

GAY PRIDE HONCHOS ARE PLAYING THE COPS

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 30, 2025

The organizers of Heritage of Pride, who are responsible for the Gay Pride Parade in New York City, are playing New York's finest. They want it both ways: they want the police to protect them from criminals but they don't allow gay cops to march with them in uniform. Yet they are delighted to have them intervene—complete with guns—when their safety is imperiled.

The media have been mostly quiet about what has been happening in New York City during "Pride Month."

After the June 29 parade, there was a false report about gunfire during Pride celebrations at Washington Square Park. The panic that ensued led thousands to run for their life. Some shirtless guy unloaded with bear spray, injuring more than 50 people.

A few hours later, two teenage girls were shot near the Stonewall Inn in Greenwich Village, home of the homosexual riots that triggered the gay rights movement in 1969. Both were hospitalized.

On June 22, a guy with a beard and dreadlocks attacked a 22-year-old man near Penn Station around 3:00 a.m.. The offender believed the man was a homosexual, and made plain his anti-gay animus.

On June 16, a man wielding a knife threatened an employee of a gay nightclub and tore down gay pride signs in Greenwich Village. The NYPD Hate Crime Task Force investigated the

incident.

On June 15, a Brooklyn worker at a 99-cent store attacked a ballet dancer, spewing anti-gay slurs. The offender was 79 and the victim was 37.

Should the police seek to apprehend the alleged criminals? Or should they tell the gay community to police themselves? After all, if gay cops are excluded from marching in the Gay Pride Parade, why should they risk their lives saving those who hate them?

The police, of course, cannot pick and choose whom to protect, so the question is nonsensical. But the fact remains that gay leaders are the real hypocrites.

NYPD Commissioner Jessica Tisch, who turned out to support gay cops banned from marching, said, "These officers standing behind me who have been pillars of reform in the community for decades have been excluded and told they are not welcome to walk in the uniforms they wear."

Gay cops have been banned from marching in the parade since 2021; it was put in place after the death of George Floyd, a black man who was subdued by a white police officer. Looking back at this, the riots that took place seem surreal.

Floyd was killed in 2020 in Minneapolis after he resisted arrest following his robbery of a grocery store. He had a criminal record spanning over 20 years. His crimes included drug use, possession of cocaine, trespassing, and firearms violations. In 2009, he pled guilty to attempting to rob a pregnant woman with a gun and sentenced to 5 years in prison. An autopsy revealed he had meth and fentanyl in his system at the time of arrest.

Left-wing activists, both straight and gay, are the most anti-police segment in American society. That they are supported by the likes of Zohran Mamdani, the socialist who won the

Democratic primary for mayor of New York City last week, proves that their intolerance is stronger than ever. This is an issue that needs to be checked before mayhem ensues.

SUPREME COURT PROTECTS PARENTS AND CHILDREN

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 27, 2025

The Supreme Court ended its session by rendering three decisions that have the effect, if not the specific intent, of protecting the best interests of parents and children. Those who ascribe to traditional moral values will find much to celebrate.

The Supreme Court ruling upholding the right of South Carolina to withhold funding from Planned Parenthood in its Medicaid program was decided on technical legal grounds, but its ramifications are much broader.

Justice Neil Gorsuch wrote that the Medicaid law doesn't include a "clear and unambiguous notice of an individually enforceable right." This is significant but what is really important is that the Planned Parenthood game of saying it is not simply an abortion provider is over. The reason this case was brought in the first place had to do with the South Carolina governor deciding that because money is fungible, Planned Parenthood could use Medicaid funds to pay for abortions. With this decision, other states will not follow suit, the net effect being a win for those who want to curb abortion and stop back-door public funding of it.

Many religious parents, in particular, do not want to subject their children to the pro-gay and lesbian agenda, and they certainly object when schools force their children to abide by it. Their rights were affirmed by the high court decision to allow parents to direct their children to opt-out of so-called LGBT-themed books.

Writing for the majority, Justice Samuel Alito said, "We have long recognized the rights of parents to direct 'the religious upbringing' of their children. And we have held that those rights are violated by government policies that substantially interfere with the religious development of children."

Religious parents also objected to those who sought to deny age verification to access pornography. Advances in technology and the rise of the internet have meant that minors have easier access to pornographic websites than in previous years.

The Supreme Court underscored the right of parents to protect their children from pornography. Justice Clarence Thomas said, "The power to require age verification is within a State's authority to prevent children from accessing sexually explicit content." Thus, the Texas law that requires age verification was affirmed.

The rights of parents and children are under attack, and this is especially true of the rights of religious parents and children. Those leading the attack are secular militants, the most intolerant of all Americans. The good news is that their morally debased agenda took a serious hit with these three Supreme Court rulings. Alleluia!

GUIDE TO KEY REMAINING HIGH COURT RULINGS

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 25, 2025

On June 26, the U.S. Supreme Court is expected to rule on three outstanding cases that involve restrictions on parental rights, access to pornography and abortion funding. Here is an outline of what these cases are about. In one way or another, they have grave implications for religious liberty.

Mahmoud v. Taylor

In 2022, Montgomery County Schools in Maryland approved the usage of pro-LGBT books as part of their elementary school curriculum. Initially, an opt-out program was implemented for parents who did not want to expose their children to these kinds of books. However, in 2023 the opt-out program was reversed by the school board. As a result, parents of several different religious faiths sued the school district, arguing that the opt-out reversal was a violation of their religious rights; both the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals ruled against the parents. The parents petitioned the Supreme Court and it agreed to hear their case.

The question before court is: Does Montgomery County Schools' refusal to allow an opt-out for LGBT curriculum infringe on the religious rights of parents?

The parents argued that:

- Their children being exposed to LGBT themed books burdens the free exercise of their religion. By exposing children to these types of books in school, it would make it more difficult for parents to raise their

children according to the tenets of their religion. In addition, it would also create confusion among students whose parents and teachers are teaching opposite things.

- The School Board showed religious animus against the parents by stating that the parents who opposed the books were xenophobic and showed “ignorance and hate.”
- The Board showed religious bias by removing the opt-out for the books while keeping in place other opt-outs for middle and high school sex education classes.
- The purpose of the books was to influence children towards LGBT issues because the books were part of the English curriculum as opposed to curriculum on sexuality.

Free Speech Coalition v. Paxton

In January 2023, the state of Texas passed H.B. 1181, which would require all websites whose makeup is at least one-third sexually explicit material to install age-verification software in order to access the site. Websites and companies that fail to do so could be subject to fines and lawsuits.

After the law was passed, several adult websites under the umbrella group Free Speech Coalition sued in U.S. District Court seeking to strike down the law. The District Court struck the law down. The state of Texas appealed the ruling in the U.S. Court of Appeals and the law was reinstated. In response, Free Speech Coalition petitioned the U.S. Supreme Court to hear their case.

The question before the court is: Does the Texas law requiring age-verification on porn websites violate the First Amendment rights of users?

Those against the Texas law argue that:

- Age verification harms the privacy of users because it stores a permanent record of their identification. This has the potential to be targeted by hackers.

- By requiring age verification, the government can have access to and track personal information of the intimate and personal life of users.
- The law would discriminate against those who do not have a valid ID.

Those in favor of the Texas law argue that:

- Age verification protects minors, particularly children, from accessing sexually explicit and obscene websites.
- The viewing of pornographic images by minors can cause negative effects to brain development and can also lead to addiction.
- Advances in technology and the rise of the internet have meant that minors have easier access to pornographic websites than in previous years.

Medina v. Planned Parenthood South Atlantic

In 2018, South Carolina Governor Henry McMaster signed an executive order that prohibited abortion providers from being funded by the state's Medicaid program. As a result Planned Parenthood South Atlantic, which operates in the state, was removed from Medicaid funding. Planned Parenthood, along with a Medicaid beneficiary, sued the state arguing that the executive order violates Medicaid's "any qualified provider" provision. The provision allows a beneficiary to obtain services from any qualified medical provider. In 2020, a U.S. District Court granted an injunction to Planned Parenthood, allowing it to be covered. In response, South Carolina petitioned the Supreme Court in 2023.

The question before court is: Does Medicaid's "any qualified provider" provision allow a beneficiary to choose a specific provider?

South Carolina argued that:

- The language in the provision lacks specific language

referring to rights. Therefore, it does not guarantee that Medicaid beneficiaries have the right to choose any provider they wish.

- Only the state can decide which providers can be covered under Medicaid rather than the patient.
-

TRUMP'S DOJ SUES OVER THE CONFESSIONAL

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 24, 2025

The state of Washington is being sued by the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Civil Rights Division for violating the First Amendment right of priests to maintain confidentiality in the Confessional. The law, which was signed by Gov. Bob Ferguson on May 2, is due to go into effect July 27.

The Catholic League was the first lay Catholic organization in the nation to write to Washington legislators about this issue.

On February 10, I raised the following question to the lawmakers, "What broke?" I specifically asked, "where is the evidence that child molesters—in any state—report their crimes to priests in the confessional? We have been studying this issue for decades but we can't name a single instance where this has happened. If any lawmaker has evidence to the contrary, you have an obligation to make it public." Not surprisingly, no one did.

Next to weigh in was the DOJ. On May 5, Harmeet K. Dhillon, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, and Michael

E. Gates, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, wrote to Gov. Ferguson putting him on notice that they are taking this issue seriously. To that end, they asked for selected documents. We thanked the Trump team for their decision the next day.

On May 20, I wrote to Sen. Noel Frame, the most vocal supporter of this attack on the Sacrament of Reconciliation. My main complaint was the encroachment of the state on religion, as witnessed by her comment that the Catholic Church should change Canon law teachings on the priest-penitent privilege. I returned the favor by saying Washington's law legalizing doctor-assisted suicide should be changed to mirror the Canon law position.

In its lawsuit against Washington, the DOJ argues that the bill "unconstitutionally forces Catholic priests in Washington to choose between their obligations to the Catholic Church and their penitents or face criminal consequences, while treating the priest-penitent privilege differently than other well-settled privileges."

This line of argument is persuasive. It has long been accepted as a legal privilege to guard the confidentiality of attorney-client, doctor-patient and psychotherapist-patient, as well as the privilege afforded the priest and his penitent. Indeed, the latter has been accepted law since it was first broached in *People v. Phillips* in New York, an 1813 ruling that set the table for subsequent decisions. The Supreme Court cited the priest-penitent privilege in both the Watergate tapes case *United States v. Nixon* (1974), and in *Trammel v. United States* (1980).

We commend the Trump administration for standing up for the rights of priests.

“CATHOLIC” GROUP WANTS TO HASTEN DEATH

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 23, 2025

It seems crazy, but it's true: a few dissident Catholics can claim to be a bona-fide Catholic organization, file the required papers with the IRS, and bingo—they are regarded as a legitimate Catholic entity. The truth is they are a fraud. This has long been true of Catholics for Choice, and it is true today of Catholics Vote Common Good.

This group is currently lobbying for the right of some very distraught people to kill themselves, with the help of doctors, no less. They are connected to Vote Common Good, a nearly bankrupt organization. It was set up with the help of The Lincoln Project, a collection of angry establishment Republicans who hate Donald Trump; it is also moribund.

Catholics Vote Common Good worked with Catholics for Kamala, a group whose nationwide members could fit into an urban phone booth. They are both pro-abortion, pro-gay and lesbian etc. They were heartbroken when Biden's stand-in got shellacked.

Why would a band of Catholic malcontents want to convince doctors that they should no longer pursue the goal of saving lives? Instead, they say, doctors should hasten the death of those going through a rough patch. This is their idea of social justice. The American Medical Association doesn't agree—it just restated its objections to doctor-assisted suicide.

The three most prominent persons who represent Catholics Vote Common Good are Kathleen Shriver, Patrick Carolan and Denise Murphy McGraw.

Shriver is the granddaughter of Eunice Kennedy Shriver, mostly known because of her ties to the Kennedy clan. Unlike her grandmother, who was a strong opponent of abortion, Kathleen is not. Otherwise she would never support the Biden-Harris team. Now she is championing doctor-assisted suicide. She rarely seeks the limelight, so it is not known what happened to her.

Carolan is co-chair of Catholics Vote Common Good. His commitment to social justice does not extend to unborn babies, or to those who are so depressed that they are giving up on life. Known for rejecting Church teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality, he has found a home with the eugenicists.

McGraw is the other co-chair. She has no problem accepting money from George Soros, the notorious anti-Catholic, and anti-Jewish, billionaire. During the presidential election season, she said Kamala “understands Catholic social justice teachings.” Too bad she didn’t mention any of them.

Catholics Vote Common Good, along with its parent group, Vote Common Good, says it advocates for “the rights and well-being of vulnerable people most in need of support from our church and our communities.” This is a lie.

Its advocacy for “the rights and well-being of vulnerable people” obviously doesn’t extend to helping those struggling with psychological or physical problems. Unless, of course, helping to put them down is their way of doing them a favor.

These “Catholics” need to show up at a conference held by the handicapped and the disabled and tell them to their face what they have planned for them. They should also tell the parents of young girls who are struggling with severe emotional issues

that the time has come to find a doctor who will do the dirty deed. And then call the morgue.

PROFILE OF RADICAL SUPPORT FOR NYC MAYOR

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 19, 2025

The Democratic primary for the next mayor of New York City will be held June 24, and of the nine candidates, only two capture the attention of the voters: former Gov. Andrew Cuomo and Assemblyman Zohran Mamdani; all the others draw single-digit responses.

The *New York Times* is refusing to endorse either candidate, though it saves its biggest salvos for Mamdani, the young Muslim who has never run anything. The newspaper says his idea of putting a freeze on rents will lead to a housing shortage, having government-owned and run grocery stores is a pipe dream, and it is wrong to sing the praises of former New York Mayor Bill de Blasio. To this it could be added that Mamdani wants free child care, hates the police, and is stridently anti-Semitic.

It is because of these crazy ideas that Mamdani is embraced by radical New Yorkers. So who are these people?

A Marist poll taken last month reveals that in almost every demographic, the voters prefer Cuomo to the young socialist. No matter, Mamdani enjoys his biggest support from young people, whites, the affluent, college graduates, and those who

have no religious affiliation.

Why is it that Mamdani, who wants to have free bus service, as well as supermarkets, receives his greatest support from those who can well afford to pay for these things? Why is it that those who can least afford to pay for food and bus fares are the least likely to support him? And why hasn't anyone asked him to explain this apparent anomaly?

It's really not that hard to figure out.

Young people have always been the most idealistic segment of the population, but these days they are drawn more to crackpot ideas than aspirational ones. It is no secret that wealthy white kids with a college degree have been drinking from the well of left-wing propaganda for some time—it's called higher education—so naturally they like socialism, dislike religion, and are anti-cop.

The only problem for them is that non-white poor people don't want their programs or their handwringing.

Most blacks and Hispanics still have common sense, and that's because their views on public policy are shaped more by reality than ideology. By contrast, affluent white college-educated young people, who spent years in sterile classrooms where independence of thought was taboo, lack the daily experience that non-whites have interacting with real people from all walks of life. That's not a small difference, and it has grave consequences.

It is also striking to learn from the poll that Cuomo, an accused womanizer, is liked more by women than men. Maybe that's because the accusations against him are more minor than major, and are thus not decisive. If that is the case, then this line of attack on the former governor appears not to be working.

Most New Yorkers are liberal and will probably choose Cuomo as

their lead choice. But a sizeable portion are radicals, and they will break for Mamdani. It is not out of the question that Brooklyn voters, who are by far the most radical, will try to rig the easy-to-rig ranked-choice voting system and pull off an upset. But if they fail, they will have to wait for the next riot to take place before they can make their mark again.

TIME TO PROBE ABUSE IN NJ SCHOOLS

The duplicity of probing Catholic dioceses for the sexual abuse of minors, while allowing the public schools to run rampant, has recently been most evident in New Jersey. Here is our response. If you would like to chime in, contact Platkin: OAGpress@njoag.gov

June 18, 2025

Hon. Matthew J. Platkin
New Jersey Attorney General
25 Market St.
Trenton, NJ 08611

Dear Attorney General Platkin:

There is no crisis of the sexual abuse of minors in the Catholic Church today—anywhere in the nation—but there is one extant in New Jersey's public schools. It is time to commence a grand jury to investigate the extent of it.

To my first point, recently released data by investigators charged with accounting for the sexual abuse of minors

conducted by the Catholic clergy found that between July 1, 2023 and June 30, 2024, there were exactly two substantiated cases made against 48,176 members; this comes to 0.004 percent. This is not the figure for New Jersey—it is the figure for the United States.

Your office has been laboring for seven years to empanel a grand jury to probe Catholic dioceses on this issue. On June 16, the New Jersey State Supreme Court ruled that this can be done, even though state law says that such proceedings can only be brought against public institutions. The Diocese of Camden, which we supported in an amicus brief, threw in the towel, leaving the door open to a grand jury probe.

If you are going to continue to go after the Catholic Church, where there is no crisis, you surely must go after the public schools, where one exists today. You won't have to worry about state law—grand juries can be authorized against the public schools. But for some reason, they never are. You can now correct this double standard.

Are you aware of what is going on in New Jersey's public schools?

- In April 2025, it was reported that six former Cherry Hill students accused the school district of failing to protect them from a teacher who sexually abused them four decades ago. Six lawsuits have been filed in Camden County Superior Court since 2023, half of them in April. The lawsuits also allege that Cherry Hill school district officials failed to make required reports of suspected abuse to the state's child welfare agency.
- In January 2025, a Middle Township Elementary School teacher in South Jersey, who gave birth to a child whose father was her student, was accused of sexually abusing the student in her home.
- In December 2024, matters got so bad in Paterson that officials from the federal Department of Education had

to step in. For five years school officials allegedly failed to address sexual harassment, including sexual assault, despite numerous complaints.

- In April 2024, a Mercer County high school teacher was charged with sexually assaulting a student. This allegedly happened multiple times at Hamilton High School West.
- In February 2024, a substitute teacher who works in Camden County was charged with the sexual assault of a 14-year-old girl multiple times.

It gets worse. In November 2024, a panel of judges found that two school districts, South Orange-Maplewood and Upper Freehold Regional, cannot be found “vicariously liable” for the sexual abuse of children in their schools. The judges ruled that school districts could not be sued for the teachers’ conduct when they allegedly sexually assaulted students.

Catholics deserve an even playing field. It is outrageous that school districts cannot be sued when their teachers molest their students, but Catholic dioceses can. More outrageous is the non-stop investigation of Catholic institutions—when all the data show that this problem has long been resolved—while the public schools get a pass, even though that is where this problem continues today.

If you, or state lawmakers, want to start a probe of this problem in the public schools, be sure you go back to 1940 looking for offenses. That is what your office is doing to Catholic dioceses. If you do not, singling out Catholic institutions for a grand jury investigation smacks of religious profiling, which in this case amounts to anti-Catholicism.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

cc: New Jersey state lawmakers

CAMDEN BISHOP THROWS IN THE TOWEL

[Bill Donohue](#)

June 17, 2025

For seven years, the Diocese of Camden fought attempts by the New Jersey Attorney General to empanel a grand jury to examine allegations of clergy sexual abuse extending back to 1940. Every Catholic organization that was contacted this past winter refused to submit an amicus brief in support of the diocese, with the exception of the Catholic League. We regret doing so given the timidity of Bishop Joseph Williams.

Two lower courts, the trial and appellate courts, agreed with the diocese that state law prohibits empanelling a grand jury to examine allegations against private individuals and private institutions. But on June 16, the Supreme Court reversed these rulings, holding that the diocese cannot block such proceedings. The state can now go forward, if it chooses to do so. As for now, the situation is moot: the Supreme Court held there is nothing to review.

The Catholic League's beef with Bishop Williams stems from his decision on May 5 to walk away from this case. He did so exactly one week after diocesan lawyers, and our attorney, Russell Giancola, addressed the Supreme Court. The diocese's lawyers never contacted me or our attorney—we found out from

priests who read about it on May 6. And Bishop Williams never responded to my letter. This is the thanks we get for trying to help. It seems some on our side never learn.

Below is the text of my letter.

May 15, 2025

Most Rev. Joseph A. Williams
Bishop of Camden
631 Market St.
Camden, NJ 08102

Your Excellency:

In late winter, I was asked by attorneys for the Diocese of Camden if the Catholic League would be interested in filing an amicus brief in defense of the diocese. They learned that we had successfully defended priests in Pennsylvania and wanted us on board.

I immediately called lawyers in Pittsburgh whom I had worked with before and was able to secure counsel. On March 14, I signed an engagement letter with Russell Giancola; he works at the Pittsburgh office of Leech Tishman. I mailed him a check for a retainer deposit, and when additional funding was later needed, I provided it.

At issue was the right of New Jersey prosecutors to launch a grand jury investigation of priests who had been accused of sexually abusing minors. Under New Jersey law, grand juries are established to investigate public agencies such as prisons and police departments. Targeting private individuals or private institutions are not permitted. Therefore, going after the Catholic clergy—investigating alleged molestation of minors dating back to 1940—is unwarranted.

It seemed fairly straightforward, and indeed the Camden Diocese won in the lower courts on two occasions. Another

round of court challenges occurred on April 28 of this year. Our attorney was given the opportunity to address the court and he did. So far so good.

On May 6, a New Jersey priest contacted me—not your lawyers or anyone working for you—with the news: you pulled the plug on the proceedings. It is true that you were new to the diocese, but you knew the history of this case.

After seven years of fighting this issue, and only a week after the last court date, you asked your attorneys to inform the state Supreme Court that you no longer wanted to prevent a grand jury from being impaneled.

Some are cheering your decision. I am not. Our attorney was told that no organization—save for the Catholic League—was interested in filing an amicus brief in defending your diocese; professional victims' groups were lining up on the other side.

In the May 2 edition of *Catholic Star Herald*, you expressed grave reservations, and a clear sense of uneasiness, over this case. In the May 9 edition, you explained your decision to withdraw.

You made it clear that you felt it was hypocritical of the diocese to preach transparency while seeking to deny a grand jury probe. But was it not hypocritical of you to preach the merits of due process for priests and then abandon them at the last minute?

Grand juries are one-sided: they do not allow for cross examination of witnesses. So anything can be said about any priest and he has no right to defend himself, including you. This hit home with us when the Catholic League won in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court by defending the reputational rights of priests who said they were unfairly maligned in the grand jury report.

To be sure, all of those who claim to have been victimized are entitled to their day in court. Make no mistake about my position: There is no excuse for sexually abusing anyone, never mind minors. But not all priests who have been accused are guilty, and they, too, are entitled to their day in court.

In this case, the central legal issue had nothing to do with sexual abuse—it had to do with an attempt to override state law on the conditions that allow for a grand jury to be established. No other religious organization was to be subjected to a grand jury, and no public school was either. The latter is critical because state law allows for a grand jury probe of public institutions, *yet no state executive or legislator has ever had any interest in doing so—they are only interested in going after the Catholic Church, and it is a private institution.*

You said that one of the reasons why you changed your mind was your meeting with an alleged victim. You are to be commended for doing so. But I noticed in your May 2 column you said that you were “consulting survivors, fellow bishops, legal experts and diocesan officers” about what to do. Too bad you didn’t include parish priests, some of whom have contacted my office expressing their dismay.

I put my sociological training to task when I wrote [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#), published by Ignatius. I know, and certainly you know, that almost all the guilty clergy are either dead or have been dismissed from the priesthood. The hunt for abuse cases extending back to before the U.S. entered the Second World War—when no other institution is subjected to the same scrutiny—is not about the pursuit of justice. It is about sticking it to the Catholic Church.

I would appreciate hearing from you about this matter.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

WHY DO LEFTISTS STILL LOVE MASKS?

June 16, 2025

[Bill Donohue](#)

This article originally appeared in the American Spectator.

On March 24, anti-Jewish protesters showed up at Columbia University [chanting, “Long live the intifada.”](#) Many were wearing masks, and speakers urged students to follow suit. But wearing a mask while protesting has been [illegal in New York City since 1845](#). It was later used to combat the Ku Klux Klan. Today, it is invoked to combat supporters of left-wing pro-Hamas terrorists.

It is easy to understand why the pro-Hamas gang likes to wear a mask: they want to conceal their identity from the police. But what explains why those on the left are fond of wearing a mask for alleged health reasons?

Recently, Sen. Bernie Sanders, a professed socialist and communist sympathizer, urged supporters in Denver [to show up at a rally wearing masks](#). His request had nothing to do with protecting their anonymity; it was a throwback to his mask advocacy during the pandemic.

Even during Covid, his plea would have made no sense—the event was outside. But that didn’t matter. Sanders loves masks.

Three years after Covid, at the State of the Union in 2023, [he was the only Congressman](#) to show up wearing a KN95 Mask.

Today, four percent of Americans still wear masks going to the stores and other businesses. Who are they? [A recent Pew Research survey](#) revealed that they are mostly Democrats. This explains why the majority of Republicans (62 percent) said that during the pandemic there should have been fewer restrictions, but only a few Democrats (15 percent) agree. The conclusion is inescapable: those on the left like masks.

This is consistent with what we learned during the pandemic. In a 2021 survey of college students, who are much more likely to be taught by Bernie Sanders-like professors than Donald Trump-like professors, found that [eight-in-ten favored mask mandates](#) for indoor settings. [In 2022, dozens of students walked out of class](#) at the University of Nevada, Reno to protest the repeal of the mask mandate. But why? Why would students demand that they be ordered to mask up?

There is something weird going on here. These same students would scream bloody murder if they were ordered not to have an abortion, or not to take drugs. They would insist on bodily autonomy.

To illustrate this point, consider Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer. She likes to [flash a T-shirt that says, "My Body, My Decision."](#) This is done to show her support for abortion. But why is it that during the pandemic she insisted that everyone wear a mask? Why didn't the injunction, "My Body, My Decision," work for those who disagreed?

It boils down to narcissism and a need to control.

Liberal young people want to have sex without consequences. Hence, the need for abortion. Drugs can be fun, too, and while there are negative consequences, that is a risk they are willing to take. When it comes to masks during a pandemic, forcing everyone to wear one guards against illness, allowing

them to maintain their hedonistic lifestyle. So they opt for control.

Control. This is the signature of left-wing ideologues and their minions. Nothing matters more to them. Take Bernie Sanders.

He not only loves masks, his radical left-wing politics explains why he chose [to go on his honeymoon to the Soviet Union](#), home to the genocidal maniac, Joseph Stalin.

In 1988, when he was Mayor of Burlington, Vermont, he traveled with his newlywed to the Soviet Union, fraternizing with Communist leaders. He wanted to establish Burlington as a “sister city” with a small Russian town. He gave gifts to his comrades, praised their wonderful system, and publicly attacked the United States. In a show of complete deference to his Communist buddies, he never mentioned the mass murders that occurred under them, nor did he reference any of the litany of human rights abuses, including the world’s first man-made famine in the Ukraine in the 1930s.

Sanders is a control freak. So are those who like to mandate masks during a pandemic. Their goal is to induce in the masses a readiness to accept the dictates of a left-wing ruling class. It’s all about nurturing compliance, having nothing to do with public health.

CLERGY SEXUAL ABUSE IN U.S. VIRTUALLY DISAPPEARS

June 13, 2025

Bill Donohue

It's too bad public school officials don't convene a national seminar inviting Catholic officials and scholars to explain to them how to resolve the sexual abuse of minors that is plaguing their schools. The Catholic Church knows a thing or two about this issue, having made horrible decisions about sexual offenders in the past. But the data clearly show that this problem is pretty much over.

The worst offenses took place a half century ago or more: it was between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s that the homosexual scandal was at its peak. Today, this issue has virtually disappeared, at least in the U.S.

Every year, the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops publishes the findings of a major investigation into clergy sexual abuse. The audits, conducted by StoneBridge Partners, accesses relevant survey information from the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate. The data from the "2024 Annual Report" on this subject are the most promising we have ever seen.

Data from July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024 show that there has been a 31 percent decrease in allegations of clergy sexual abuse over the past year. This is encouraging, but it should not command our attention. After all, it is not a high bar for allegations against the clergy to be deemed credible—it is fairly easy—and therefore it is not of much utility in accurately judging the extent of this problem.

What is a serious problem is the extent to which accusations continue to be made about innocent priests who have been targeted by shakedown artists. It is lamentable that the annual reports give scant coverage to this.

Similarly, allegations about offenses that took place many decades ago are also of dubious utility—we know for certain that almost all the offending clergy are either dead or are no

longer in ministry.

What should command our attention has unfortunately not commanded the attention of the media, including the Catholic media.

Of central interest to the Catholic League is the proportion of the clergy who had a *substantiated* accusation made against him in the past year. There were two. That's right. There were two substantiated accusations in the entire nation made against 48,176 members of the clergy. This means that a whopping **0.004 percent** had a substantiated case of sexual abuse made against him by a minor.

There is no institution in the nation, secular or religious, where adults regularly interact with minors which can beat this record. None.

The other issue of grave importance is, "Who is doing the molesting?" On this score, the relevant data must be gleaned from those who have been credibly charged.

When the John Jay College of Criminal Justice released its report in 2004, it found that between 1950 and 2002, 81 percent of the offenses were committed against postpubescent boys, meaning the abuser was a homosexual. In the latest annual report, 80 percent of all the credible allegations of sexual abuse involved victims who are minors, and in 84 percent of the cases the victim was male.

In other words, homosexual priests remain the big problem. This does not mean that most homosexual priests are sexual abusers—I have made this point many times—but it does mean that most of the abusers have been, and still are, gay.

Catholics are called to tell the truth—we are not called to shade it because the truth sometimes stings. The homosexual coverup in the Catholic Church is still a problem, and it shows no signs of abating.

Nonetheless, we should all take note of the astounding progress that has been made.