

VATICAN REJECTS GAY UNIONS; DISSIDENTS REBEL

Pope Francis has been under considerable pressure by gay activists, in and out of the Church, to give the green light to gay marriage. On March 15, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith released a statement to queries on this issue that is the most decisive rejection of those efforts ever written. Dissident Catholics were enraged.

The Church's top doctrinal office said, "it is not licit to impart a blessing on relationships, partnerships, even stable, that involve sexual activity outside of marriage (i.e, outside the indissoluble union of a man and a woman open in itself to the transmission of life), as is the case of the unions between persons of the same sex."

The statement made it clear that this "does not preclude the blessings given to individual persons with homosexual inclinations, who manifest the will to live in fidelity to the revealed plans of God as proposed by Church teaching." It is homosexual unions that are the problem, not homosexuals.

With regard to homosexuality, the Vatican said it cannot "approve and encourage a choice and a way of life" that is "objectively disordered."

God, the document declared, "does not and cannot bless sin." In short, "the Church does not have, and cannot have, the power to bless unions of persons of the same sex." In other words, the Church must follow Scripture.

This did not sit well with those Catholics who have been at war with the Church's teachings on sexuality. The German bishops, in particular, were unhappy; many are prepared to sanction gay unions. In the U.S., so-called progressive Catholics were beside themselves.

The statement simply reaffirmed the Catholic Church's teaching on marriage. Nonetheless, it was seen as controversial in some quarters, and that is because Pope Francis has been welcoming to homosexuals. In fairness to the pope, it is not his fault that some interpret his friendly approach as signifying an interest in changing Church doctrine. That's their problem. To put it differently, it is one thing to say all persons possess equal dignity in the eyes of God; it is quite another to say that whatever they do is acceptable to God. Human status and human behavior are not identical. Also, this document applies equally to heterosexuals. According to Catholic sexual ethics, cohabiting men and women are involved in an illicit relationship, and this statement is very clear about their status. Yet the media missed this point, so absorbed were they with gay rights. Whatever previous confusion there was is now gone. The Vatican left nothing on the table. The door has been slammed shut on the gay agenda.

USCCB REJECTS COVID BILL

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) formally opposed the American Rescue Plan Act, more commonly known as the "Stimulus Bill" or the "Covid Relief Bill."

USCCB president José Gomez wrote a letter on March 6 to all U.S. Senators urging them to vote against the bill; several USCCB committee chairmen co-signed the letter.

This came the day after the USCCB released a letter by Gomez (and the committee chairmen) stating they could not support the bill unless it prohibited funding for abortions. The sponsors of the bill refused to accede to the bishops'

request.

The bishops were unequivocal in their opposition to the bill. "This grievous result gives us heavy hearts because it leaves us with no choice but to urge you to oppose final passage of the American Rescue Plan Act."

The big story here is the decision of the bishops to make good on their promise that abortion is their "preeminent issue." For those Catholics who prioritize social justice issues, this is a stunning loss. After all, this was their dream bill, packed with money for all their favorite programs.

There are many elements of the bill that are very appealing to the bishops, and to Catholics in general. But to ask Catholics to support legislation that helps the needy while denying the unborn the right to life is offensive. The most basic human right is the right to life, not income assistance.

WE LOST TWO GREAT MEDIA VOICES

William A. Donohue

Last December, I told staff members that I don't think Larry King or Rush Limbaugh will be with us much longer. From what I had been reading, their days were numbered. Regrettably, my concerns were validated. Larry died in January and Rush passed away the next month.

I dealt with both of these men for many years, and regard them as media titans.

They had a few things in common: Larry was the greatest TV

interviewer of all time and Rush was the greatest radio commentator of all time. They also had a few things in common in their personal lives: Larry had seven wives; Rush had four. But Larry was liberal, and Rush was conservative. Neither was Catholic, however that didn't matter to me: what mattered was their kindness and support.

When I was interviewed for this job in April 1993, I was in competition with three other persons, all of whom had better experience in running organizations than I had. But I was a professor, an author and a TV personality. The search committee saw tapes of my TV interviews and were impressed. Among the interviews they previewed were some that Larry hosted. So in an indirect way, Larry was instrumental in getting me this job.

Why was Larry the best interviewer of all time? Because he did something that almost no one does today on TV: he listened. His show was never about him—it was about his guests. He actually held a conversation and allowed his guests to talk. His next line of questions were based on something his guests just said; they were not based on questions prepared by his producer. That's why he was never seen reading from index cards.

When the show was over, I occasionally spent time with Larry, usually talking about the subjects we had just discussed. While we were of two different minds, he was never acerbic or condescending, the way too many in this business are today. He was a gentleman who appreciated honesty and an informed opinion.

While Rush played no role in helping me land this job, once I took over, he got the word out about the Catholic League; he reached an audience I could never reach. On many occasions throughout the years, someone would call our office saying Rush just gave us a rousing endorsement. Unfortunately, I was almost always working when he was on the air and did not have

a chance to hear him. But I sure appreciated his support.

I knew there was something special about Rush before he made it really big. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, while driving from Pittsburgh, where I lived, back home to New York City, where my mom and sister lived, I listened to Bob Grant on WABC radio. He was the kingpin of radio at the time. Following him was Rush. I said to family and friends, "Watch this guy—he is going to be bigger than Grant."

Rush and I never met, though when he interviewed me at length in 2014, it felt as though we had. He featured the interview in the April edition of The Limbaugh Letter. He was easy going and was quite humble.

"I wanted to talk to you for the longest time," he said, "and I'm really appreciative that you've been able to make this time here. You intrigue me. I've been watching you for years on TV. I don't think there's an advocate who does it better, and does it in a way that's not overtly devout or religious." I was blown away by what he said.

Larry and Rush were refreshingly unscripted. Of course, they came mentally prepared and knew exactly what they wanted to convey. But unlike so many members of the chattering class today, they didn't repeat themselves endlessly, and they never lost their spontaneity.

The rap on Larry was that he threw softball questions. It would be more accurate to say that he never felt it necessary to insult his guests. This explains why he could secure some blue chip guests who were known to turn down TV interviews. That's why his competitors were jealous.

The rap on Rush was that he was too judgmental. Typically, those who made this accusation had no problem listening to the most judgmental commentators in the world, provided they were on the same side. In other words, they objected to his conservative listeners. What really drove them mad—and this

was part of his genius—was his ability to reach an enormous audience of men and women who did not necessarily think of themselves as conservative, but realized they were after listening to him.

If I had to name one quality that Larry and Rush had in common that explains their greatness it would be their education: they were both high school graduates (Larry never attended college and Rush dropped out after two semesters).

To be sure, college has its merits, but it can also stifle creativity. No institution breeds more cognitive conformity than higher education, and this is especially true of the humanities and social sciences. Fortunately, Larry and Rush were never held hostage.

BIDEN'S CURIOUS CATHOLIC CREDENTIALS

Bill Donohue

Obsessing Over Biden's Religion

The obsession with President Biden's religion is everywhere apparent, especially among Democrats, liberal pundits, reporters and activists. They are working overtime to convince the public that he is a good Catholic.

On Biden's first day in office, White House press secretary Jen Psaki addressed his religion at a press conference. "I will just take the opportunity to remind all of you that he is a devout Catholic, and somebody who attends church regularly." "Devout Catholic." A lexis-nexis search reveals that this

descriptive term has been used by the press hundreds of times in the last three months.

The day after Biden was inaugurated, the New York Times gushed that he is “perhaps the most religiously observant commander in chief in half a century.” Usually, this newspaper is apprehensive, if not alarmed, about “religiously observant” public officials (especially Catholic ones), yet for some reason they made an exception for Biden.

Sister Carol Keehan is the former head of the Catholic Health Association. She says Biden is a “man who clearly loves his faith.” To get an idea of what she considers to be a model Catholic, she recently showered Xavier Becerra with praise when he was grilled by a Senate committee over his nomination for Secretary of Health and Human Services. It does not bother her one iota that Becerra supports partial-birth abortions and is known for his never-ending crusades against the Little Sisters of the Poor.

Another Biden admirer is John Carr, co-director of a Catholic project at Georgetown University; he is a reliable liberal Catholic voice. He is impressed by the difference between Biden and his predecessor. “We’re going from one of the least overtly religious presidents in modern times to one of the most overtly religious presidents in recent times.”

If there is one thing that makes Biden “overtly religious,” it is his habit of carrying a rosary. That puts a smile on the face of liberal Catholics like Father Tom Reese, a prominent Jesuit writer. “This is a guy who carries a rosary around in his pocket and talks about his faith.” The media also love this story. This explains why there is so much chatter about Biden’s rosary beads.

Let’s concede that Biden is a rosary-carrying “devout Catholic.” What does that have to do with his public policy decisions that are of interest to the Catholic Church?

Biden's lust for abortion rights, and his steadfast opposition to religious liberty legislation—as exemplified in his defense of the Equality Act—are uncontestable. In other words, if a “devout” Catholic doesn't connect the dots between his faith and his public policy decisions, how excited should Catholics be about him? And does this not explain why secularists adore this kind of Catholic?

At the individual level, Biden is the embodiment of what the privatization of religion means. In this view, religion is solely an interior exercise, having no public role to play. It must be said that there is nothing Catholic about such a position. Indeed, every pope in recent times, including Pope Francis, has spoken against this insular view. Catholicism, they contend, must have a robust presence in the public square.

Biden's privatized conception of religion is not a stunt—it is who he is.

The first time he publicly mentioned his rosary beads was in 1995, twenty-two years after he became U.S. Senator from Delaware. What he said at a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing on religious freedom was classic Biden.

“I am one of those guys who's never talked about my religion. I carry a thing called a rosary bead with me all the time—I say it all the time, I say it on the train—to me, it's a comforting thing. I don't suggest it to anybody else.”

He did not explain why, if the rosary beads meant so much to him, he did not want to “suggest it to anybody else.” Perhaps in his mind such a suggestion could be read as an imposition. But that wouldn't explain his support for forcing nuns to pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plans. That was not a suggestion—it was a mandate. It was also one that violated Catholic moral teachings.

It seems a little strange for a “devout Catholic” to keep

private his religion. After all, Biden is not a monk—he has been a public office holder for 47 years. This accounts, however, for the fact that when he was running for president, the majority of the public had no idea he was Catholic. In September 2020, Newsweek released a poll showing that 56% were unaware that Biden was Catholic.

Biden's long-time secretive Catholic status is a secret no more. Indeed his fans are now touting his "devout Catholic" status whenever they can. Given the president's strong opposition to the life issues and religious liberty, they have little choice. It is precisely this kind of Catholic that the New York Times loves.

The Politics of Branding Biden a Catholic

Everyone knew that Sen. Joe Lieberman was proudly Jewish, so there was no need to persuade the public of his religious status. Similarly, it is widely recognized that Sen. Mitt Romney is a practicing Mormon, therefore making moot attempts to prove he is. President Biden is different. Not a day goes by without some commentators, usually left-wing Catholics, trying to convince the public that he is a model Catholic.

This is disingenuous. If Biden were a model Catholic, there would be no need to assure us that he is. Even his fans know he isn't, otherwise they wouldn't waste so much energy on this issue. What galvanizes them is their war with the bishops.

Los Angeles Archbishop José Gomez is president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). When Biden was elected, he congratulated him. However, when Biden was inaugurated, Gomez expressed concerns about the president's positions on various issues, explicitly wondering whether he "will advance moral evils."

Most bishops agreed with Gomez, but a few did not. Among the laity, those on the left were furious. Immediately, a campaign against the USCCB was launched by the National Catholic

Reporter, a rogue Catholic publication.

On January 28, the Reporter asked the Vatican to investigate the USCCB for its alleged “staunch Republican support.” On February 5, Faithful America, a George Soros creation, started a petition online in support of the Reporter’s efforts. It will have no effect—the Vatican won’t even acknowledge their game—but their intent matters greatly.

What’s driving the campaign against the bishops?

Those on the Catholic left have an ideological interest in selling Biden to the public as a loyal son of the Church. Their goal is to undermine the authority of the bishops by promoting the false idea that the bishops do not have the last word on what constitutes a Catholic in good standing. They seek to persuade the public, especially Catholics, that it is perfectly acceptable to reject the Church’s teachings on life, marriage, and religious liberty—the way Biden does—and still be a model Catholic.

One of their favorite tactics is to contend that Biden is more similar to Pope Francis than are the bishops. David Gibson, who directs an institute at Fordham University, claims that Biden is “more in line with the pope than the American bishops.” That would surely come as news to priests who have denied Biden Communion.

Paul Elie, a Georgetown professor, says the pope and Biden have much in common. “Their informality, the fact that they were elected late in life, the fact that they seem to take issues as they come, listening, discerning and then acting.” He fails to note that the pope and Biden have nothing in common when it comes to their fidelity to the Church’s moral teachings. But that evidently matters less than their “informality.”

Elie is more accurate when he gets to the heart of why it is necessary for Catholics like him to rescue Biden from his

critics. "The hope is that the Biden Administration will invigorate American Catholicism, and vice versa." Translated this means that Catholic dissidents want the Biden brand of Catholicism to prove triumphant.

It angers Catholic malcontents that some criticize Biden's Catholic credentials. Julia Maloney, who works at the University of Michigan, gets incensed when she hears someone say that Biden is "Catholic in name only." Mark Silk, who is not Catholic, wants us Catholics to know that the president's pro-abortion record "doesn't necessarily make Biden a bad Catholic."

Sister Simone Campbell, the Democrats' favorite nun, is bolder than Silk. The star of "nuns on the bus" tries to bail out Biden by saying his views on abortion are "very developed." By that she means "he will not force his religious beliefs on the whole nation." Not exactly reassuring considering his desire to force his anti-Catholic beliefs on the Little Sisters of the Poor (as well as everyone else).

Joe Sweeney of the University of California at Davis says it is "incredibly offensive and absurd" to call into question Biden's Catholicity simply because he has a "moderate approach to issues like abortion and same-sex marriage." One wonders what positions Biden must take for Sweeney to label him an extremist. After all, Biden supports infanticide—babies killed in partial-birth abortions are 80% born—and he has officiated at gay weddings.

Jamie Manson, who heads an anti-Catholic organization, Catholics for Choice, says the majority of American Catholics agree with Biden on abortion. They do not. Practicing Catholics, as a recent survey disclosed, are pro-life by a 2-1 margin, and even non-practicing Catholics do not support late-term abortions.

The Catholic left has an uphill battle. Most people know that

someone who identifies as Catholic yet rejects the Church's teachings on abortion, gay marriage and the First Amendment cannot realistically be regarded as a loyal Catholic. The fact that these dissidents are working overtime to convince us that Biden is a Catholic in good standing is proof that he isn't.

BIDEN V. THE BISHOPS

President Biden was in office for only a month when he collided with the bishops. It reached a new level when he issued a statement endorsing the Equality Act; the bill is tied up in the Senate.

Biden sees the Equality Act as granting "dignity and respect" to everyone, making sure that "America lives up to our foundational values of equality and freedom for all." He says it is needed because "LGBTQ+ Americans" have been denied "full equality."

This is a dishonest account. If the bill were as benign as Biden says it is, why would the United States Conference of Catholic Bishop's (USCCB) be so adamantly opposed to it? The bishops have not been fooled. The Equality Act is, without a doubt, the most radical assault on religious liberty, the right to life, and privacy rights ever packaged into one bill.

When Archbishop José Gomez, chairman of the USCCB, warned in November that some of Biden's policies were troubling, he explicitly mentioned "the passage of the Equality Act." As the bishops have previously noted, it could gut the autonomy of Catholic hospitals, especially with regards to reproductive issues. It could also be used to compel Catholic schools to grant boys access to the locker rooms and shower facilities of girls.

Gomez said the Equality Act poses “a serious threat to the common good,” but that wasn’t the worst of it. What made it really treacherous was its endorsement by a Catholic president. The chairman of the USCCB rightly observed that “it creates confusion among the faithful about what the Church actually teaches on these questions.”

The Catholic League would object to any president who would promote this bill. That it is being done by a Catholic makes it all the more disconcerting.

BIDEN’S SECULAR VISION OF FAITH-BASED PROGRAMS

President Trump and President Biden could not be more different when it comes to religion. Trump never gave the impression that he was a deeply religious man; Biden has. But Trump delivered on religious liberty, passing many key policies and appointing religion-friendly judges. Biden, on the other hand, is content to check his religion at the church door.

Biden’s decision to appoint Melissa Rogers to head the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships is telling. She is also a senior director for faith and public policy in the White House Domestic Policy Council. He could not have chosen a more seasoned secularist to steer these faith-based entities.

Rogers may be a Baptist, but it is her secular vision of faith-based programs that will direct her decision-making. This is not a matter of speculation. This is her second appointment as director of faith-based programs: Obama chose

her to head this initiative in his second term. So we know what we are getting.

When Rogers worked in the Obama White House, her idea of reaching out to faith communities was to invite the Secular Coalition of America to the White House. She welcomed the professional atheists in the name of religious pluralism. As we previously said, this was “akin to welcoming racists in the name of racial harmony.”

The clash between religious liberty and the LGBT agenda is well known. It is fair to say that we would not expect an LGBT activist to champion the cause of religious liberty. Nor would we expect a religious leader to champion the LGBT cause. That’s what makes Rogers special. She sides with the homosexual agenda against people of faith.

Does this mean that Rogers would ban Orthodox Jews from exclusively hiring their own to run their day-care centers? Yes it does. Does this mean that she opposes Catholic foster-care programs from following Catholic teachings when deciding whom to place children with in adoptive settings? Yes it does.

Rogers doesn’t miss any salient issue. For example, she wants to ban “government-sponsored religious displays.” Not sure whether she would approve of the Catholic League’s display of a life-size nativity scene in Central Park. After all, it is on public property.

Biden obviously shares Rogers’ secular vision, which is why he went back to the well and brought her on board again. In doing so, he is right in step with his previous boss, President Obama. Three months into his first term, the Obama advance team told Georgetown University that the president would not speak there unless they put a drape over religious symbols. Then there was the serious debate over whether to display a manger scene at Christmastime in 2009.

These anecdotes are revealing, but it was secularization of

faith-based programs that angered religious leaders. Matters got so bad that on January 15, 2010, we released a statement, "Time to Close Faith-Based Programs." On June 24, 2011, after another round of dumbing-down the religious element of these programs, we issued another news release calling to "Shut Down Faith-Based Programs."

President Biden has a right to appoint whomever he wants to command his faith-based programs. But in choosing Rogers the "devout Catholic" has sent an unmistakable message to people of faith: You lose.

EQUALITY ACT IS ANTI-CHRISTIAN

According to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, the Equality Act is "about ending discrimination"; President Joe Biden agrees. That may be its intent, but its effect is to promote the most comprehensive assault on Christianity ever written into law.

This explains why the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has been fighting this proposed law for years. Most recently it said the Equality Act "would discriminate against people of faith." The Catholic League and many other civil rights and religious organizations have also sounded the alarm.

The Equality Act has two major goals: it would amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act to include sexual orientation and gender identity to the definition of sex; it would also undermine the Religious Freedom Restoration Act by allowing gay rights to trump religious rights.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act was primarily motivated by a desire to end racial segregation. It banned discrimination based on race, sex or national origin. That was it. It said absolutely nothing about sexual orientation, and it certainly didn't address transgender rights—it wasn't even a concept in the 1960s. Adding sexual orientation and gender identity to this law not only violates the intent of the legislation, it unduly burdens houses of worship and other religious organizations.

In order to end racial segregation, the 1964 Civil Rights Act banned discrimination in public accommodations. Blacks had historically been denied services in many public facilities, ranging from diners to hotels. The Equality Act goes way beyond this, so much so that it disfigures the meaning of this historic 1964 law.

The Equality Act not only covers homosexuals and transgender persons, it expands public accommodations to include consumer services such as healthcare. In practice this would be a disaster. It would mean, for example, that healthcare providers would be forced to provide hormone therapies and surgical procedures that are required to change the physical characteristics associated with sex changes.

One does not have to be a Catholic healthcare practitioner to register moral and religious objections to this "healthcare" initiative. Will anyone be allowed to voice objections to these procedures, pointing out the long-term physical and mental problems associated with sex reassignment? What about parents who learn that their child wants to switch his or her sex? Will their rights be respected or eviscerated?

It has become increasingly clear that the expansion of rights to transgender women—really biological males who identify as female—has come at the expense of rights for biological females. Take sports.

Boys and men would be allowed to compete in sports with girls

and women, thus unfairly altering women's athletics. Females would also lose their privacy rights. These biological males can use the locker rooms, restrooms and shower facilities that have always been reserved for females. None of this has anything to do with why the 1964 Civil Rights Act was passed. There are other problems with this bill that alone should be enough to stop it from ever becoming law.

In 1993, Rep. Nancy Pelosi and Sen. Chuck Schumer co-sponsored the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA); it was signed by President Bill Clinton. This was a major victory for religious liberty. But now Pelosi and Schumer regret their vote, even to the point of supporting the Equality Act, knowing full well that it exempts itself from RFRA! This is perverse. There could be no more serious undercutting of religious liberty than what they are proposing.

It would mean that Catholics, evangelicals, Orthodox Jews, Mormons, Muslims and many other religious communities could not raise religious liberty objections to any of the aforementioned rights of transgender women. In effect, religious entities would be secularized.

For example, if the Equality Act were to become law, Catholic foster care programs would be shut down. They would either have to agree to allow two men to adopt children—a clear violation of Church teachings—or lose federal funding. This is the kind of “gotcha” type element that makes this bill so pernicious.

Currently, Catholic hospitals can legally refuse to perform abortions. Under the Equality Act, they would either lose federal funding or be forced to get into the abortion business. That is because refusing abortion services would be declared “pregnancy” discrimination.

Without the religious liberty protections afforded by RFRA, virtually every religious institution—from houses of worship

to schools—would be expected to fall in line with this radical legislation. Catholic schools, for instance, would be expected to change their teachings on sexual ethics to suit the radical LGBT agenda.

It is hard for the public to understand, especially Catholics, why such allegedly “devout Catholics” as Biden and Pelosi would want to champion such patently anti-Christian legislation as the Equality Act.

We contacted the entire Congress and asked our email subscribers to do the same.

We understand the bill has stalled in the Senate, and because it is a non-budgetary item it would take 60 votes to pass. That will not be an easy sell. No matter, we know Biden’s thoughts on this legislation, and that does not bode well for religious liberty.

BECERRA IS A MENACE TO LIFE AND LIBERTY

Xavier Becerra was President Biden’s worst nominee for a Cabinet post. On March 18, he was confirmed as Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS). We did our best to fight him, pressing legislators to do their job. The Senate voted 50-49 to confirm him.

The man is a menace to life and liberty and has no business serving in this capacity. Here are 16 reasons why we opposed Becerra.

Beginning of Life

1) It would be impossible to find a more enthusiastic advocate of abortion-on-demand. While a majority of Americans support legal abortion, it does so with important qualifications: it does not support abortion for any reason and at any time during pregnancy. As such, Becerra is out of the mainstream. Indeed, he is an extremist. That is why he secures a 100% rating from NARAL and Planned Parenthood and a 0% score from National Right to Life.

2) Becerra's lust for abortion even allows him to support partial-birth abortion, a practice which allows the abortionist to crush the skull of a baby who is 80% born so that the child can exit the woman's birth canal.

3) For all the talk about allowing pregnant women the right to choose, Becerra is on record seeking to prevent them from choosing life. To be exact, when he was the California Attorney General, he lost in the U.S. Supreme Court in his attempt to effectively close down crisis pregnancy centers across the state.

In 2016, in *National Institute of Family & Life Advocates v. Becerra*, the high court ruled against his mandate forcing abortion-alternative centers to post a message saying the state will pay for a woman's abortion. This not only negated the reason these centers were founded, it constituted "compelled speech," and was therefore unconstitutional under the First Amendment. In short, Becerra's idea of freedom to choose is limited to choosing abortion over adoption.

4) If someone who assaults a pregnant woman winds up killing her unborn child, that would seem to make him a criminal. But not to Becerra. As a congressman, he voted against a bill that would criminalize the killing of an unborn child during the commission of another crime. According to Becerra, the unborn child has no rights that the law needs to respect.

5) Though it is hard to believe, there are underground railroads run by abortion extremists that literally transport minors to states where they can easily get an abortion. This is a particularly obscene form of human trafficking that makes even pro-abortion politicians wince. Not Becerra. He voted

against a ban on this hideous practice.

6) Becerra proved himself to be a pro-abortion zealot once again when he brought charges against pro-life activists who went undercover to film Planned Parenthood officials trafficking in aborted baby parts. He brought felony charges against them. His decision was so radical that even the abortion-rights Los Angeles Times criticized him for "disturbing overreach." In 2017, a judge dismissed 14 of the 15 charges as legally insufficient.

Genetic Engineering

7) Embryonic stem cell research, unlike other kinds of stem cell research, is a life and death issue. Science tells us that nascent human life is evident at the embryonic stage, making it impossible to do embryonic stem cell research without killing the embryo. This does not matter to Becerra, which explains his vote in Congress to approve it.

8) Human cloning is an issue that most lawmakers and judges have declined to address. Their reluctance is grounded in the moral and legal dilemmas associated with making a genetically identical copy of a human being in the laboratory. Becerra, however, is different. When he was in Congress, he approved human cloning for research purposes.

End of Life

9) It makes sense that if someone does not value innocent human life at its beginning that he would not value it at its end. Becerra is a classic example of this mentality. When he was Attorney General in California, his strong support for doctor-assisted suicide won him the kudos of the most radical proponents of this cause.

Religious Liberty

10) Conscience rights are at the very heart of religious liberty. To put it mildly, Becerra is not a fan. When those who owned Hobby Lobby were pleading their case, invoking their

conscience rights as grounds for objecting to paying for birth control in their healthcare plan, Becerra maintained that such rights should not matter. He said it was one thing to hold to religious beliefs, quite another to act on them. Fortunately, the U.S. Supreme Court did not ratify such contorted logic and sustained the conscience rights of the business owners.

11) Few Attorneys General in the United States fought more ferociously to deny the Little Sisters of the Poor their religious rights than Becerra. The nuns objected to being forced to pay for abortion-inducing drugs, contraception and sterilization in their healthcare plan. At every stage, Becerra hounded them. He even filed lawsuits against the Trump administration for shielding the nuns from the HHS mandate passed under the Obama administration.

12) Should a baker be forced against his will to make a wedding cake for two men planning to marry? The owner did not object to selling his products to gay men. What he found objectionable, on religious grounds, was being ordered to inscribe a wedding cake for two homosexuals; to do so would force him to affirm their status. Becerra said too bad for him—his religious convictions should be overridden. This explains why he filed an amicus brief on the part of the gay men. But once again, he lost.

13) Practicing Catholics, among others, do not believe that people of the same sex should be adoptive parents. Anyone is free to disagree, but respect for the diversity that Catholicism affords suggests that Catholic foster care agencies should be entitled to practice what they preach. Becerra disagrees. He is so wedded to the LGBT agenda that as California Attorney General he even supported a law to deny California public agencies, public universities and boards the right to fund work-related trips to states that respect the religious liberty interests of foster care agencies.

14) In January 2017, at his confirmation hearings as California Attorney General, Becerra stunned lawyers when he said that it was one thing to respect the religious rights of individuals, quite another to extend these rights to

organizations. Thus did he try to marginalize houses of worship, faith-based organizations and religious non-profits. It doesn't get more absurd, or constitutionally wrongheaded, than this.

15) The Equality Act is not law but it is strongly supported by Biden. If passed, it would be the most serious assault on religious liberty ever enacted. As a congressman, Becerra was a co-sponsor of this bill. In the name of abortion and LGBT rights, it would not only devastate the autonomy of Catholic hospitals, it would ensure that boys who claim to be girls could compete against biological girls in sports. It would even allow them to shower with girls. When religious liberty objections are made, Becerra dismisses them outright.

16) Over the past year, California Governor Gavin Newsom imposed the most draconian Covid-19 restrictions on houses of worship in the nation. His limitations on occupancy have been so severe as to abolish the rights of churchgoers. Becerra, of course, was delighted to enforce these strictures.

For all of these reasons, it would be hard to think of a more unfit person in the United States to serve as Secretary of HHS than Xavier Becerra. His positions on life and religious liberty make him an outlier and should have automatically disqualified him from serving in this capacity. But Biden got his way.

BECERRA IS NO VICTIM OF BIGOTRY

Given his anti-Catholic record, it was not a surprise that Xavier Becerra's nomination as Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) ran into trouble. Unfortunately, he got help

from a nun. Sister Carol Keehan, the former head of the Catholic Health Association of the United States, came to his defense.

NBCNews online picked up an op-ed by Keehan alleging that Becerra is a victim of anti-Catholicism. Though she deplored those who were “attacking his Catholicism,” she failed to offer a scintilla of evidence. The best she could do was to cite a remark by Senator Mitch McConnell last January noting that Becerra’s healthcare experience was limited to suing those “who dare to live out their religious convictions.”

McConnell’s observation was correct. The Senate Minority Leader was referring to Becerra’s role in crafting the Affordable Care Act (ObamaCare), a central part of which is the HHS mandate forcing the Little Sisters of the Poor to pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plan. That is what he was referring to, and there is nothing bigoted about it.

Keehan adores Becerra so much that she says his character “is rooted in his Catholic upbringing and values.” Really?

- When Becerra voted as a congressman against a ban on partial-birth abortions—the child’s skull must first be crushed—was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?
- When Becerra voted against a ban on transporting minors seeking an abortion to states with relaxed abortion laws—a form of human trafficking—was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?
- When Becerra voted against a bill that would criminalize the killing of unborn babies during the commission of another crime, was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?
- When Becerra, acting as California Attorney General, sought to put crisis pregnancy centers out of business, was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?

- When Becerra brought felony charges against those who filmed Planned Parenthood officials trafficking in aborted baby parts, was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?
- When Becerra said that the conscience rights of Christian business owners who objected to paying for birth control in their healthcare plans need not be respected, was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?
- When Becerra relentlessly pursued the Little Sisters of the Poor, trying to force them to violate Catholic teachings, was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?
- When Becerra co-sponsored the Equality Act—the most radical assault on Christianity ever broached in the Congress—was that an example of his “Catholic upbringing and values”?

Becerra is no victim of anti-Catholicism. In fact, he is a master sponsor of it.

CUOMO COOKED HIS OWN GOOSE

Gov. Cuomo is finished, and everyone knows it. The investigative reports on the nursing home scandal, along with a probe of accusations of sexual harassment, will detail his deadly decisions and his sexual misconduct. If he were prudent, he would resign. But his unrelenting arrogance will not allow him to do so.

Regarding the latter charges, it is now clear that Cuomo’s campaign for a new law on sexual harassment in the workplace backfired. Indeed, he cooked his own goose.

Cuomo started 2019 bragging how New York will enact legislation on sexual harassment that will be the strongest in the nation. In mid-February, when the first public hearings

were held, he said, "I am very proud that New York is the most aggressive state in the country on women's rights. Anything I can do on sexual harassment we will do."

One month later, after championing what he said was the gold standard on sexual harassment legislation, Cuomo was asked by Karen DeWitt, a reporter for NPR, about a recent high-ranking official in his administration who had to resign amid a sexual harassment probe. That set Cuomo off.

According to one news story, "Cuomo got extremely testy." Another report said he "scolded" DeWitt. Her crime? She asked what he was going to do different about this problem in his state government. "When you say it's state government," the governor said, "you do a disservice to women, with all due respect, even though you are a woman. It's not government; it's society."

In June, state lawmakers passed the new law. Cuomo was delighted that the bar was set very low. "We will make it easier for claims to be brought forward and send a strong message that when it comes to sexual harassment in the workplace, time is up." The New York Times weighed in, saying, "The legislation eliminates the state's 'severe or pervasive' standard for proving harassment, which advocates said had allowed judges to dismiss claims of inappropriate comments or even groping as insufficiently hostile."

Cuomo signed the legislation in August. When it went into effect in October, he said something that came back to haunt him. "The ongoing culture of sexual harassment in the workplace is unacceptable and has held employees back for far too long. This critical measure finally ends the absurd legal standard for victims to prove sexual harassment in the workplace and makes it easier for those who have been subjected to this disgusting behavior to bring claims forward."

As it turns out, multiple women have accused Cuomo of sexual harassment, and one of them, Lindsey Boylan, specifically accused him of creating “a culture within his own administration where sexual harassment and bullying is so pervasive that it is not only condoned but expected.” Isn’t that what Cuomo explicitly said was “unacceptable”?

Cuomo said at a press conference on March 3rd, “I never touched anyone inappropriately. I never touched anyone inappropriately.”

This is contradicted by four of his accusers. Boylan says Cuomo kissed her on the lips without her consent and touched her lower back, arms and legs. Anna Ruch (unlike the others she did not work for Cuomo) said he put his hands on her lower back and cheeks and asked to kiss her. Karen Hinton said that after he embraced her, she tried to pull away, but he pulled her back. Ana Liss says he touched her lower back and kissed her hand, calling her “sweetheart.”

Only Charlotte Bennett has not accused Cuomo of “inappropriate touching.” However, she said he asked her about her sex life, and whether she ever slept with older men, making her feel uncomfortable. “I thought he was trying to sleep with me,” Bennett told Norah O’Donnell in a CBS interview. As the New York Times noted about Cuomo’s new law, offenses include “inappropriate comments.”

Now it can be argued that some of these offenses are more infractions than they are serious cases of sexual misconduct. However, when he was giving the green light to lawyers wanting to pursue old cases of alleged clergy sexual abuse, Cuomo knew that many of the accusations involved “inappropriate touching.” So why should we give him a break now?

No one is saying Cuomo is guilty of doing what President Bill Clinton did with Monica Lewinsky. But according to his own relaxed standard of what constitutes sexual harassment in the

workplace, he is guilty as sin.