

THE RACIAL POLITICS OF SMOKING

[Bill Donohue](#)

Democrats in many parts of the country have endorsed the legalization of marijuana, and the Biden administration is pushing hard to deemphasize its negative effects. Ironically, the Biden team is hell bent on banning menthol cigarettes. From a public health perspective, none of this makes any sense.

The Department of Health and Human Services wants marijuana use to be treated as a Schedule III drug, which would put it in the same class as Tylenol with codeine; currently pot is treated as Schedule I, meaning it is treated as a serious drug.

What gives? Al Sharpton's National Action Network, the NAACP and the ACLU don't want a ban on menthol cigarettes. Why? To these activists, every issue, no matter how trivial, is seen through a racial lens. Sharpton said it best. "A menthol ban would severely target and harm African American smokers, who overwhelmingly prefer menthol cigarettes."

Sharpton did not address the health effects of smoking cigarettes or marijuana—his mind is exclusively fixated on the racial dimension. So is the Biden administration. Interestingly, it goes the other way, maintaining that *because* menthol use is popular with blacks, that smacks of racism. The one thing they agree on is that racism is everywhere.

But given the pushback—this is an election year—it looks like the Biden campaign to ban the menthol brand is going up in smoke.

In 2018, Sharpton came out strongly in favor of legalizing

marijuana. He never addressed the health effects. It was simply a matter of racial justice. He called it a “civil rights cause,” citing statistics that show blacks being arrested for marijuana use more than whites.

What would it take for the Biden administration, and the African American elite, to conclude that marijuana legalization poses a clear and present danger to the health of those who use it? Former Harlem Congressman Charles Rangel recognized this years ago, but today there are few minority leaders taking his side.

After legalizing marijuana six years ago in California, gang activity and violent crime is on the rise. Colorado’s experiment led to a record number of marijuana-related traffic deaths and ER visits. Impaired brain function is another problem. And in city after city where legalization is the rule, both in the United States and abroad, the black market is thriving.

For years conservatives such as William F. Buckley, Jr. have been telling us that drug legalization will put an end to the black market. The data prove them wrong. When drugs are plentiful, more people will try them, including the very young, and when government-approved drugs are regarded as too restrictive—in terms of potency, quantity, availability and new substances—black market profiteers move in for the kill. Nothing will ever stop this barely underground occupation.

Moreover, when drugs are legalized, social disorder follows. Truancy, street crimes and morally destitute acts spike. We should have learned by now: Cultivating virtue and citizenship is never easy—destroying it is.

But to those who are obsessed with race, none of this matters. They are the true regressives, having learned nothing about the frailty of the human condition.

CATHOLIC COLLEGES GONE ROGUE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The Catholic Church is opposed to segregation, homosexuality and gender ideology. Yet many Catholic colleges and universities are holding graduation ceremonies that segregate students on the basis of their sexual identities.

St. John's University in Queens, New York has long had a reputation of being a solid Catholic institution. When we learned that it was holding a Lavender Graduation this year (for the second consecutive time), we sought to learn how common this is on Catholic campuses. For the uninitiated, Lavender Graduation ceremonies exclusively honor homosexual students and those who mistakenly believe they belong to the opposite sex.

What we found would surprise many Catholics.

We randomly chose 40 Catholic colleges and universities, from various geographic regions, to see if they have a separate graduation ceremony for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students. We found that 20 did and 20 did not. To read the list click [here](#).

In 2006, St. Mary's College of California was the first to have a Lavender Graduation. Three years later Georgetown and the University of San Diego followed suit.

Segregated graduation ceremonies at non-Catholic colleges and universities are nothing new: Harvard has long segregated on the basis of race (a win for the KKK) and Columbia intentionally divides students by holding a wide variety of segregated graduations. The commitment these Ivies have to

separating students on the basis of ascribed and achieved statuses is outstanding.

But for Catholic institutions of higher learning to promote segregation—on the basis of sexual identity no less—is astounding: they are not only in open defiance of Catholic moral theology, they are working to undermine the work of Pope Francis. Consequently, these schools are virtually indistinguishable from secular colleges and universities. In short, these are rogue Catholic entities.

I once asked a well-known Jesuit priest if he could tell me the difference between Georgetown University and George Washington University. He knew what I meant. He just stared at me.

If students can't come together on graduation day, there is no reason to continue the fiction that colleges are a community. They are not. Welcome to the New Apartheid (with a sexual twist).

BIDEN “RED FLAGS” EVANGELICALS

[Bill Donohue](#)

President Biden showed his bigoted side on April 23 when he spoke in Tampa, Florida about the glory of abortion. It wasn't abortion, per se, that got him going—it was those whom he identified as pro-life that set him off.

To be specific, he railed against Donald Trump's pro-life stance, saying the former president made “a political deal”

with “the evangelical base of the Republican Party to look past his moral and character flaws.”

[Fifty percent](#) of all the money raised by the Democrats comes from Jews. Yet no one is going to say that Biden made a “political deal” with “the Jewish base of the Democratic Party to look past his cognitive flaws.”

Biden refuses to condemn the anti-Jewish rhetoric stemming from Muslims in Dearborn, Michigan. Yet no one is going to say that he made a “political deal” with “the Muslim base of the Democratic Party to look past his cognitive flaws.”

Notice that Biden’s comment in Tampa wasn’t about Protestants in general. He focused exclusively on evangelicals, and that is because to take a swipe at all Protestants would be to slam the mainline denominations; they are mostly in the pro-abortion camp. He chose a subset of Protestants who are known for their pro-life convictions.

Biden intentionally red-flagged evangelicals, knowing it would appeal to his bigoted base (survey data also show that Democrats do not think highly of Catholics, either). This was a classic example of religious baiting, and it should be condemned by everyone.

As the election year progresses, look for Biden to continue with this demagogic strategy. The “devout Catholic” has no problem manipulating religion to serve his militantly secular agenda.

FBI'S PROBE OF CATHOLICS: UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following letter by Bill Donohue is in response to the Inspector General's report on the FBI probe of Catholics:

April 24, 2024

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

Dear Chairman Jordan:

After issuing a news release on April 19, the day after news stories broke on the FBI's internal probe of Analysts involved in the investigation of Catholics, I had a chance to read Inspector General Michael Horowitz's report on this issue. While he satisfied some of our concerns, serious issues remain.

Horowitz begins by noting that the Richmond Field Office examined "a purported link between Racially or Ethnically Motivated Violent Extremists (RMVEs) and 'Radical Traditionalist Catholic (RTC)' ideology." He then cites the conclusion reached by the FBI Inspection Division.

While there was no evidence of malice, it was determined that the probe of Catholics "lacked sufficient evidence" to establish a relationship between the aforementioned extremists and RTC ideology. The report also concluded that the FBI Analysts "incorrectly conflated the subjects' religious views with their RMVE activities..."

This begs the question: Why did the Analysts think there was a

relationship in the first place? It is one thing to concede that there are racial and ethnic extremists in every religious *and* secular organization; it is quite another to assume a nexus between a mainstream religious organization and violence, especially when the grounds for making such an assumption are spurious.

It is as revealing as it is disturbing to note that the probe of Catholics was based on *one* person, namely, Defendant A. That he is clearly a violent, bigoted thug—he hates everyone from Jews to cops—is uncontested. But where are the others? There isn't even a Defendant B.

More disturbing is the admission that Defendant A does not attend a Catholic church. The report admits that he attended a church “with an international religious society that advocates traditional Catholic theology and liturgy *but it is not considered by the Vatican to be in full communion with the Catholic Church* (my italics).”

Later in the report we learn that “there was no evidence that Defendant A was being radicalized” at the church he attended, and that “he had been on the radar ‘as an unstable, dangerous individual’ before ‘any association with any Catholic related entity whatsoever.’” That being the case, why was it necessary to investigate his fellow churchgoers? Since when does the FBI conduct an investigation of a world religion on the basis of one miscreant whom they admit was not radicalized by it?

To make matters worse, the report says that when those who attended church with Defendant A were questioned about him, they confessed that he “displayed ‘unusual’ and ‘concerning’ behavior.” In fact, the report does not note a single person who attended church with him who found him persuasive—they knew he was odd. Thus does this admission undercut the rationale for a further probe of Catholics.

We know from previous disclosures that “mainline Catholic

parishes” were targeted by the FBI. Yet we now know that the Analysts couldn’t even identify radicals within this breakaway Catholic entity, never mind rank-and-file Catholic men and women.

The judgment of both Analysts was more than flawed—it was totally irresponsible. Even more mind-boggling is what the FBI HQ Analyst had to say.

Analyst 1 voiced the opinion that the probe had a “national application.” Analyst 2 admitted that she was “going to take a look at other RMVE actors that are rad-trads” (radical traditionalists). To top things off, the FBI HQ Analyst said she was “really interested in this resurgence of interest in the [C]atholic [C]hurch from our [DVEs]. The latter refers to Domestic Violence Extremists.

What occasioned this “resurgence of interest” in the Catholic Church? Was it something that someone did? Or does this reflect the ideological predilections of the Analyst? Notice she wasn’t referring to a “resurgence of interest” in breakaway Catholic entities. She was referring to the Roman Catholic Church.

There are many issues left outstanding. Moreover, if we are to believe that what happened was nothing of a serious nature, why was it necessary for the FBI to delete files? That suggests a cover up.

Thank you for your continued interest in this matter. When the Catholic Church is subjected to scrutiny by the FBI because of the beliefs and behavior of one maladjusted individual—who does not attend a Catholic church—it cries out for a much more detailed response than what the Horowitz report affords.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION AND THOUGHT CONTROL

[Bill Donohue](#)

No administration in American history has tried harder to promote thought control than the Biden administration. Orwellian at its finest, the goal is to induce the public to accept its highly politicized vocabulary as a means of controlling its thought patterns.

To read the entire report click [here](#). Here are some examples.

Gender Identity

Just hours into his presidential term, Mr. Biden's White House website allowed users to choose their pronouns, a change that drew swift praise from advocates. As part of the website revamp that occurs during presidential transitions, the White House changed its contact form. The form now allows individuals to select from the following list: she/her, he/him, they/them, other, or prefer not to share.

Illegal Immigration

Suggested terminology swaps reportedly include using "noncitizen" or "undocumented noncitizen" instead of "alien" or "illegal alien," and referring to the "integration" of immigrants into society instead of "assimilation," which has been criticized as racist.

Health

- “Convict/ex-convict” becomes “People who were formerly incarcerated”
- “Crazy” is replaced by “People with a pre-existing mental disorder”
- “Homosexuals” should be called “Queer”
- “Transgender/transgendered/transsexual” is replaced by “LGBTQ (or LGBTQIA or LGBTQ+ or LGBTQIA2)”

Aviation

Recommendations included replacing “airman” with “aircrew,” “manned aviation” with “traditional aviation” and “cockpit” with “flight deck.”

General Accountability Office

Leaked internal memos obtained by DailyMail.com show the Government Accountability Office (GAO) forbids employees from using male and female terms.

State Department

Secretary of State Antony Blinken issued a memo instructing State Department employees to refrain from using what he deemed to be “problematic” language. He instructs staffers not to “pressure someone to state their pronouns.” Instead, he offers a list of commonly used pronouns including “she/her, he/him, they/them, and ze/zir” explaining that people use a variety of pronouns.

Additionally, Blinken identified other common terms that State Department employees should avoid using. Rather than saying “mother/father,” staffers should say “parent” instead. Likewise, “son/daughter” should be replaced with “child.” Meanwhile, “spouse” or “partner” should be used in place of “husband/wife.”

Just for a moment, imagine if those who died as recently as at the end of the last century were informed of this madness.

What would they say? Our cultural descent is happening very quickly, and those leading the charge are mostly well-educated white people who have declared war on truth, nature, and nature's God.

Contact the White House Press Secretary: Karine.Jean-Pierre@who.eop.gov

WHY ARE LEFTISTS SO MISERABLE?

[Bill Donohue](#)

It was the day after Ronald Reagan beat Jimmy Carter in the 1980 presidential election. I was smiling (I had run Reagan's campaign in the North Hills of Pittsburgh), but most of the other professors at La Roche College (now a university) were sulking, and many appeared depressed. However, their mood was not uncharacteristic of the way they were most of the time: There are a lot of unhappy campers in the professoriate, especially in the liberal arts.

Nothing has changed.

In a new study by psychologists in Finland assessing the state of mind of radical social justice devotees, it was found that those who bought into progressive ideas are profoundly unhappy. Published in the *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, the researchers started with a sample of 851 persons, mostly students and professors at the University of Turku, and then expanded it to 5,030 adults. They distinguished between those who hold to a traditional liberal perspective and those who identify with a radical one. They focused on the latter.

The researchers devised a Critical Social Justice Attitude Scale (CSJAS) that measured seven aspects of what they deemed as representative of “woke” politics. Most of the items dealt with race, though one tapped transgenderism (the idea that the sexes are interchangeable). For example, “University reading lists should include fewer white or European authors” was deemed reflective of the “woke” view.

Social justice attitudes, the study’s authors said, “perceive people foremost as members of identity groups and as being, witting or unwitting, perpetrators or victims of oppression based on the groups’ perceived power differentials; and advocate regulating how or how much people speak and how they act if there is a perceived power differential between speakers, and intervening in action or speech deemed oppressive.”

The conclusions were riveting.

Regarding the initial small sample, it was determined that high CSJAS scores were “linked to anxiety, depression, and a lack of happiness.” On the larger sample, “this lower mental well-being was mostly associated with being on the political left and not specifically with having a high CSJAS score.” Women were more likely than men to have high CSJAS scores, which explains why their happiness quotient was smaller.

The researchers noted that their findings were consistent with that of other studies on this subject. They are right about that.

“Liberals, especially liberal women, are significantly less likely to be happy with their lives and satisfied with their ‘mental health,’ compared to their conservative peers aged 18-55.” According to University of Virginia sociologist W. Brad Wilcox, this was “the big takeaway from the 2022 American Family Survey, a striking new poll from YouGov and the *Deseret News*.”

In 2023, Musa al-Gharbi, a sociologist at Columbia University, examined data from many studies on this subject and concluded that conservatives are indeed happier than liberals. He said this finding “is consistent across countries and extends back in time.”

The question remains: Why are those on the left so miserable?

For starters, consider this. Imagine waking up each day thinking the world is made up of oppressors, racists, sexists, homophobes and their victims. Is that likely to put a smile on your dial?

It's actually worse than this. Left-wing professors, which is to say most of them in the social sciences and humanities, love to bask in their negativity. Smug as can be, they love thinking that those who don't share their views are ignorant buffoons; they, of course, are the only really bright ones. Their darkness is their defining characteristic.

But why do these malcontents think this way?

It has much to do with what Catholicism calls the sin of pride, the belief that we are self-sufficient human beings and have no need for God. The big thinkers believe they are too smart to believe in God. Too bad they aren't smart enough to know that boys who claim to be girls should not be allowed to compete against girls in sports and shower with them. There must be a cavity in their brain when it comes to sex.

It must be said that while those on the left are the most likely to be unhappy, it has been my experience that extremists on the right are just as likely to be despondent.

I have often said that when I encounter a highly educated person, or an activist, for the first time, I know within minutes if I am dealing with an extremist. The individual could be on the right or the left—it doesn't matter. The common denominator is humorlessness. They rarely smile and

their bouts of laughter usually come at someone else's expense.

Smiling is important. Laughter is important. They are staples of mental health. Hanging around those who are habitually unhappy—for reasons wholly due to their cast of mind and their inflated idea of who they are—is a chore. It's also a bore.

The Finnish psychologists learned that left-wing “woke” mavens find it hard to be happy. The deeper problem is that they actually like it that way.

FBI PROBE OF CATHOLICS STILL UNRESOLVED

[Bill Donohue](#)

On Thursday, April 18, 2024, the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Inspector General (IG) Michael E. Horowitz released his report on the FBI's leaked memo targeting Catholics, and once again the loyal sons and daughters of the Catholic Church have been slapped in the face.

While the IG's report notes that the memo “improperly conflated religious beliefs of activists with the likelihood they would engage in domestic terrorism,” it goes on to say that there was no evidence that “anyone ordered or directed” an investigation of Catholics because of their religious beliefs.

To say that no one ordered an investigation of Catholics because of their religion is about as persuasive as saying no one ordered an investigation of blacks because of their race.

Frankly, the IG's report does little to bring this issue to a close. It is overly vague, ambiguous, and littered with contradictions. Catholics deserve a better accounting of the FBI's and DOJ's actions.

The IG insists that the memo grew out of the FBI's investigation of alleged domestic terrorists. But if the intent of this investigation was to focus on right-wing nationalists, how did Catholics become the focus of the leaked FBI memo last year? Why did the FBI look into establishing sources and other contacts in the Church, instead of focusing on the stomping grounds unique to right-wing nationalists? The IG's report has nothing to clarify these questions.

Further, the IG's report admits that one of the authors of the leaked memo says she was "really interested in this resurgence of interest in the Catholic Church" by what the FBI claim are domestic terrorists. This statement alone contradicts the claim in the IG's report that Catholics were just tangentially connected to the FBI's investigation of genuine targets. From the jump, the authors clearly were "interested" in the Catholic Church.

Ultimately, the IG's report does not put this matter to rest. Certain elements within the FBI and DOJ went rogue and have not been held accountable for their actions. For a year, they could have taken proactive steps to assure Catholics across the country that these renegades faced serious consequences; however, they have admitted they were "aghast" and even "appalled" by the leaked memo but took no substantive actions to resolve the matter.

Therefore, I call upon the Congress, a co-equal branch of government, to exercise its oversight authority to get to the bottom of this once and for all. Senator Chuck Grassley (R-IA) has rightfully pointed out that the IG's report glosses over the fact that critical files associated with the memo were deleted. This is a serious breach. These files are federal

records and bureaucrats cannot just destroy them on a whim.

Additionally, Representative Jim Jordan (R-OH) has shown great tenacity in taking on the FBI. I would encourage him in the strongest terms possible to call for new hearings on this matter so we can hear directly from IG Horowitz to clear up the vagueness and ambiguities in his written report.

Last year, I sent several letters to Rep. Jordan with direct questions that would help allay the fears of Catholics regarding the FBI's memo. Many of them remain unanswered. It is paramount we get the answers to these questions:

Was it someone from outside the FBI that crafted this egregious abuse of power?

Has there been a broader internal investigation of the FBI seeking to learn if other agents have also been spying on Catholics?

How common is it for FBI agents to infiltrate houses of worship—of any religion—employing “tripwire sources”?

What did they intend to do with the information once they completed their probe?

Without new hearings and concrete efforts not only to resolve the lingering questions but also to hold these rogue agents accountable, Catholics will rightly remain skeptical of the FBI and DOJ. We are not walking away from this, and I will have more to say on this in the future.

NY AG MISREPRESENTS BROOKLYN DIOCESE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The Diocese of Brooklyn, ably led by Bishop Robert J. Brennan, has entered into an agreement with the Office of New York State Attorney General Letitia James regarding the diocese's two-decade child protection policy. Both organizations have issued a press release on this matter. But there are instances where the Office of the Attorney General's (*OAG*) account misrepresents the terms of the agreement that were reached with the Diocese of Brooklyn (*DB*); in some instances, existing Diocesan policies are not properly noted by *OAG*.

- *OAG* says the Diocese “**failed to consistently comply** with its own policies and procedures for responding to sexual abuse.”

DB notes that the agreement specified that the Diocese's “policies and procedures **were significant** and improved the Diocese's response to sexual abuse.”

- *OAG* claims “The Diocese **did not have policies in place** to ensure a prompt and thorough response to allegations of sexual abuse or misconduct.”

DB says the agreement admitted that “**in most cases, the Diocese timely referred the Abuse Allegations** to the Diocesan Review Board and hired an independent investigator to investigate the charges.”

- *OAG* argues that “the Diocese will also post online a confidential portal and telephone number for submitting complaints.”

Breaking News: The Diocese has had such a phone number for 20 years.

- OAG opines that “The Diocese will also refer all complaints it receives to law enforcement.”

Hello! Unlike other religious and secular institutions—which are never scrutinized—the Diocese has been doing this for a very long time.

- OAG contends that “**The agreement requires the Diocese** to take significant action to prevent and address allegations of clergy sexual abuse” and make reforms such as “**Installing an independent, secular monitor** who will oversee the Diocese’s compliance with policies and procedures....”

Fact Check: It was the Diocese which **proposed the appointment of an independent third party** to monitor compliance.

Why OAG misrepresented the Brooklyn Diocese’s response to these issues is unknown. But the public, and state lawmakers, need to know the truth. It is important for the state not to feed anti-Catholicism, and one way to avoid doing that is to accurately report interactions with Catholic officials.

As I recount in my book, [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#), there is no institution in the nation that has a better record in combating the sexual abuse of minors today than the Catholic Church. This is not open to debate: the data are conclusive. And this has been true for decades.

The heyday of the scandal was between 1965 and 1985. Current reports are typically about old cases. The fact of the matter is that almost all the offending priests are either dead or have been kicked out of ministry. To suggest otherwise is egregiously unjust.

We are contacting Attorney General Letitia James and all members of the New York State legislature.

Contact James Sheehan, author of the OAG report:

WHY IS THE POPE'S FAVORABILITY RATING TANKING?

[Bill Donohue](#)

The latest Pew Research Center poll on Catholics reveals that Pope Francis' favorability rating is tanking. The survey does not attempt to explain why, though its findings are suggestive of what's happening.

In 2015, the pope's favorability rating was 90 percent. In 2021, it was 83 percent. Today it is 75 percent. Those Catholics who attend Mass at least weekly are the least supportive of him: his favorability rating is 71 percent.

Why are Catholics who are the most practicing also the least happy with Pope Francis? It is surely not because they are hearing the Holy Father denounced from the pulpit—that just doesn't happen. But we know from virtually every survey that these Catholics are mostly orthodox, and it is likely that they are also more attentive to what he has been doing. That may explain their relative dissatisfaction with him.

In the few years since the last poll in 2021, the pope has endorsed civil unions, putting no conditions on its acceptance. More provocative was his decision to allow the blessing of homosexual couples; it has led to unprecedented pushback by the clergy all over the world.

He reorganized the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith as the Dicastery for the Doctrine of the Faith, appointing

Cardinal Victor Manuel Fernandez to head it; he previously published a book that was seen by many as pornographic. More than anyone, he defended same-sex blessings.

Pope Francis allowed Fr. Marco Rupnik, a fellow Jesuit, to remain a priest in good standing, notwithstanding his being thrown out of the Society for Jesus for sacrilegious and sexual offenses. After Rupnik was excommunicated, he was reinstated. The pope similarly failed to deal forthrightly with his Jesuit friend, Bishop Gustavo Zanchetta, who was sentenced to prison by an Argentine court for sexually abusing seminarians.

The pope has put severe restrictions on the Latin Mass, curtailing its availability and alienating millions of Catholics. After San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone publicly denied Communion to Rep. Nancy Pelosi, the pope granted her a private audience at the Vatican. He dismissed one of his critics, Bishop Joseph Strickland of the Diocese of Tyler, Texas, and stripped Cardinal Raymond Burke of his salary and his subsidized apartment in Rome.

All of these issues, and others like them, are seen by many practicing Catholics as wrongheaded. It is not likely that at this late date in his pontificate that Pope Francis will be able to substantially increase his favorability rating with these Catholics.

**MAHER JUSTIFIES KILLING
INNOCENT KIDS**

[Bill Donohue](#)

On his April 12 HBO show, "Real Time," Bill Maher justified the killing of innocent children. Speaking of pro-life Americans, he said, "They think it's murder, and it kind of is. I'm just okay with that. I am. There [are] 8 billion people in the world, I'm sorry, we won't miss you. That's my position on that." He did not volunteer to make a personal contribution to that end.

Maher's sincerity is appreciated, if not his promotion of violence. He knows, as every honest person who agrees with science knows, that abortion is the taking of innocent human life.

The most famous person to warn of overpopulation, Thomas Malthus, was opposed to abortion as a remedy. Perhaps that's because he was an Anglican minister. Maher is an atheist.

Maher has more in common with Paul Ehrlich, the most famous overpopulation zealot in recent times. He predicted in 1968 that "hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death" in the next decade. It never happened. In fact, obesity spiked in the 1970s. Like Maher, however, he recommended aborting more children to "solve" this alleged problem.

Maher makes abortion rights advocates jittery. On his show, two guests, Gillian Tett and Piers Morgan, admitted they are fans of abortion rights, but when Maher said he was okay with the killing of innocent kids, they branded his position "quite harsh." They did not explain what was harsh about it.

It is dishonest to say that some abortion rights advocates are not happy to be pro-abortion. They most certainly are.

- In 1975, Anne Nicol Gaylor, the atheist co-founder of Freedom from Religion Foundation, wrote a book titled, *Abortion Is A Blessing*. Feminists such as Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem loved it.
- In 2009, the newly appointed president of Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts, Rev. Dr.

Katherine Ragsdale, wrote that “abortion is a blessing.”

- In 2019, an obstetrician-gynecologist-abortionist, Lisa H. Harris, writing in the *New York Times*, said, “I know that for every woman whose abortion I perform, I stop a developing human being from being born. I know that for each of them [her patients], there was a second entity there—a baby, a person, a potential life, a life, depending on your beliefs.”
- In 2021, Dr. Ghazaleh Moayedi testified before the House Oversight Committee on abortion. She told the panel that “for thousands of people I’ve cared for, abortion is a blessing, abortion is an act of love, abortion is freedom.”
- In 2022, Sarah Lopez testified before the House Oversight Committee and labeled her abortion “an act of self love.” She said “it was the best decision I ever made.”

Yes, there are people who really love abortion, and some readily confess that its victims are innocent children. Maher is just the latest to do so.

Contact the vice president of media relations at Warner Bros.

Discovery: Ashley.Mokma@wbd.com