

ALARMING BIDEN NOMINEE; WE JOIN SEN. RUBIO IN PROTEST

After we learned what Sen. Marco Rubio had to say about Atul Gawande, a Biden nominee for a senior healthcare post, we joined with him in seeking his defeat.

Gawande is a Professor of Surgery at the Harvard School of Medicine, a Rhodes Scholar, a distinguished author, and the former CEO of a healthcare organization. This is surely why President Biden nominated him to be assistant administrator of the Bureau for Global Health at the U.S. Agency for International Development.

There are good reasons, however, why the senator from Florida sounded the alarm on Gawande. He is a defender of infanticide. As evidence of this, Rubio pointed to an infamous essay from 1998 that Gawande wrote on this subject.

Gawande casually describes what partial-birth abortion entails. "The fetus is delivered feet first. To get the large head out, the doctor cuts open a hole at the base of the fetus's skull and inserts tubing to suck out the brain, which collapses the skull. Often, but not always, the fetus is injected lethally beforehand."

Gawande knows how normal people react to this monstrous procedure, and he has a ready answer for them. "If partial-birth abortion is too gruesome to allow, however, it is hard to see how other late abortions, especially D and Es [dilatation and evacuation], are any different."

He's right about that.

"About 80 percent of late-term abortions are done by D and E," Gawande says. "A couple of days ahead, small, absorbent rods are put in the pregnant woman's cervical opening to expand it

gradually. Then, for the actual procedure, she—and the fetus—are given heavy sedation or general anesthesia. The doctor breaks her bag of water and drains out the fluid. The opening won't let the fetus out whole. So the doctor uses metal tongs, physically crushes the head, and dismembers the fetus. The pieces are pulled out and counted to confirm that nothing was missed."

Gawande speaks with clinical detachment about the most Nazi-like practices.

"What makes abortion disturbing is that the fetus is big now—like a fully formed child. Two of my obstetrician friends, both strongly pro-choice, told me that, even when it is a mother's life at stake and abortion is absolutely necessary, doing the D and E feels 'horrible.' We imagine, as we look in the fetus's eyes, that there is someone in there."

We asked our email subscribers to contact Sen. Rubio showing their support for his opposition to Gawande. Regrettably, we stood virtually alone among activist organizations in doing so.

ABUSE AUDIT'S GOOD NEWS

The 2020 Annual Report on clergy sexual abuse published by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops brings good news.

During the period July 1, 2019 – June 30, 2020, there were 22 current allegations involving minors. Given that there are approximately 50,000 members of the clergy (49,926), and the number of substantiated charges are 6, this means that 99.9% of the clergy did not have a substantiated accusation made against him in the last year we have data.

This is nothing new. From 2010 to 2020, the average number of substantiated charges made against the Catholic clergy stands at 5.9. In short, this problem has almost been wiped out in the Catholic Church.

There is no other institution in society where adults regularly interact with minors that can match this record. But don't expect state attorneys general to launch a probe of the sexual abuse of minors in any of them.

What has changed is a reduction in the percent of abuse committed by homosexuals. Typically, 8 in 10 cases of abuse involve male-on-male sex, the victims being postpubescent boys. The latest data show that this figure has dropped to 6 in 10. The decrease makes sense: the seminaries have done a much better job screening for candidates who have deep-seated homosexual tendencies.

We continue to deplore the failure of the media to cite data which contradict the false narrative that the scandal is ongoing. That is an absolute lie.

ARCHBISHOP GOMEZ'S FINEST HOUR

On November 4, Los Angeles Archbishop José Gomez made one of the most brilliant addresses given in Catholic circles in recent memory. His speech was given at the Congress of Catholics and Public Life in Madrid, Spain.

Like so many other Catholic intellectuals, Gomez is rightly concerned about the radical secularization that has taken root in the Western world. Unlike most of them, he has also been in

the trenches. I know that because the Catholic League has assisted him in his efforts to combat the agenda of secular zealots, made plain, for instance, in attempts to break the seal of the confessional.

Gomez takes direct aim at the ruling class, those who occupy the command posts in the United States and Europe. "In the elite worldview," he says, "there is no need for old-fashioned belief systems and religions. In fact, as they see it, religion, especially Christianity, only gets in the way of the society they hope to build." He offers as an example the "cancel culture" that is so prevalent.

There can be no denying the veracity of Gomez's observation. Anyone who dares challenge the conventional wisdom, on issues ranging from critical race theory to gender ideology, is a candidate for censorship. It is not those who promote these pernicious views who are being silenced, it is those who challenge them.

Sociologists have long understood that when the dominant cultural strain in society atrophies, it is filled with an ersatz philosophical or religious variant. Power vacuums never last long. Thus, Gomez is right to call attention to the extent to which the de-Christianization of the West has been replaced by movements such as "social justice," "wokeness," "identity politics" and the like.

"They claim," as he perceptively notes, "to offer what religion provides." Indeed, they provide "a sense of meaning, a purpose for living, and the feeling of belonging to a community." This is exactly what the great sociologists have been saying for over a hundred and fifty years. Sadly, it is now happening in the United States.

Gomez's critics take umbrage at his comment that the reigning movements function as a new religion. He properly notes that "Today's critical theories and ideologies are profoundly

atheistic.” Anyone who follows what the proponents of these ideologies espouse know that Gomez is right. Indeed, they don’t even try to hide their animus against Christianity.

John McWhorter is a Columbia University professor and he understands what Gomez is talking about. An African American, he has written a new book, *Woke Racism: How a New Religion Has Betrayed Black America*. Both men call attention to identity politics and radical race theories—which judge people on the basis of their race, not their individual characteristics. These ideological currents are not only profoundly racist in themselves, they satisfy the religious yearnings of those drawn to them.

As a man of God, Gomez wants us to repair to the Gospel, not to “these new religions of social justice and political identity.” But to his critics, many of whom are Catholic theologians, what he says is verboten. Some no doubt would like to cancel him.

Franciscan Father Daniel Horan is upset with Gomez for making a speech that exhibits a “shocking disconnection from reality.” Too bad he never says what the disconnect is. He cites for support a left-wing Jesuit theologian, Fr. Bryan Massingale, who, according to Horan, said the problem is that bishops like Gomez “have the audacity to speak with unearned authority about issues they clearly do not understand.”

It would be hard to find a more arrogant example of professorial elitism than this. Readers should know that Horan and Massingale spend much of their time writing and lecturing about homosexual and transgender issues. Gomez spends much of his time writing and lecturing about the Catholic Church: He is president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Thus he has earned the authority to speak about any issue of interest to the Catholic community.

Fr. Tom Reese wonders why Gomez “abandoned” the term “social

justice” to those he considers the enemy of religion, especially when social justice has a place in the “long history of the church’s social teaching.” This is a serious misreading of Gomez’s address. He has not abandoned social justice—the term has been hijacked by those whose ideology sharply departs from the Catholic Church’s understanding of it.

The late Fr. Richard John Neuhaus wrote a seminal book, *The Naked Public Square*, that describes what happens when a society rooted in the Judeo-Christian heritage weakens. The cultural holes are destined to be filled with exactly the kinds of secular movements that Gomez alludes to in his speech. The only difference is that even someone as bright as Neuhaus did not envision how quickly and radically the transformation would be.

That is what makes Gomez’s presentation so valuable. He sees what is going on in the United States and Europe and beckons us to get back to basics, the basics as outlined by Jesus. If we do not resist the forces of decadence and division, the future will soon become unrecognizable.

HOODWINKING THE PUBLIC

Bill Donohue

The pollsters were mostly wrong again on Election Day—in some cases by a huge margin—thus making a mockery of psephology, the statistical study of elections. It doesn’t have to be this way: statistical models are not the problem; the problem is poor sampling. Unfortunately, much of the survey research done these days is not much better, often allowing the political bent of those conducting it to color the outcomes.

One of the most glaringly hyper-political surveys ever done was released in November by the Public Religion Research Institute (PRRI), in partnership with the Brookings Institution. "Competing Visions of America: An Evolving Identity or a Culture Under Attack?" is the title of this year's American Values Survey.

PRRI has a partisan record, so it is not surprising that it would conduct a flawed survey, though this one is by far its worst undertaking. On the other hand, the Brookings Institution has a good reputation, making this co-venture regrettable.

To be sure, there is much about this survey that is quite good, and helpful to sociologists like myself. But there are several aspects to it that are so indefensible as to discredit it.

The report was written in part by the CEO of PRRI, Robert P. Jones. He is not a sociologist; his Ph.D. is in religion. He is most well known for promoting the idea that white Christian men pose an existential threat to American democracy, feeding the left-wing trope that white supremacists are one of the nation's most pressing problems.

It is not until the latter part of the report that there is a segment on this subject—Trump supporters are singled out for rebuke—but it is front- and-center in the marketing of the survey. Indeed, the first subject in the press release is titled, "Anti-Democratic Beliefs and Support for Political Violence on the Right."

We just came off a year when left-wing violence almost destroyed Portland, Seattle, Minneapolis and other cities. The spike in crime that affected most big cities is at least partly the result of left-wing mayors and district attorneys taking a hands-off approach to crime, ordering cops to stand down. Meanwhile Antifa and Black Lives Matter killed dozens of

innocent people, and trashed so many stores in cities like New York that it turned them into a ghost town for much of the year.

The report, however, has nothing to say about these events. It is only concerned about right-wing violence, which was miniscule compared to the degree of violence carried out by the left.

Survey researchers, like social scientists in general, are firmly situated on the left-wing side of the political spectrum. Many of the honest ones among them often suffer from ideological blinders: they are so used to thinking that their political leanings are an expression of reality (as opposed to a reflection of their bias), that they don't realize how tendentious their work is.

Take, for example, the report's treatment of the survey questions on abortion. Having read literally scores of surveys on this issue for several decades, it is clear that the only ones that are truly helpful are the ones that dig deep, offering respondents many different ways they can explain their position. In short, the more simplistic and brief the questions, the less enlightening they are.

This survey hones in on one question: Was *Roe v. Wade*, the decision that legalized abortion, the right one? It found that 63% agree. What it didn't ask is more important.

Most Americans are conflicted on this subject. They do not want to make all abortions illegal, yet they do not like the current condition whereby all abortions are legal, regardless of the reasons for it, and at any time of gestation. They want restrictions. Most do not endorse abortions that are procured for matters of inconvenience, and the further along a woman is in her pregnancy, the less likely they are to support it.

This survey never gets to this level of discernment, and is therefore of limited utility.

Has God granted America a special role in human history? In 2013, 64% said yes, but today the figure has dropped to 44%. That is surely worth exploring. The report simply offers the findings, without drawing any conclusions. Fine. But the press release tells a different story. It says that those who answered affirmatively evince "Christian nationalist sympathies," citing Republicans as an example (68% of whom agree with the statement).

This is cruel and dishonest. Simply because someone believes that God granted our nation a special role in history does not make him a Christian nationalist, a term employed by Jones as roughly analogous to white supremacists. He's wrong. In fact, his own survey undercuts his narrative. What was not said in the press release, but is said in the report, is that 67% of black Protestants agree with the statement. Are they also white supremacists?

It says a lot about the bias that these authors harbor that they don't say a word about the black response in their press release. To do so would make mince meat of their argument that Republicans, most of whom are white, are the most likely to be Christian nationalists.

Perception does not always jive with reality, even if it functions as such. In objective terms, there is less discrimination against African Americans today than at any time in American history. Gains in education and employment are stunning, approval of interracial marriage has never been higher, and a record number of blacks hold public office. Obama and Oprah are unusual, but their climb to the top is indicative that things have changed dramatically.

This has to be said because the report finds that only 42% of Americans agree that "We have made great progress in achieving true racial equality in the U.S." Why, given all the objective measures of racial progress, is the figure so low?

It is not hard to figure out. Over the past few years, the nation has been embroiled in one racial controversy after another, many of them dealing with police interactions with blacks. That the media have exploited these incidents—and in some cases seriously misrepresented what actually happened—cannot be denied, the effect of which is to feed the perception that the cause of racial equality is going backwards. This is irresponsible and dangerous.

One of the main factors accounting for the perception that racial discrimination is getting worse is the prevalence of critical race theory. The report's coverage of this issue smacks of politics.

The report offers data on what Americans think about this subject, which is helpful, but then it says, "Despite some high-profile flare-ups over this issue in the media," most Americans believe that students should be taught about the nation's "best achievements and worst mistakes."

This is a lousy segue. The latter has nothing to do with the former. Critical race theory teaches students that there are oppressors, namely white people, and the oppressed, namely black people. It makes judgments about people based on their skin pigmentation, not their individual attributes. In short, it is a racist ideology, designed to drive a wedge between whites and blacks.

The report's section on the issue of race only gets more inaccurate when the subject of police reaction to black crime is discussed. It found that Democrats are significantly less likely to say that police killings of black men are isolated incidents than are Republicans, most of whom "trust far-right media outlets (91%) and Fox News (88%)." In other words, the more objective-minded Democrats, who no doubt watch such "politically neutral" stations as CNN, MSNBC and PBS (more about this shortly), are assumed by the report's authors to be right in concluding that police killings of blacks "are part

of a broader pattern of how police treat Black Americans.”

This perspective, however, does not square with reality.

Michael Tonry, a researcher whom no one would consider a conservative, came to a surprising conclusion in his book, *Malign Neglect*. “Racial differences in patterns of offending, not racial bias by police and other officials, are the principal reason that such greater proportions of blacks than whites are arrested, prosecuted, convicted, and imprisoned.”

Robert Sampson and Janet Lauritsen, who have sterling liberal credentials, found that “large racial differences in criminal offending,” not racism, explains why more blacks are in prison proportionately than whites for longer terms.

In 2016, Harvard professor Roland G. Fryer Jr. led a team of researchers to study this issue. They examined more than 1,000 police shootings in 10 major police departments in three states. “On the most extreme use of force—officer-involved shootings—we find no racial differences in either the raw data or when contextual factors are taken into account.” The black economist admitted, “It is the most surprising result of my career.”

In 2019, social scientists from Michigan State University and Arizona State University reported on the results of their two-year study. “When adjusting for crime, we find no systemic evidence of anti-Black disparities in fatal shootings of unarmed citizens, or fatal shootings involving misidentification of harmless objects.”

In other words, the Republicans came to the right conclusion, and the Democrats were wrong in their assessment of this issue. Could it be that Fox News and the “far-right” media outlets did a better job covering this matter than their competitors did?

Many other examples could be given, but what genuinely reveals

the left-wing bent to this report is the way it treats media sources. Throughout the report it scores respondents who get their news from "Fox News" (cited 28 times) or "far-right" media outlets (asked 31 times). It never defines the latter. Nor does it ask about "left-wing" news sources.

The term "far-right" suggests fascist or Nazi-leaning. In the press release, we learn that the authors of this research believe that Newsmax and One America News are "far-right" sources! On p. 25 of the report, in footnote #10, it defines CNN, MSNBC and public television as examples of "mainstream news." Only someone living in a left-wing bubble thinks this way.

If CNN, MSNBC and PBS were labeled "far-left" in a survey, it would be written off as a right-wing study. It must also be said that, in keeping with the game plan, "mainstream" CNN hosted a show on the report, inviting its authors, including Jones, to appear, and the New York Times ran a story on one part of the report. That was the icing on the cake.

The funding for this dishonest research was largely made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, with help from the Wilbur and Hilda Glenn Family Foundation and the Unitarian Universalist Veatch Program at Shelter Rock. The Glenn Foundation appears not to be hyper-politicized, but the same is not true of the other two.

The Carnegie Corporation of New York makes grants to the Center for American Progress, Faith in Public Life, and the ACLU. All have an anti-Catholic record and receive money from George Soros. The Veatch Program gives to PRRI, Faith in Public Life, and Black Lives Matter.

In other words, left-wing foundations fund a report by a left-wing research company and the left-wing media give them a media splash. The public has been hoodwinked.

WHAT POPE SAID TO BIDEN IS UNCONFIRMED

After Pope Francis and President Biden met recently, President Biden said that the pope called him a “good Catholic” and that he should “keep receiving communion.” The Vatican has not confirmed the veracity of Biden’s account.

Like everyone else, we at the Catholic League have no way of knowing whether Biden’s remarks are accurate. But from what we know about the Vatican’s handling of the meeting, and Biden’s long record of lying about many important matters, we are maintaining a healthy skepticism about the president’s rendition.

It is certainly in Biden’s interest to have everyone think that the pope encouraged him to keep receiving communion. This issue matters because it has troubled many American bishops; they met from November 15-18 to discuss it. Biden’s lust for abortion rights, for instance, is cause for grave concern.

One reason why we are skeptical of Biden’s account is that it seems to be at odds with the Vatican’s decision to deny media press coverage of the meeting. The White House was banking on a photo-op, knowing that the optics would serve the president’s interests. But they were stiffed the day before the meeting.

If it is reasonable to conclude that the Vatican did not want the appearance of being played by the White House—sending the message that this pro-abortion Catholic president is a model Catholic—then it appears contradictory to laud his Catholic credentials. More important, why would the pope inject himself into the controversy between U.S. bishops and the president,

knowing that by doing so he would undercut the USCCB (United States Conference of Catholic Bishops)?

Then there is the issue of lying. That Biden is a pathological liar cannot be denied. Here are a few instances.

The first example looks like small potatoes, but when coupled with the other examples, it takes on significance.

In 1974, when Biden was a freshman senator from Delaware, he bragged how he hit a ball 358 feet at his second congressional baseball game on July 2nd. In fact, he went 0-for-2.

The year 1987 was not a good one for the presidential hopeful. David Greenberg, writing in Slate, a left-wing media outlet, recalled how Biden plagiarized a speech given by British Labor Party leader Neil Kinnock.

“Biden lifted Kinnock’s precise turns of phrase and his sequences of ideas—a degree of plagiarism that would disqualify any student for failure, if not expulsion from school. But the even greater sin was to borrow biographical facts from Kinnock that, although true about Kinnock, didn’t apply to Biden. Unlike Neil Kinnock, Biden wasn’t the first person in his family history to attend college, as he asserted; nor were his ancestors coal miners, as he claimed when he used Kinnock’s words.”

This was just the beginning of Biden’s lies. It was later revealed that he plagiarized from speeches given by Robert F. Kennedy, John F. Kennedy and Hubert Humphrey. The next day he admitted to telling more lies. He confessed to receiving an “F” in a law school course because he plagiarized five pages from a published article.

According to the Washington Post, Biden also told several lies about his academic credentials. He said that he graduated with “three degrees” from the University of Delaware. Wrong. He graduated with one degree. He said he won a coveted political

science award at the university. He lied. He said he graduated at the top of his class at Syracuse Law School. He did not. He was 76th in a class of 85. He said he had a "full scholarship" at Syracuse. Another lie. He had a half scholarship.

Shaun King, an African American writer and civil rights activist, has tracked Biden's civil rights record. Here is what he wrote last year about this issue.

"On two very important occasions, Joe Biden actually told the entire truth about his involvement in the Civil Rights Movement. **Nearly everything else has been a lie.** I've counted at least 31 different lies he has told about being an activist, organizer, sit-in demonstrator, boycott leader, voter registration volunteer, Black church trainee and more in the Civil Rights Movement, but every time I dig, I actually find more interviews, more lies, more fabrications, more tales he told to voters, reporters, historians, and more (his emphasis)."

When an anti-Semite attacked the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh in 2018, leaving 12 dead, Biden claimed he later visited the synagogue, saying he spoke to the people there. He lied. He was never there, as officials at the synagogue recounted.

In his first 100 days in office, the Washington Post listed 78 false or misleading statements he made.

Recently, several high ranking military officials said that Biden's rendition of the advice they had given him on withdrawing from Afghanistan was patently untrue.

It is for these reasons that we are skeptical of Biden's account of what the pope said to him at their meeting.

SOROS ENTITIES ATTACK ARCHBISHOP GOMEZ

Los Angeles Archbishop José Gomez is under attack by left-wing Catholics and outside activists for his stellar speech given in Spain on November 4th. They are particularly angered over his comments on contemporary social justice movements, which he properly labeled as “pseudo-religions.”

The petition portrays Gomez as being somehow indifferent to racial injustice. That is a lie. He has been an outspoken champion of racial equality; it’s just that he doesn’t toe the line as set by those who have a larger agenda.

What is really getting to these activists is Gomez’s appreciation for how Marxist-inspired movements wreak havoc, without doing anything positive for the dispossessed.

Anyone is free to disagree with Gomez’s address, but there is something unseemly about left-wing organizations launching a petition drive against him. Gomez, who is president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, should be commended, not condemned, for his courage to speak the truth.

Those who started the petition, Faith in Public Life and Faithful America, have both received funding from George Soros, the atheist billionaire who hates the Catholic Church. The former is a front group for agenda-ridden zealots; the latter is run by a rogue Episcopalian priest who mettles in the Church’s affairs.

We rallied our email subscribers to support Archbishop Gomez.

POPE-BIDEN MEETING STILL UNRESOLVED

Many Catholics were dismayed, if not furious, when they learned of news reports indicating that Pope Francis told President Biden on October 29 that he was “a good Catholic” and “should keep receiving Communion.” The Vatican has neither confirmed nor denied this account. As we said when the news broke, we have good reasons to be skeptical of Biden’s rendition.

After taking another look at this issue, examining the exact words used by Biden—not relying on media interpretations of what he said—our skepticism is growing. The president was asked about this matter at two press conferences: one on October 29, and the other on October 31.

On October 29, Biden was asked, “Mr. President, did the issue of abortion come up at all?” The first words out of his mouth were, “No, it didn’t.” Then he contradicted himself saying, “It came up.” So which account is true?

After Biden said, “It came up,” he then said what the media widely reported. “We just talked about the fact that he was happy I was a good Catholic and I should keep receiving Communion.”

If the first version is right—abortion never came up for discussion—then it seems peculiar, to say the least, for the pope to tell him he should “keep receiving Communion.” What would be the context for such a statement, if not abortion? After all, the entire controversy is about Biden’s pro-abortion record, so it is hard to imagine the pope imploring him to “keep receiving Communion” absent any discussion of

abortion. Are we to believe he said this out of the blue?

If abortion did come up, what did the pope say to him about it? Just recently Pope Francis said that “abortion is murder. Those who carry out abortions kill.” Such an unequivocal remark suggests it is unlikely that the pope would discuss abortion without talking about it in such graphic terms. That would surely have made Biden uneasy, yet he did not appear to be that way when he spoke.

At the same press conference, Biden was asked, “Did you discuss the U.S. Conference of Bishops?” He answered, “That’s a private conversation.” This begs the question: Why would a discussion of the bishops’ conference be considered a private matter but not a conversation that affects him personally, namely his suitability to receive Communion?

It is entirely possible that Biden is lying.

After admitting that abortion never came up, he quickly pivoted. Why? Because he saw an opening, an opportunity to report to the press the most important thing he wanted from the pope—a chance to undercut those U.S. bishops who are deeply troubled about his pro-abortion record (they met from November 15-18 to discuss this subject). Having been denied the photo-op the White House desperately wanted, he needed to come away with something that served his interest. The Communion issue had to be in the forefront of his mind.

At the October 31st press conference, Biden was asked, “For these Catholics back home, what did it mean for you to hear Pope Francis, in the wake of this—in the middle of this debate, call you a good Catholic? And what did he tell you—should that put this debate to rest?”

“Look, I’m—I’m not going to—a lot of this is just personal,” Biden said.

But it wasn’t personal just two days earlier. In fact, he

showed no hesitancy in getting the word out that the pope regarded him as such a good Catholic that he allegedly encouraged him to “keep receiving Communion.” What changed? Could it be that the Vatican contacted the Biden team and asked them to quash this issue, knowing that Biden’s account was not accurate?

Our incurious media are not asking these questions. That’s because they want to protect the pope and the president, both of whom they like.

There are too many unanswered questions to put this matter to rest. The unwillingness of the Vatican to either confirm or deny Biden’s account, and Biden’s inconsistent and implausible responses—only adds to the problem. Both sides do not look good.

DUPLICITY ABOUNDS IN CHAPPELLE CONTROVERSY

In Dave Chappelle’s Netflix special “The Closer” he says “Gender is a fact. Every human being in this room, every human being on earth, had to pass through the legs of a woman to be on earth. That is a fact.” Chappelle is twice wrong, but that should not distract us from what he meant.

[What he is describing is not gender, which refers to socially learned roles appropriate for males and females, but sex. Ergo, it would be more accurate to say, “sex is a fact.” Also, some babies are born of a Cesarean section.]

Leaving aside linguistic technicalities, what Chappelle said is not only inoffensive, it is pedestrian. But in today’s

world, where certain protected classes of people demand that the rest of us walk on eggshells—making sure we don't offend their hyperinflated sensibilities—what he said has been roundly condemned as hate speech by LGBTQ purists and their ilk.

In other words, Chappelle is right to stick to his guns and not bow to their twisted understanding of sex. Sex is determined by nature, and nature's God, and not by some ideological guru who insists that nature does not exist. News flash: The entire world is not a social construction.

GLAAD, the homosexual organization, is very upset with Chappelle. It declared that his "brand has become synonymous with ridiculing trans people and other marginalized communities." The Human Rights Campaign, another homosexual outfit, told Chappelle that "Trans women are women. Trans men are men. Non-binary people are non-binary."

Netflix transgender staff members were so angered by what Chappelle said that they staged a walk out. They also drew up a list of demands they want the top brass to honor. Essentially, they want an end to any jokes that might offend them, which means they don't ever want to be the butt of jokes again, not by Chappelle, not by anyone.

Netflix executive producer Jaclyn Moore quit her job after Chappelle's special, "The Closer," aired. "I won't work for @netflix again as long as they keep promoting and profiting from dangerous transphobic content." Meanwhile, the comedian Jaye McBride accused Chappelle of "punching down" with "mean" remarks. Additionally, Alyssa Milano said, "it is really important to hold people accountable." and by that she meant that Netflix should discontinue Chappelle's "hate speech" special.

None of these organizations and individuals should be taken seriously.

They're all phonies. Their interest in objecting to bigotry never seems to include Catholics.

GLAAD has been bashing the Catholic Church for years. When Pope Francis came to the U.S. in 2015, it issued a "papal guidebook" advising the media on how to treat him and what words they should adopt, all of which were contentious. Whenever a parish or diocese seeks to operationalize Catholic teachings that it disapproves of, it slams the Church as bigoted. It has sought to cancel Bill Donohue on TV, and has given awards to patently anti-Catholic plays.

Human Rights Campaign has a "Catholic initiative" that, among other things, monitors Catholic schools that do not accept its idea of marriage. For example, when a Catholic teacher "marries" someone of the same sex, in clear violation of a contract he or she voluntarily signed, and is then terminated for doing so, it registers its outrage.

Moore likes to tweet about "pedo priests," thus smearing all priests because of the behavior of a few miscreants. McBride has made many similar comments. Milano has overtly denounced her Catholic upbringing, explaining that her two abortions were "something that I needed."

Netflix is also duplicitous. Its co-chief executive, Ted Sarandos, says the company is standing by its big investment in Chappelle—he is their long-time prize comedian—arguing that "The Closer" did not cross the line by inciting "hate or violence." He is right about that, but there is more to this account.

In 2017, Netflix aired "F is for Family." Episode One featured a husband who had just reconciled with his wife, thanks to Father Pat. He is shown pulling a crucifix out of his pocket, asking the Lord for strength while chanting, "vagina, vagina, vagina." Episode Six showed their son masturbating while staring at a candle with an image of Our Blessed Mother.

Further, Episode Nine depicted the priest—who of course is a homosexual—fondling Jesus’ body on a crucifix, saying, “Oh, you’ve got a swimmer’s body.”

Now Sarandos may not consider these scenes to be hate speech, however, many practicing Catholics would beg to differ.

Just last year Netflix aired “Cuties,” a soft-core child porn film. Critics hammered it for normalizing pedophilia. For instance, it showed a pre-teen girl taking pictures of her private parts before publishing them online.

This is not hate speech, but it is certainly irresponsible and exploitative, inviting sick men to practice their trade.

So what’s the answer? We need to lighten up, while also treating every segment of the population the same. Most of us know the difference between cracking a joke that stings and one that is patently offensive. No, not everything goes, but whatever the standard is must be uniformly applied.

Kudos to Chappelle for standing up to the sexually confused, especially the bullies among them.

DURBIN SPINS COMMUNION DENIAL DECISION

Illinois Sen. Dick Durbin, who identifies as a Catholic, has yet to find an abortion he couldn’t justify. That is why his bishop, Thomas J. Paprocki of Springfield, recently said he will be denied Holy Communion in his diocese. Durbin was incensed.

He complained that “Other Catholics may share my point of view

[on abortion]—statistics suggest they probably do—but they show up to Communion every week without any questions asked.” He added that “with very few exceptions, Communion is offered to anybody if the person believes that they [sic] are worthy of it.”

Durbin is right about the latter comment. Very few Catholics are denied Communion, but what he failed to say is that he is one of them. In 2004 he was denied Communion by Monsignor (now a bishop) Kevin Vann of Blessed Sacrament Church in Springfield.

So yes, Durbin is unique. Where he is wrong is in his assertion that he is just like those Catholics who voted for him and go to Communion without this being an issue.

Here is what the U.S. bishops have said about this matter. “A Catholic cannot vote for a candidate who favors a policy promoting an intrinsically evil act, such as abortion...if the voter’s intent is to support that position.”

In other words, Catholics who vote for a pro-abortion politician because they like his pro-union record, or his position on other issues, are not “guilty of formal cooperation in grave evil.”

Durbin is wrong to conflate his status as a senator—someone who votes on pro-abortion bills—with those Catholics who vote for him for reasons other than his support for abortion rights. In fact, the Catholic Church is very specific about the difference.

On November 24, 2002, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith issued a “Doctrinal Note on Some Questions Regarding The Participation of Catholics in Political Life.” Part II, Sec. 4, reads, “John Paul II...has reiterated many times that those who are directly involved in lawmaking bodies have a grave and clear obligation to oppose any law that attacks human life (*italics in the original*).”

Congress is a lawmaking body and Durbin is a member of it. He is not analogous to a blue-collar guy who votes for him despite his lust for abortion. Therefore, he merits disparate treatment.

SOCIAL JUSTICE, BIDEN STYLE

In the name of helping families, President Biden wants to reward many of those who broke into our country illegally by making them millionaires. However, American families that are living here legally and elect to place their children in religious child care centers have to wing it on their own.

On October 31, Fox News reporter Peter Doocy asked President Biden “Is it true we’re going to give \$450,000 to border crossers who are separated?” Biden simply looked away and scratched his head.

On November 3, Doocy said to the president that news reports were surfacing that “your administration is planning to pay illegal immigrants who are separated from their families at the border up to \$450,000 each, possibly a million dollars per family. Do you think that might incentivize more people to come over illegally?”

Biden took umbrage at Doocy’s comment, accusing Fox News of “sending that garbage out,” adding that “it is not true.” After rhetorically raising the question that Doocy asked, he flatly said, “That’s not going to happen.”

What Biden calls “garbage,” however, is the official policy of his administration. It’s just that he was the last to find out. Now, like the obedient soul he is, he’s on board.

On November 4, Doocy asked Karine Jean-Pierre, Deputy White House press secretary, about the \$450,000 prize for illegal aliens. She said the president was “perfectly comfortable” with that decision. Doocy then asked, “what changed, from yesterday” when Biden said, “That’s not going to happen?” She skirted his question, choosing instead to blame Trump for creating this problem.

Biden’s professed interest in child care is well documented. Speaking of his big social spending bill, he said in August, “Child care is personal to me—that’s why I’ve put it front and center in my Build Back Better Agenda.” On October 26, he said of this bill, “Every American family deserves access to high quality, affordable child care.” This is a lie.

On pp. 1399-1400 of the 2,468 page Build Back Better Act, H.R. 5376, it addresses child care for religious entities. “A recipient of funds under this subsection may not use the funds for modernization, renovation, or repair of facilities that are primarily used for sectarian instruction or religious worship or in which a substantial portion of the functions of the facilities are subsumed in a religious mission.”

In other words, Protestants, Catholics, Jews, Muslims and Mormons who place their children in a child care center of their faith are not entitled to any assistance.

Due to pressure from religious organizations, it appeared likely that the wording of the bill would be changed to include them. Even so, we know that Biden wanted to exclude them.

The bottom line is clear. Bust into our country illegally and you stand to become a millionaire. Put your kid in a religious child care center, and you’re on your own. This is the face of social justice, Biden style.