that young girls are the most likely to use social media; they are also more likely than boys to feel lonely.

It all comes down to bonds. Bonding with others, and bonding with God.

Humans are social animals. When, for whatever reason, a sense of community is absent, serious mental issues arise. In my study comparing Hollywood celebrities to cloistered nuns, I found that the nuns were healthier and happier, by far. Yet our society prizes the "freedom" that the celebs enjoy. But are they happy?

Parents, teachers and the clergy have to do a better job ensuring that young people spend more time interacting with each other face-to-face and less time on social media; the bonds they would form pay big psychological dividends. It would also behoove them to nudge young people to spend more time alone bonding with God.

If this were done, we would be less likely to ask who the lonely people are, and where they all come from.

TRANS PERSONS ADMIT TO MENTAL DISORDERS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a WAP0 survey on transgender persons:

One of the most significant findings in a new KFF/*Washington Post* survey of transgender persons is not even discussed in the *Washington Post* (WAP0) news story on the poll.

The 2517-word story, published May 5, covers just about every aspect of the 26-page survey except for the issue of mental health. It is hard to believe this was an oversight.

(The survey calls transgender persons “trans” for short; this explains the adoption of this term in this account.)

- When asked about their childhood, 81 percent of all adults surveyed said it was either a very happy or somewhat happy time; only 53 percent of trans respondents answered this way.
- Only 13 percent of adults said that growing up as a child or teenager they had an alcohol or drug use problem. The figure for trans persons is more than double, 29 percent.
- When it comes to serious mental health problems, such as depression and anxiety, 32 percent of adults said they had such problems growing up. For trans adults the number is an astonishing 78 percent.

Respondents were asked how often they felt in the past 12 months about several emotional conditions. Here are the results.

- Lonely: 21 percent of adults answered always/often; 45 percent of trans answered this way.
- Hopeful: 50 percent of adults reported always/often, but only 29 percent of trans felt this way.
- Depressed: 22 percent of adults admitted to depression, but almost half, 48 percent, of trans confessed to being depressed.
- Anxious: The figure for adults was 31 percent; for trans, it was 56 percent.
- Happy: 59 percent of adults said they were happy, but only 40 percent of trans said they were.

When trans persons were asked about abnormal behaviors, the results were predictable.

- Engaged in self-harm: For adults, the number is 3 percent; it is 17 percent for trans.
- Suicidal thoughts: 16 percent of adults, and 43 percent of trans, said they thought about killing themselves.

Why didn't WAP0 mention any of this in its news story?

The conventional wisdom, as entertained by elites, is that any mental health problems that trans persons have is a result of discrimination. But that is not what the survey suggests.

- When those who identify as trans were asked if they had ever been refused health care from a health care provider, or someone else working in a health care setting, 82 percent said "no."
- When asked if they had been denied a job or a promotion, 78 said they had not.
- When asked if they had ever been evicted or denied housing, 86 said "no."

It is not societal rejection of trans males and females that is at the root of their problem—their problem lies deep within themselves. They are unhappy, lonely, depressed persons who are more likely to engage in self-destructive behaviors.

That's not normal. Their mental health problems are a reflection of their sexually confused status. They need help.

It must also be said that public policy should no more be driven by accommodating mentally disturbed trans persons than it should be driven by accommodating everyone else who has a mental disorder. It is one thing to reach out to such persons; it is quite another to restructure society in a vain attempt to rescue them.

One more thing. WAP0 is intellectually dishonest to ask respondents if they agree that gender is assigned at birth. Gender is no more "assigned" than sex is.

Gender is a sociological term that refers to the roles that society considers to be appropriate for males and females. In other words, the current usage of gender is inaccurate—what is called gender is really the sex of the person.

Moreover, our sex is never "assigned" by anyone. It is exclusively determined by our father, and it is evident at the time of conception, not birth. It is anti-science to argue otherwise.

TRUE HISTORY OF THE E.R.A.

Bill Donohue

This article originally appeared on the [American Spectator](#) on May 3, 2023.

On May 3, Kate Shaw, who teaches at Cardozo Law School, and Julie C. Suk, a law professor at Fordham, wrote an op-ed in the *New York Times* arguing that the Constitution should be amended by passing the Equal Rights Amendment. In the Senate

last week, it received 51 votes, nine shy of the 60 needed for passage.

They correctly note that the E.R.A. was first introduced in 1923, but it took until 1972 before it passed in the Congress. Next up was to garner the support of two-thirds of the states. A deadline was set for ratification within seven years, and when that failed, it was extended to 1982; it failed again.

Shaw and Suk never explain what happened between 1923 and 1972. They leave us with a very different impression why the E.R.A. bounced around for decades, saying that “progress ground to a halt in the late 1970s, just three states short, after a conservative movement led by Phyllis Schlafly ignited fear of an America without patriarchy.”

This is an inaccurate account.

The reason why the E.R.A. never went anywhere for a half century is because feminists and left-wing organizations worked against it. They were not defending patriarchy—they were opposing a deeply flawed constitutional amendment.

The following is taken from my 1985 book, *The Politics of the American Civil Liberties Union* (Transaction Press).

In the first half of the twentieth century, no woman was more influential in defending the rights of women than Eleanor Roosevelt. But her understanding of women’s rights led her to conclude that women needed special protection from hazardous and “demeaning” occupations. Those kinds of exceptions would never pass muster with the language of the E.R.A., which is why, as Peter Drucker wrote, she was supported by liberals, socialists, and reformers “of all stripes.”

Beginning in the 1940s, the ACLU entered the fray. It rejoiced in July 1946 when the E.R.A. was defeated, sarcastically calling it the “Unequal Rights Amendment.” The person who worked the hardest to defeat the E.R.A. was Judge Dorothy

Kenyon, a member of the board of directors; she chaired the ACLU's Committee on Women's Rights.

In the 1950s, the ACLU turned up the heat, working overtime to kill the E.R.A. Also taking its side was the League of Women's Voters and the American Association of University Women. The ACLU maintained that the amendment "might well freeze mathematical equality into our Constitution and stand in the way of or overrule desirable differential legislation."

The ACLU held that discrimination against women was "definitely on the way out. Only the remnants of feudalism remain." It then explained its position with surprising candor, saying something it would never say today.

"But even in this bad area there is a little good. It is accepted social policy in most countries nowadays that it is better for mothers not to have to work outside the home but to be able to stay home with their children during a short part at least of their early infancy. For this purpose husbands must contribute support for both wife and children during the period in question. Hence the need of differential laws on this subject if true equality of opportunity and sound policy are to be achieved."

This made good sociological sense then, and it makes good sociological sense today, though it is pure heresy among the ruling class, never mind the ACLU.

Throughout the entire 1960s, the ACLU remained steadfast in its opposition to the E.R.A. Led again by Judge Kenyon, the board of directors voted unanimously against it. On the board at that time were such radicals as Michael Harrington and William Kunstler.

It wasn't until 1970 that the ACLU pivoted and became an advocate of the E.R.A. Once Kenyon made the about-face, the others fell in line.

Women, however, still didn't want the amendment, and this included liberal women. In 1975, the E.R.A. was on the ballot in New York and New Jersey, and it was decisively defeated in both states. As Linda Greenhouse of the *New York Times* observed, it was women, not men, who were responsible for the defeat. They said no to the male-dominated Congress that overwhelmingly passed the E.R.A. in 1972.

According to Shaw and Suk, "The E.R.A. would protect the fundamental rights necessary to women to live as equal citizens in America." It's hard to take them seriously.

The Democrats recently voted unanimously against women's rights. Their vote against the "Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2023" was driven by their insistence that biological males should be able to compete in women's sports, effectively destroying the athletic rights of girls and women. Women's privacy rights obviously mean very little to the Left, given their conviction that men have the right to share the locker rooms and showers with women.

How ironic it is to note that for a half century, it was feminists and left-wing activists who supported women's rights by fighting the E.R.A., and now we have the specter of those same people working to destroy the rights of women in the name of promoting them.

NAVY'S DRAG QUEEN STAR DRAWS FIRE

The decision by the Navy to feature a drag queen as a recruitment model impelled Catholic League president Bill Donohue to write a strong rebuke to General Mark A. Milley;

several others were copied.

To read his letter, click [here](#).

Contact Joint Chiefs of Staff: js.pentagon.ocjcs.list.public-affairs-awareness@mail.mil

CULTURAL CORRUPTION MARKS SILICON VALLEY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the culture of Silicon Valley companies:

Silicon Valley has more than banking problems: the high tech industry is culturally corrupt. To be specific, all the talk about diversity and inclusion that the left-wing elites speak about is nothing but claptrap. In fact, it is one of the most bigoted places in America to work.

The left-wing obsession with anatomy and ancestry as markers of diversity and inclusion allows its proponents to completely exclude people whose ideas they loathe. That means conservatives and Christians.

Lincoln Network, a community of free-market tech professionals, conducted a survey in late 2017 and early 2018 of tech professionals in Silicon Valley. The focus was on ideology and workplace norms. The findings remove any doubt about the extent of cultural corruption that exists. Here are six of the conclusions.

- A large majority consider their workplace liberal or very liberal.
- Most feel their views are at odds with the cultural

norms in their workplace.

- Most do not feel comfortable sharing their views on political or cultural issues...
- A significant number cannot do their best work because their ideological views are at odds with their workplace norms.
- A large majority cannot bring their whole selves to work.
- Some know someone who did not pursue or left a career in tech because of perceived conflicts in viewpoints.

Tim Ferriss is an investor and an author who describes himself as “very socially liberal.” He moved from Silicon Valley to Austin, Texas because “Silicon Valley [...] has an insidious infection that is spreading—a peculiar form of McCarthyism [...] masquerading as liberal open-mindedness.” Sam Altman, a venture capitalist, concurs, saying he “felt more comfortable discussing controversial ideas in Beijing than in San Francisco.”

“I have been retaliated against, bullied, verbally intimidated and subject to ridicule for my own opinions that are not accepted by corporate majority rule.” Those are the reflections of a middle-age tech libertarian woman whose experience in Silicon Valley is commonplace.

A male Google employee said he moved from very liberal to conservative after undergoing a “reign of terror” by senior left-wing staff. One of his co-workers admitted that “I have lost multiple talented colleagues who resigned rather than continue in the face of increasingly extreme, narrowminded, and regressive environment here at Google.”

Roughly half (48 percent) of those who work in Silicon Valley are self-described atheists or agnostics. Many don’t like Christians.

Those who are religious attribute the animus to a “postmodern

secularist Silicon Valley viewpoint.” Others note that the “quietest” employees are “conservative Christians that don’t want to risk the perceived ire of an obviously non-Christian non-conservative majority.” Another worker confessed, “I would definitely be worried about professional repercussions if people knew my political and religious views.”

Religious employees are careful about wearing their religion on their sleeve. Here’s how one worker put it. “People in my workplace certainly can’t know who I really am.” He said, “a lot of people have this mindset that intellectually capable, smart people are atheist and rational.”

Similarly, a tech employee at LinkedIn opined, “When colleagues go off on jeremiads about how terrible Christians are, I infer that if they knew I was a Christian, they would not like it.” A software developer who is gay, Christian and a lifelong Democrat said he avoids sharing his views because “any sort of disagreement would make them wonder if I’m a secret Trump supporter.”

There is plenty of evidence beyond the Lincoln Network survey that shows how things work in Silicon Valley. In a piece posted on Vox, the reporter said, “Silicon Valley is a young atheist’s world,” but quickly noted, “that’s becoming a problem.” Specifically, it’s a problem for older employees who “belong to a traditional religion.”

It’s wise for such people to keep their mouth shut. As one woman put it, her colleagues are shocked to learn she is religious. “What, really?” is a typical response. That is why she avoids mentioning her religion. When she does, “she feels the need to explain her faith to reassure previously skeptical parties that she is ‘rational.’”

HBO’s “Silicon Valley” satirized the intolerant tech sector. In one episode, it depicted a gay man who is religious. They were “shocked to learn that he goes to church.” Another

character admitted that Christianity “freaks people out in the Valley.”

Peter Rex, a CEO who worked there, said there is truth to the satire. He said, “I’ve experienced a combination of hesitation and hostility toward my Catholic faith.” He flatly says, “There is discrimination against Christians in Silicon Valley.”

Is it any surprise that Daniel Dennett is one of Silicon Valley’s most popular guest speakers? He is one of America’s most influential atheist writers.

Why is it that everywhere the left-wing elite exist—the university, the foundations, Silicon Valley, the media, the entertainment industry—the last thing they prize is diversity of thought? Are they that insecure of their own convictions that they must trample on freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of religion? Must be so.

HOW TO END THE BUD LIGHT CONTROVERSY

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wrote a letter today to Brendan Whitworth, the CEO of Anheuser-Busch, explaining his concerns about the Human Rights Campaign pressuring him to stand by Dylan Mulvaney, the transgender person who ignited the Bud Light controversy.

There is a way to end this controversy. To read Donohue’s letter, click [here](#). (We are contacting many more officials at the company.)

Contact Mr. Whitworth: brendan.whitworth@anheuser-busch.com