

MAJORITY OPPOSE ROE V. WADE

In a survey released June 11, Gallup found that a majority of Americans, 53%, say abortion should be legal in only a few circumstance (35%) or in no circumstances (18%). This means that most Americans reject abortion-on-demand, the effective ruling of the 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade*.

The survey also found that as many Americans identify as “pro-life” (48%) as they do “pro-choice” (48%).

Importantly, more Americans, 48%, believe abortion to be morally wrong; 43% disagree.

Gallup senior editor Jeffrey M. Jones offered an interpretation that deserves a rebuttal.

Jones could have written that the survey results show how out of touch *Roe v. Wade* is with the public, but he elected not to comment.

Jones also said that “During the 1990s—when Gallup first asked the question [about identifying as “pro-choice” or “pro-life”]—more Americans personally identified as pro-choice than as pro-life by 51% to 40%, on average.”

In fact, those results are from the second survey on this issue. The first one showed that 56% of Americans identified as “pro-choice” compared to a mere 33% who said they were “pro-life.” In other words, the “pro-choice” side has declined by 8% (56% to 48%) since the mid-1990s, while the “pro-life” side jumped by 15% (33% to 48%). That’s a huge difference, yet Jones said nothing about it.

“By a slim five-percentage-point margin, 48% to 43%,” Jones said, “Americans believe abortion is wrong from a moral perspective.” Five percentage points is not huge, but neither is it “slim.” Furthermore, the difference is statistically significant.

Jones was not alone in downplaying the good news. The mainstream media would never run a headline saying, "Majority of Americans Oppose *Roe v. Wade*." Nor would they tout the fact that more Americans think abortion is morally wrong than are okay with it. And they certainly won't discuss why the pro-life side is ascendant, climbing 15% since the mid-1990s.

Whenever there is bad news on abortion, look for the media to highlight it. Whenever there is good news, look for them to bury it. That's why so few have any respect for journalism these days. The dishonesty is rampant.

SURVEY SHOWS COLLAPSE OF MORAL VALUES

A recently released Gallup survey, June 1, came up with some very disturbing findings.

Half the nation, 49%, say moral values in the U.S. are "poor." This is the highest percentage ever recorded on this issue since Gallup first asked about it in 2002. Only 37% say moral values are "fair," and a mere 14% say they are "good." Moreover, 77% say moral values in the U.S. are getting worse; 18% think they are improving.

The American people are conflicted on moral issues. Even though more than three in four say our moral values are collapsing, a Gallup survey taken a year ago found that "Americans Hold Liberal Views on Most Moral Issues." Consider the following.

More Americans find morally contentious practices acceptable today than ever before. For example, sex between an unmarried

man and woman is now found to be morally acceptable by 7 in 10 Americans (69%); gay or lesbian relations register a 63% approval; having a baby outside of marriage is at a record high approval rating (62%). Pornography is gaining acceptability, and so is polygamy

What does this tell us? It tells us that Americans know in their hearts that some behaviors are morally wrong, but they have a hard time passing judgment on them. In other words, they know in their gut that the state of our moral values is getting worse, but they also feel the pinch of the dominant culture's embrace of moral nonjudgmentalism.

Here's the rub: The more we find morally contentious behaviors acceptable, the more likely we are to conclude that our moral values are deteriorating. This paradox is a function of immaturity: We refuse to stigmatize the very behaviors (e.g., having kids out-of-wedlock) that convince us that our moral values are collapsing.

It would be wrong to say that we are opposed to stigmatization. We are not. Ask smokers. Did stigmatizing smokers work? Yes, smoking has declined dramatically. But when it comes to other behaviors, we wimp out, following the lead of elites in the dominant culture. So we lose.

This is what an immature society looks like. We want to be caring and compassionate in our dealings with troubled Americans, but we also want to decrease their numbers. But trying to have it both ways isn't working.

Gallup needs to broaden its questioning. It needs to ask the American people how they think people like Samantha Bee are helping to drive our morals south. Indeed, Hollywood merits its own survey—it has had more to do with crafting our morally debased culture than any other factor.

TIME TO END BISHOPS' PRIESTLY ABUSE AUDIT

In 2004, two years after the priestly sexual abuse scandal broke in the media, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops released its first annual audit of this subject. We have been tracking this issue every year, noting the incredible progress, and have now concluded that it is time to discontinue the audits. Here's why.

In the latest audit, the 2017 Annual Report, there were 24 new allegations made by minors during the period July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017. But only six were substantiated; the clergy were removed from ministry. Moreover, four of the six allegations were made against the same priest. This means that of the 50,245 priests and deacons, *.006 percent of the clergy had a substantiated charge made against him.*

The 2016 Annual Report showed that there were two new substantiated cases made against 52,238 priests and deacons. This means that *.004 percent of the clergy had a substantiated charge made against him.*

In short, over the past two years, an average of *.005 percent of the clergy had a substantiated charge made against him.*

The time has come to end the audits. If not now, when?

The problem of sexual abuse in the Catholic Church occurred mostly between 1965 and 1985. Now that it is harder for practicing homosexuals to enter the priesthood—they are responsible for 8 in 10 cases of the sexual abuse of minors (pedophiles are responsible for less than 5 percent)—there is no need for the annual study.

To be sure, the training programs and screening procedures that have worked so well should continue, but it makes no sense to waste money on a study of this magnitude any longer. Indeed, it only feeds the erroneous perception that the problem continues unabated. This is not our problem anymore. We need to have the guts to say so.

CARDINAL McCARRICK'S CROSS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the news that credible and substantiated accusations of sexual molestation have been made against Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, forcing him to resign from ministry:

A little over a year after assuming the reins of the Catholic League, I started exchanging letters with Newark Archbishop Theodore McCarrick. He was genuinely supportive of our efforts. On October 17, 1994, he wrote to me saying, "I have been speaking to the bishops of New Jersey at our Provincial meeting and encouraging them to support the work of the Catholic League in their own dioceses."

Now he is bearing a heavy cross. The takeaway for me is clear.

On June 12, I wrote the following: "The problem of sexual abuse in the Catholic Church occurred mostly between 1965 and 1985. Now that it is harder for practicing homosexuals to enter the priesthood—they are responsible for 8 in 10 cases of the sexual abuse of minors (pedophiles are responsible for less than 5 percent)—there is no need for the annual study [of clergy sexual abuse]."

I added that in the last two years, "an average of .005 percent of the clergy had a substantiated charge made against

him." I also credited the training programs and screening procedures instituted by the bishops, saying they should be continued.

How is this relevant to the situation that Cardinal McCarrick is in?

The three key points that I made are: the timeline (1965-1985); the sexual orientation of the molester (most were homosexuals); and the progress that has been made (practicing homosexuals have a harder time becoming priests and efforts to check this problem have worked).

In the case of Cardinal McCarrick, the alleged abuse took place a half century ago (in the 1970s), and the alleged victim was a teenager, thus ruling out pedophilia.

Pray for Cardinal McCarrick and anyone whom he may have hurt.

PHILADELPHIA ARCHDIOCESE SUES CITY

For over 100 years, the Catholic Church in Philadelphia has been serving children in need. Now the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, led by its able leader, Archbishop Charles Chaput, has been forced to sue the city for the right to continue doing so. It is a suit that must be won, for the sake of the children and the defense of religious freedom.

The city of Philadelphia—even as it issued an urgent call for 300 new foster parents—has abruptly barred Catholic Social Services (CSS) from placing children in foster homes. They have done this despite the fact that CSS is one of the top-

rated foster care agencies in the city, and despite the fact that Philadelphia has more than 6,000 foster children in need of the kind of loving homes that CSS provides.

The city has barred CSS because, as a Catholic agency, it adheres to Church teaching that marriage is a sacrament reserved to one man and one woman. As such, it cannot place foster children with same-sex couples.

This does not mean that same-sex couples are prevented from becoming foster parents. Philadelphia contracts with dozens of other agencies that do place children with same-sex couples. So that is not the issue. Rather, the issue is the use of government's coercive powers to force the Catholic Church to either compromise its moral teachings or abandon its services to people in need.

We pray that Archbishop Chaput prevails over this insanity.

MEDIA COVER UP TEXAS KILLER'S ATHEISM

The news media and the pundits are wading through another fog trying to figure out why the latest mass murderer went on a rampage. As a sociologist who has written on this subject before, I can attest that mass murderers have much in common, and this is especially true of young killers.

To begin with, let's dispense with a popular myth about the latest tragedy. Contrary to what most are saying, Dimitrios Pagourtzis, the killer who shot his victims at Sante Fe High School, did evince warning signs.

Soon after 10 innocent persons were shot dead, Texas Gov. Greg Abbott said, “the red-flag warnings were either nonexistent or imperceptible.” He was fed the wrong information.

A few weeks before the shooting, there were at least three perceptible signs of trouble: Pagourtzis made two alarming changes on his Facebook page, and, more importantly, he threatened to kill someone.

For example, he posted a picture of a black T-shirt on his Facebook page with the words “BORN TO KILL” on it. On the same day, he posted a picture of a jacket with genocidal symbols on it: the hammer and sickle of the Communist Party, and the Nazi Iron Cross of Germany’s Fascist regime. These two postings were obvious signs that something was wrong.

Then there is the tragic case of Shana Fisher. Two weeks before Pagourtzis shot her, he told the 16-year-old student that he was going to kill her. She told both of her parents. According to her father, who did not live with either his daughter or his ex-wife (he had remarried 13 years earlier), “He [Pagourtzis] had told her himself he was going to kill her. He was walking around planning this in his head for weeks.”

The father blamed Shana’s teachers, saying, “If they are smart enough to teach our kids, they should be smart enough to see when something is badly wrong with someone.” He did not say why he wasn’t smart enough to do something, even though he, unlike the teachers, knew of the threat on his daughter’s life.

When analyzing mass murderers, it is important not to miss telltale signs. There are plenty of them. While any one of them, standing alone, may not be cause for concern, they become worrisome when spliced together. The fact is that mass murderers evince a pattern of behavior that clearly defines who they are. Consider Jeff Weise.

In 2005, when Weise was 16, he killed his grandfather, his grandfather's companion, and nine of his classmates in the Minnesota massacre; he then killed himself. He was a loner whose father had committed suicide four years earlier, and was hostile to religion. In addition, he posted many messages on the Internet site of www.nazi.org, loved heavy metal music, and was told by his classmates that he dressed like the Trench Coat Mafia who killed 12 students and a teacher at Columbine. In fact, he wore a black trench coat and combat boots.

What do we know of Pagourtzis? Besides his affection for Communist and Nazi symbols, the 17-year-old was known as a "weird loner" by his classmates; he lived in a mostly elderly neighborhood where children were almost nonexistent. As one young person who knew him put it, "He stuck to himself. He had a few friends but never really talked to many people." He also loved playing videogames and listening to heavy metal.

Pagourtzis did not see his father too often; he was typically overseas, working in the maritime business. Like Weise, Pagourtzis wore a trench coat (even when it was 90 degrees) and military boots. Similarly, his classmates liked to joke that he looked just like the Columbine shooters. He planned to kill himself but was apprehended by the police before doing so. He was also a professed atheist.

It goes without saying that if any of these mass murderers had been a practicing Christian, the media would make sure the whole world knew about it.

The pattern is there for all to see: young mass murderers are loners; they have a dysfunctional relationship with their father; they sport an affection for terrorist symbols; they wear military apparel; they imitate other mass shooters; they are drawn to the solitude of videogames; they love the crashing sounds of heavy metal; and they are either atheists or have no room for God in their lives. Sadly, they also have a wicked desire to kill themselves after finishing their

victims.

Why do we have so many mass killers? It is true that they suffer from psychological disorders, which are made manifest in their traits. But unless we appreciate the role that boredom plays in their lives—killing excites them—we will never be able to figure them out.

“Among the forces that have shaped human behavior boredom is one of the most insistent and universal.” That was the conclusion the esteemed sociologist Robert Nisbet came to in his assessment of human history.

Boredom, Nisbet argued, could be relieved by “migration, desertion, war, revolution, murder, calculated cruelty to others, suicide, pornography, alcohol, narcotics.” He added that “the pains and the results of boredom are everywhere to be seen, and nowhere more epidemically than in Western society at the present time.”

He wrote that in 1982. For many sociological reasons, the curse of boredom has only worsened since then, finding relief in murder, calculated cruelty to others, and suicide.

HYPOCRITES SHINE AT TONY AWARDS

A national writer for the Associated Press, Jocelyn Noveck, described the Tony Awards as an event “where tolerance and inclusion were constant themes.” So this is what Robert De Niro was doing—exercising his “tolerance”—when he screamed “F*** Trump”?

At least De Niro didn't threaten violence against the president, which he did previously ("I'd like to punch Donald Trump in the face," he said during the last presidential campaign). More recently, he vigorously defended Michelle Wolf's obscene-laden address at the White House Correspondents Dinner. This is how Mr. Tolerance acts.

Another beacon of tolerance who spoke at the Tony Awards was Tony Kushner. He implored the audience to "heal our country."

Kushner's idea of healing is to bash Catholics and Jews. He not only cheered when Terrence McNally gave us "Corpus Christi," the play where Christ is depicted as having sex with the twelve apostles, he lashed out at the Catholic League for exercising its First Amendment right to free speech by protesting the play.

After Matthew Shepard was murdered in Wyoming, Kushner blamed the pope for the homosexual's death: "Pope John Paul II endorses murder," the healer said. He has also been relentless in bashing the democratic state of Israel.

When Andrew Garfield won the best actor award, he took the occasion to reference the Supreme Court decision which affirmed religious liberty in the Masterpiece Cakeshop case. He sided against the decision calling on everyone to say "no to bigotry, no to shame, no to exclusion."

It's too bad Garfield didn't direct his comments at the gay bullies who took aim at the baker, Jack Phillips. "We declined to create one custom cake to celebrate a wedding ceremony that would directly violate my faith's teachings...and it resulted in five years of court battle, 40 percent of my business, losing half my staff and even death threats," Phillips said.

Tolerance. Inclusion. Civility. The New York-Hollywood axis may shout those virtues from the rooftop, but in practice they violate them with regularity. There are no bigger phonies on earth.

MARIO BATALI WINS TOP PRIZE FOR HYPOCRISY

There is no celebrity chef more adored by elites nationwide than Mario Batali. They particularly like the way he champions women's rights and the rights of the poor. And so far, at least, they seem untroubled by revelations that he abuses both women and the poor. Maybe that's because they still approve of the way he called out the pope five years ago.

Mario is back in the news, this time for sexual assault. On May 20, "60 Minutes" aired a piece noting that at least 11 women have accused him of sexual misconduct; a criminal investigation is underway. Last December, revelations of sexual assault hit the media, but it had no effect on his standing with elites.

One of the stories that broke five months ago involved an encounter that Mario had in 2010, the week of the Oscars. The dinner was held at one of his restaurants in Los Angeles, hosted by the publisher of Vanity Fair. Mario showed up late and was obviously smashed. He didn't waste time sexually molesting the special events director.

Mario may like to abuse women but he loves to stand up for their rights. Not surprisingly, he is a big proponent of abortion rights (most abusers tend to be that way). Indeed, in 2013 he even donated \$5,000 in an abortion telethon for women's abortions.

Mario is also an advocate of two men marrying (those who are pro-abortion are almost always pro-gay marriage). That explains why he wasn't too happy with Pope Francis, who, while visiting the U.S. in 2015, met with Kim Davis; she is the

Kentucky County clerk who refused to issue a marriage license to gay couples. Mario blasted the pope for meeting with her.

Mario also loves the poor. The welfare of the poor, however, was not on Mario's mind when he and his partner agreed to pay \$5.25 million to settle their cash-skimming schemes at eight high-scale restaurants. They took 4-5 percent of the tips from employees, ripping off the busboys to pay for the sommeliers' salaries. The money that was paid out was shared by 1,100 employees; many were forced to work more than 40 hours a week without making minimum wage.

If we knew the identity of the poor whom Mario stole from, we would probably learn that a good portion of them are illegal aliens. In all likelihood we would also learn of Mario's public exhortations on behalf of the "undocumented."

How different is Mario from most other high-flying liberal elites? From what we've learned over the past year, it appears he has plenty of company. But for right now, the top prize for hypocrisy goes to Mario Batali.

ABC'S BEEF WITH ROSEANNE BARR IS PHONY

Roseanne Barr has been making vile comments for years, so why—all of a sudden—has she crossed the line? In 1990, when she grabbed her crotch, spit on the ground, and gave a screeching rendition of our national anthem at a baseball game, the cultural elites who now hate her were fine with her stunt. It's not America bashing they despise—it's racism.

It sure isn't anti-Catholicism that bothers them, either. Now

that the media are rediscovering some of Barr's past bigoted statements, they seem to be unaware of, or just don't care about, her anti-Catholic bigotry.

In 2012, Barr said that Catholic employers should include psychiatric coverage for the children of women workers because the kids "might get molested by Catholic priests." Two years earlier she said, "I am starting to think that any parent who takes their kids to Catholic churches from now on should lose custody. Taking your kids where you know sex offenders hang out is inexcusable." No one blinked an eye in New York or Hollywood.

But when Barr made a racist remark recently about a black woman, the alarms went off. ABC entertainment president Channing Dungey called Barr's comment "abhorrent, repugnant and inconsistent with our values." That is demonstrably untrue. Neither ABC nor its parent company, Disney, has found bigoted comments to be inconsistent with their values. To prove it, consider the following summary of ABC's tolerance for anti-Catholic bigotry.

Valerie Jarrett may be a prominent woman, but she is not exactly in the same class with Mother Teresa. When the saintly nun died in 1997, ABC anchor Peter Jennings allowed anti-Catholic bigot Christopher Hitchens to rant and rave against Mother Teresa at her funeral Mass. That it took place during the consecration of the Host made it all the more offensive.

In 1996 and 1997, ABC launched "Nothing Sacred," a drama series about a radical Catholic priest who excoriated the Church for its teachings on sexuality. He engaged in violence in and out of the church, and was surrounded by Buddha-worshipping nuns and dysfunctional priests. ABC kept the show alive to spite our protest, moving it around to different days and times, but finally succumbed to our pressure. It would never do a show about a discordant rabbi or imam.

On April 7, 1998, ABC debuted "That's Life," a show that mocked Christ's crucifixion, the Host, transubstantiation, Holy Water, Catholic prayers, Midnight Mass, salvation, Catholic rituals, the Vatican, the New Testament, the Stations of the Cross, Confession, nuns, priests, and practicing lay Catholic men and women. This was intentionally aired during Holy Week.

In 2002, ABC presented "Miracles," a show about a man who studies for the priesthood and leaves before taking his vows. He engages in a personal search for God but concludes that the Church is "extraneous and even a hurdle in the spiritual quest." He parts company with the Church hierarchy because "he feels its leaders do not really believe in miracles."

In 2005, ABC treated viewers to a segment, "On the Trail of Pope Joan," about a pope that never existed. Earlier in the year, "20/20" correspondent Elizabeth Vargas told viewers that the resurrection of Jesus was either "physical, metaphysical, or simply a hallucination—the dreams of grieving followers."

No show on ABC has been more relentlessly bigoted than "The View," co-hosted and co-produced by Barbara Walters for many years. She allowed Joy Behar, Elizabeth Hasselbeck, and Whoopi Goldberg to make the most vicious and sweeping comments about priests, the pope, the sacraments, and Catholic rituals. Never once did she find fault with their bigotry. If anything, she led them on, provoking even more vitriol.

More recently, ABC gave viewers "The Real O'Neals," a cruel caricature of an Irish Catholic family based on the life of one of its producers, Dan Savage. He is an obscene anti-Catholic bigot. We fought it and eventually it crashed.

Family shows are big at ABC. Gays love "Modern Family," Jews love "The Goldbergs," Asians love "Fresh Off the Boat," and African Americans love "Black-ish." And what do Catholics get? "The Real O'Neals."

Looks like they can't get enough of Irish Catholic families at ABC. This fall viewers will be treated to "The Kids Are Alright," a show about a "traditional Irish-Catholic family" of working-class stock. They live like animals: ten people sharing three bedrooms and one bathroom. The oldest son enters a seminary but quits so he can "save the world." ABC boasts that "the times are changing and this family will never be the same." They will make sure of that.

This show, following "The Real O'Neals," is based on the life of its producer, in this case Tim Doyle. Guess which show he just finished doing? "Roseanne."

In the May 30 edition of the *New York Times*, it says that Disney "has been widely praised in recent years as a leader in efforts to combat racial stereotypes through its movies and [ABC] TV series"; it offered several examples. That's true. Disney even pulled a Halloween costume in 2016 that depicted a Polynesian figure featured in the movie, "Moana." They didn't want to offend Pacific Islanders.

Why doesn't Disney/ABC find religious stereotypes as offensive as racial ones? Actually, it does, as long as its Jews or Muslims who are being considered for stereotyping. But not Catholics—they're fair game.

When a pilot was ordered in January for "The Kids Are Alright," ABC entertainment chief Channing Dungey said the network was "going to continue to sort of push the boundaries of what a family comedy actually means."

She surely did not mean that ABC would push the boundaries of acceptability for gays, Jews, Asians, or blacks. That would be bigoted. They save that kind of fun for Catholics.