

TRANSGENDERISM RELIGIONS

DIVIDES

[Bill Donohue](#)

Transgenderism, the pernicious ideology that holds that sex is a social construction and the sexes are interchangeable, was formally rejected again by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) on November 12 at their biannual meeting in Baltimore. On the same day—this is not a coincidence—ten “progressive” religious bodies, consisting of some Protestants and Jews, signed a statement affirming everything the Catholic bishops rejected.

The USCCB made it clear that Catholic medical care will do what it can to serve those who are suffering from gender dysphoria, but it cannot approve operations that deny what God has ordained. The directive explicitly says that “Catholic health care services must not provide or permit medical interventions, whether surgical, hormonal, or genetic, that aim not to restore but rather to alter the fundamental order of the human body in its form or function.”

In other words, Catholic health services do not include sex-reassignment surgery, genital mutilation, chemical castration, puberty blockers and all procedures that are inimical to our God-given nature.

By contrast, the “landmark” statement signed by ten “progressive” religious groups, which include the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) and the Union for Reform Judaism, embraces “transgender, intersex, and nonbinary people.”

It would be more accurate to say that they embrace those who *identify* as such, because in reality sex is binary. Gender ideology, or transgenderism, is anti-science and should therefore not be given a mantle of legitimacy.

The lead author of this remarkable statement is Rev. Dr. Sofia Betancourt; she represents the Unitarian Universalist Association. The document she wrote speaks of the “persecution,” “oppression” and the “acts of violence” that these people experience.

The violence that transgender people endure is indeed real, but it is a lie to suggest that they are not doing it to themselves. In the majority of cases, transgender persons are victimizing other transgender persons. The [evidence](#) is conclusive. So lecturing the rest of us about their travails is the worst kind of handwringing. These people need help to deal with their deep-seated psychological problems, not grandstanding.

It is not surprising that this “progressive religious” statement is led by the Unitarian Universalist Association. This is a religion which teaches that belief in God is “optional.” As such, they welcome atheists and agnostics, alongside Buddhists, Christians, Earth-Centered, Hindu, Humanists and Jews.

We know who most of the people are, but “Earth-Centered” threw us at the Catholic League. Then we learned that many Unitarian Universalists “draw inspiration from the cycles of the seasons,” and the “spiritual teachings of earth-centered traditions.” In a bow to inclusivity, “Some of us practice indigenous religions and Modern Paganism.” What unites this motley crew of believers and non-believers remains a mystery.

The Catholic Church has its share of problems, but given the contrast between what the USCCB has reaffirmed about nature and nature’s God—as compared to what these anti-science religions teach—we are delighted to stand with the bishops.

WHY MAMDANI DIDN'T MARCH WITH VETERANS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Predictably, New York City Mayor-elect Zohran Mamdani did not march in the Veterans Day Parade. His decision to visit a veteran's residence in the Bronx, having a meal with them, is no substitute for marching in the big parade. If he decided to have lunch with gays at a community center in Brooklyn, instead of marching in the New York City Pride Parade, everyone would know what he was doing. But he would never do that, nor would he ever offend Muslims.

Mamdani came up with the lame excuse that "I haven't thought much about parades." This is not true. As we pointed out [November 10](#), he has marched in many parades, but he draws the line with those that honor Israel or Columbus. That's because his radical left-wing ideology governs his views on Israel and the United States.

New York City Mayor Eric Adams marched in the Veterans Day Parade, as have mayors before him. Even Bill de Blasio marched. When asked if he would march in next year's parade honoring veterans, Mamdani refused to answer. Everyone knows he won't. His base would be furious if he did.

Patriotic Americans will always be horrified by what happened on 9/11. For Mamdani, the nearly 3,000 who were killed by Islamists are a footnote to what this day means. He sees "Islamophobia" as the number-one problem. "Growing up in the shadow of 9/11, I have known what it means to live with an undercurrent of suspicion in this city."

More recently he has said that his aunt was too afraid to wear her hijab in public after 9/11. Besides the fact that she is his cousin, not his aunt, it is striking what really bothers

him about that fateful day. To be exact, what radical Muslims did to innocent Americans seems not to bother him as much as alleged incidents of anti-Muslim bias.

Let's face it. Mamdani is more at home smiling with his friend, Siraj Wahhaj, the Islamist linked to terrorist activity in the U.S., than he is smiling with veterans marching up Fifth Avenue. That says it all.

WILL MAMDANI MARCH WITH VETERANS?

[Bill Donohue](#)

New York City Mayor-elect Zohran Mamdani likes to march in most of the city's celebratory parades. Will he march in the NYC 2025 Veterans Day Parade? There is no evidence he has ever marched in this annual parade.

Mamdani recently marched in the Labor Day Parade and the West Indian Day Parade. He has previously marched in the Bangladesh Day Parade, the Sikh Day Parade, the Dominican Day Parade, the Panamanian Day Parade, the Puerto Rican Day Parade, the African American Day Parade, the St. Patrick's Day Parade *in Queens* (this is the most gay-friendly of these parades—he does not march in the big one up Fifth Avenue), and, like a good Muslim, he proudly marches in the New York Pride Parade, waving his gay flag.

There are some parades he hates. But this doesn't stop online apologists from lying about him. For example, an internet search asking if he ever marched in a veteran's parade turned up a statement from Newsflare, an online video news source,

that said, “Yes, Zohran Mamdani has marched in a veteran’s parade. He participated in the 2025 Labor Day Parade...”

News flash for Newsflare—Labor Day parades have nothing to do with veterans.

If the Marxist Muslim Millionaire were a patriot, it would make sense for him to march in the Columbus Day Parade. He didn’t in 2025, but that is because the parade was cancelled due to high winds. But he could have marched in the 2024 Columbus Day Parade, yet he said no. The fact is he hates this parade. How do we know? Because in 2020 he issued a tweet that showed him giving the middle finger to a Columbus statue in Astoria, Queens. He called for its removal.

We know what he thinks of Israel. He is a Hamas sympathizer. This explains why he refuses to march in any parade that honors Israel. What’s his excuse? He says he will not “recognize any state’s right to exist with a system of hierarchy on the basis of race or religion.”

Mamdani lies. How do we know? He has no problem marching in a parade that honors Pakistan, yet this country has adopted Islam as the official state religion. Wouldn’t that disqualify it as it smacks of “a system of hierarchy” on the basis of religion?

In other words, because Israel is a Jewish state, Mamdani refuses to march in their parades. Pakistan, however, is an Islamic state, so that makes it okay for him to march.

Mamdani should tell his queer friends why he loves Pakistan, a nation which punishes gays. Under Penal Code 1860, it is illegal for men to have sex with men. Gay sex carries a maximum penalty of life imprisonment.

The New York City Veterans Day Parade is the largest one of its kind in the nation, drawing patriots from all over New York and beyond. That explains why Mamdani never marches in

it.

NEWSOM INVOKES THE BIBLE TO SLAM VANCE

[Bill Donohue](#)

On November 9, California Governor Gavin Newsom called out Vice President JD Vance for allowing the poor to go hungry. He invoked the Bible to make his case. He made his comments to Jake Tapper on the CNN show, "State of the Union."

The Daily Beast, a left-wing media outlet, said, "Newsom Rips New Catholic Vance for Denying Food to Poor." It noted that Newsom was a "Tried-and-tested Catholic," and Vance was a "newbie" Catholic.

What prompted Newsom to lash out at Vance was the suspension of SNAP benefits, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. He never mentioned that SNAP has run out of money. With good reason: for 13 consecutive times, the Democrats in Congress have voted to keep the government closed; they did so most recently on November 4th. Only now are they back in the game.

This kind of bickering is commonplace among politicians, but what is different this time is that Newsom brought religion into the mix, essentially saying he is the model Catholic, not Vance.

"I mean, Old Testament, New Testament," he told Tapper. "What's the fundamental thing that connects every—I mean, from John to Matthew to Proverbs? It's this notion of hunger,

feeding the poor, the sick, the tired...it's not an option, it's central to advancing God's will."

The Daily Beast is wrong. Newsom is not a "Tried-and-tested Catholic." Even he admits he is not. In fact, he calls himself a "secular Catholic." Those must be the type who play bingo in a Church basement while rarely going upstairs.

There is good reason why Newsom is not a real Catholic. Real Catholics do not pretend to be interested in the welfare of children, as Newsom does, and then champions child abuse in the womb. Mr. "Cultural Catholic" has never found an abortion he couldn't justify, and loves to brag how he is the strongest advocate of abortion in the nation. Just a few weeks ago, he took \$140 million of California taxpayer's money and gave it to Planned Parenthood, the behemoth abortion mill.

Newsom is shameless. He even invokes God's name to justify the killing of innocent unborn children. In 2022, after Mississippi and Oklahoma passed restrictive abortion laws, he promoted billboards in those states that wrapped his support for abortion in Scripture. *"Love your neighbor as yourself. There is no greater commandment than these."* Mark 12:31.

Other children who are not safe from Newsom's policies are those who are sexually confused and seek to undergo sex-reassignment surgery—the governor argues that these minors should be allowed to go through with this madness over the objections of their parents. Removing the genitals of children is something he finds humane.

Was it also humane when he killed his own mother? The night before he and a few others put her down in 2002, Newsom was so kind as to make her dinner. He gave her hard-boiled eggs. He finished her knowing that assisted suicide was against Californian law (it wasn't legalized until 2016).

Now, of course, Newsom is lecturing Vance about what the Bible has to say about caring for the "sick." Evidently, in his book

caring for the sick includes killing them.

If Newsom had any guts, he would tell us what he really thinks about Catholicism and stop repairing to it to justify his passion for killing the innocent. But he is not man enough to do so. That's what we would expect from a "cultural Catholic." Bingo anyone?

PROFILE OF MAMDANI VOTERS IS TELLING

[Bill Donohue](#)

Who voted for Zohran Mamdani? He is the young radical Muslim socialist who was elected the next mayor of New York City. He took 50.4 percent of the vote; Andrew Cuomo received 41.6 percent; and Curtis Sliwa picked up 7.1 percent.

Let's start with the two most important demographic segments who voted against Mamdani: Jews and Catholics. Jews voted for Cuomo over Mamdani by a margin of 63 percent to 33 percent; Catholics split the vote 53 to 33 percent, respectively. Among those with no religious affiliation—who are second in size to Catholics—Mamdani won 52 percent of them.

Mamdani walloped Cuomo with the two least sophisticated segments of the voting population, namely first-time voters and young people. He won 65 percent of the former and 62 percent of voters under 30. The older the voter the more likely he was to vote for Cuomo. No matter, seniors were outdone not only among the youngest voters, middle-age voters also broke for Mamdani.

The socialist led the field among those of every race and ethnicity, save for white voters (Cuomo won by 1 percent). An impressive 62 percent of Asians voted for the man of mixed African and South Asian ancestry. Blacks voted for Mamdani over Cuomo 57 percent to 38 percent, and the split for Latinos was 52 to 39 percent.

Men did not turn out to vote (they are 48 percent of the New York City population but they made up only 44 percent of voters) and they chose Mamdani (50 percent) to Cuomo (41 percent). Women are 52 percent of the NYC population, but they accounted for 55 percent of the voters; 50 percent voted for Mamdani, and 43 percent went for Cuomo. Mamdani creamed the field among young women voters—they are the most radical segment of the electorate—winning an astonishing 84 percent of them.

It is incontestable that in recent times both the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* have moved far to the left of their traditional center-left position. But they drew the line with Mamdani.

Last June, the *Times* not only refused to endorse him when he was running in the Democratic primary, they said, “His experience is too thin, and his agenda reads like a turbocharged version of Mr. de Blasio’s dismaying mayoralty.” A few days ago, the *Post* said that if he succeeds with his radical policies, “New Yorkers will begin to flee.”

In other words, New Yorkers are *more left-wing* than the editorial boards of the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. This is amazing.

Does this mean that New Yorkers really believe that a man whose only full-time job outside politics was working as a counselor at a non-profit organization for about a year has the chops to do the job? No. They don’t believe him. Only 39 percent of New Yorkers say he is up for the job, as compared

to 47 percent who say he isn't.

Mamdani prevailed at all income levels, doing best with high-income voters. He tapped into a lot of economic fears. For example, New Yorkers said that their number-one issue is the cost-of-living, and Mamdani ran on a campaign to make New York "affordable." But his basket of goodies—free bus fare, free child care, a rent freeze—cannot be done without raising taxes. Here's the kicker: 60 percent of voters said raising taxes will "hurt the economy."

So is Mamdani being realistic when he sports his budget-busting policies? No. Only 44 percent of voters said his policies are realistic. Cuomo, by contrast, was believable—58 percent said his policies were realistic.

In other words, a majority of New Yorkers voted for a man whom they believe (a) can't do the job (b) will pursue measures that will hurt the economy, and (c) will promote policies that are unrealistic.

What gives? What we are witnessing is a merger of La La Land and The Twilight Zone. It's called New York City.

MAMDANI'S RULINGS BEAR CLOSE SCRUTINY

[Bill Donohue](#)

We have made plain our grave concerns about Zohran Mamdani (click [here](#)), and now that he will become the mayor of New York City on January 1, 2026, we will keep a close eye on his rulings, especially as they bear on religious liberty and

Catholic interests.

Specifically, we will report on his personnel picks and policy decisions, holding him accountable. This means we will not wait until January to track him. Moreover, we will provide our email subscribers and Catholic League members with contact information, so they can have their voice heard. We will post our findings on our website under “Mamdani Watch.”

Mamdani is poised to be much more than a local figure, which explains why we will monitor his every move.

MEET THE NEW MISOGYNISTS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Tonight, at New York’s Plaza Hotel, *Glamour* magazine will hold its 2025 “Women of the Year” ceremony. But no one really cares about the celebrities being honored, and that’s because all of them are women. It’s just too mundane to matter.

What sells is honoring men who falsely claim to be a woman. That is what the November U.K. *Glamour* is doing: on the cover are photos of men who pretend to be women; they are being honored as “Women of the Year.”

Why do those who work at the U.K. offices at *Glamour* hate women? It cries out for an honest answer.

If there were a cover story recognizing the achievements of blacks, featuring “African Americans of the Year,” and every one of the honorees was white, wouldn’t this be labeled racist? Why, then, is it not misogynistic to honor men who are deemed to be “Women of the Year”?

Aside from J.K. Rowling in the U.K., and Megan Kelly and Allie Beth Stuckey in the U.S., there has been little pushback against this attack on women. Where are all the feminists who for years have been telling us that men occupy positions of privilege, denying women equal rights? In a perverse shift, it is now feminists who are championing the evisceration of women's rights, promoting the interests of men who are out to destroy them. These are the new misogynists.

This fall, *Glamour* writer Stephanie McNeal blasted the men who harassed Irish golfer Rory McIlroy, and his wife Erica Stoll, at the Ryder Cup golf tournament held on Long Island. Many of them were rude beyond belief. McNeal didn't hold back. "Let's call a spade a spade: The behaviour was pure misogynistic abuse, and it's a growing movement in American culture right now."

Yes, it is time to call a spade a spade. We can begin by explaining why it is misogynistic to mistreat McIlroy's wife, but it is not misogynistic to mistreat women who would make splendid candidates for "Women of the Year," instead recognizing men who falsely claim to be a woman. What's worse—catcalls or discriminating against women?

It is not as though McNeal hasn't thought about this subject. Back in January she wrote a piece for *Glamour* titled, "Misogyny Is 2025's Biggest Trend." She gave as an example Mark Zuckerberg telling Joe Rogan that companies need more "masculine energy." Another example of misogyny is removing tampons from men's bathrooms (she did not say why the guys never complained). Abortion restrictions, which protect females in the womb as well as males, are also labeled misogynistic.

"Masculine energy" shows contempt for women. Removing tampons from men's bathrooms shows contempt for women. Protecting the unborn shows contempt for women. But denying high-achieving women the right to be considered "Women of the Year"—awarding

that right exclusively to men—does not show contempt for women.

Mainstreaming delusion has never been more chic.

Kara Dansky is a left-wing feminist activist of the old school, meaning she does not suffer from delusion. She is the author of *The Abolition of Sex: How the 'Transgender' Agenda Harms Women and Girls*. She maintains that transgender is “a made-up concept,” one that it is really a “men’s rights movement.” Indeed, she says, “It is left-wing misogyny on steroids.”

She agrees with J.K. Rowling that we are living in the one of the most misogynistic times in recent history. That the biggest misogynists are feminists, working to promote men’s rights at the expense of women’s rights, is something previous feminists never fathomed.

On the cover of the October edition of *Ebony* magazine, the prominent black publication, eight young men and women were featured in a story on “The Next Wave of HBCU Leaders in Beauty.” HBCU stands for “Historically Black Colleges & Universities.” All of the young men and women were black. Had they been white, *Ebony* would fold.

But *Glamour* will survive, and that’s because the new misogynists have proven to be triumphant. To put it differently, if the savants who work there can’t tell the difference between a man and a woman, then how can they be sure they are right when they complain that women are being mistreated? How do they know they’re a woman?

WHY IS MASSACHUSETTS SO ILLIBERAL?

[Bill Donohue](#)

The short answer to this question is because Massachusetts is so liberal.

To be a liberal used to mean being tolerant, especially of free speech. No more. Today it means being an authoritarian. This has been confirmed by many surveys, including ones sponsored by the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE). In other words, many—not all—self-identified contemporary liberals are illiberal in their words and deeds.

Among the most illiberal states in the nation is Massachusetts. One recent example of this verity is the recent lawsuit brought by more than a dozen residents in Quincy objecting to the display of St. Michael and St. Florian on the new police headquarters. The town mayor, Thomas Koch, chose these two figures to adorn the building because they are the patron saints of police and firefighters, respectively. A judge has granted a preliminary injunction stopping the installation of the statues.

The lawsuit argues that the statues violate religious neutrality, as required by law. Mayor Koch responds by saying they were chosen “to honor Quincy’s first responders, not to promote any religion.” The legal issues are critical, but it is not fidelity to the law that is spurring the lawsuit—it is intolerance to anything Christian.

St. Michael was chosen as the patron saint of the police because of his role, as described in Scripture, of being a warrior angel who protected the people. Florian was a third-century military officer who was responsible for assembling an

elite corps of firefighters. That's why the two of them were chosen as exemplary representatives of first responders.

The Supreme Court has several times understood that religious figures can have secular connotations, meaning their non-religious activities can be appreciated independent of their religious status. One example of this would be the many schools, streets and statues named after Martin Luther King. They are a tribute to his civil rights efforts. He was also a minister, yet no one says they should be renamed because he was a man of the cloth.

Corpus Christi is a city in Texas. It means "Body of Christ." Should it be renamed? Throughout California there are towns and cities that start with "San," meaning "saint." Should they be renamed? We are coming into the holiday season: the word "holiday" means "holy day." Should we cancel that as well? Or are we not being deliriously sensitive?

What is going on in Quincy is a state-wide problem. Take Boston, barely ten miles away.

From 2006 to 2018, the city of Boston authorized 284 flags to fly atop a city flagpole outside of city hall, representing a myriad of government and private interests. But in 2018 it turned down a request by Camp Constitution to fly what they described as a "Christian" flag, maintaining that to do so would amount to government endorsement of religion. But Gay Pride flags were allowed: only Christian flags were banned.

Eventually, the Supreme Court resolved the Christian lawsuit in their favor. The high court ruled that the flagpole represented a public forum, and therefore the government could not discriminate on the basis of religious viewpoint.

Why did secular elites in Boston decide to cherry-pick one group and deny it the right to fly their Christian flag when they had no problem honoring the flags of Communist nations? Why was rejecting the Christian flag so important to them that

they appealed lower court rulings to the highest court in the land? Let's face it, they did so because of their deep-seated animus against Christianity.

The same hostility is at work today in Quincy. Historically, this is bizarre.

The last state to abandon state churches was Massachusetts. That was in 1833. But in 2016, a Pew Research Center poll found that the Bay State was tied with New Hampshire as the least religious state in the nation. In 2007, 81 percent of the residents of Massachusetts identified with a religion; in 2024, it was 63 percent. The decline was driven largely by a decrease in adults who identified as Christian. Moreover, the percentage of adults who identified as religiously unaffiliated jumped from 17 percent in 2007 to 37 percent in 2024.

One major reason for the secularization of Massachusetts is the proliferation of elite colleges and universities; it ranks second on this measure to California. This matters greatly as higher education is one of the most significant drivers of secularism in the nation. Regrettably, these days it is associated with illiberalism.

In its 2026 College Free Speech Rankings, FIRE rated 257 colleges and universities. Harvard University ranked 245, Boston College placed 251, and Northeastern University came in at 253. The study concluded that "Massachusetts is home to some of the most speech-restrictive campuses in the country." Thus does it represent a textbook case of how liberalism has evolved into illiberalism.

Those who spend their days on campus, as administrators, faculty or students, surely consider themselves among the most enlightened and fair-minded people in America. Nonsense. They are precisely the kind of people who get exercised about the statues that adorn the Quincy police headquarters.