

VICTORY FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY; HIGH COURT RULES 9-0

On June 17, the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously ruled that Catholic foster care agencies can reject gay couples from adopting children. This was a huge victory for religious liberty and a resounding defeat for LGBTQ activists.

It was these activists who launched a contrived assault on the rights of Catholic social service agencies—no gay or transgender couple had ever complained that they were discriminated against by these Catholic entities—and now their effort to impose their secular beliefs on Catholics has been rejected.

Chief Justice John Roberts, writing for the six members who joined his majority opinion (others offered their own opinions), noted that the Catholic agency named in the lawsuit only sought “an accommodation that will allow it to continue serving the children of Philadelphia in a manner consistent with its religious beliefs; it does not seek to impose those beliefs on anyone else (*our italics*).”

The First Amendment guarantees religious liberty, and that provision means little if it only means the right to worship. The right to freely exercise one’s religious beliefs in the public square is central to religious liberty, and while that right—like all other constitutional rights—is not absolute, it must be seen as presumptively constitutional.

This decision makes it more difficult for LGBTQ activists to argue that sexual orientation and sexual identity are analogous to race. They are not. Race is an ascribed characteristic, and as such it is an amoral attribute. Sexual orientation (at least when it is behaviorally operative) and sexual identity are achieved, and to that extent they are

normative, thereby making them legitimate categories for moral judgment.

There are some who argue that to deny a gay couple the right to adopt children is morally wrong. This position contends that the only thing that matters to children is love. While love is a necessary element, it is not sufficient. Children need proper formation, and that is difficult to do, at best, when they have two parents of the same sex. Boys and girls need mothers and fathers, and while that is not possible in every situation, it remains the gold standard, departures from which should be discouraged.

Those who support diversity should hail this high court ruling. No one is forced to go to a Catholic foster care agency when seeking to adopt children; we should respect the diversity these places entail.

Naturally, anti-Catholic bigots maintained that we have too many Catholics on the Supreme Court. Guess they didn't notice that two Jews and one Protestant were on the same side as the Catholic justices.

POPE ISSUES REFORMS

Pope Francis recently did the Catholic Church a great service in issuing some much needed changes in the Vatican's Code of Canon Law.

The new reforms provide sanctions against priests who "groom" or "induce" minors to perform sex acts. Similarly, the possession of child pornography is declared a crime deserving of punishment.

The most dramatic changes affect sexual abuse committed by priests against another adult. If a priest “forces someone to perform or submit to sexual acts,” he will be punished. The penalty may include “dismissal from the clerical state if the case so warrants.”

It remains to be seen how the norms that affect adults will be enacted. Will they, for example, be invoked against priests who engage in homosexual acts with other priests?

Another area of controversy is sure to be the norms that provide sanctions for “the attempted ordination of women.” Currently, there are many dissident Catholic organizations that openly reject the Church’s teaching on ordination.

It is refreshing to read that the new norms apply to lay leaders in the Church who abuse their office. They will now be held accountable for their own behavior.

Fortunately, the changes, which go into effect on December 8, 2021, will provide improvements in the due process rights of priests.

These reforms by Pope Francis will likely be welcomed by the vast majority of Catholics. Those who are likely to be troubled by them need to engage in some serious self-reflection.

RIGHTS FOR TREES BUT NOT FOR THEE

Christopher D. Stone is not exactly a household name, but he clearly left his mark on the “rights” movement. The University of Southern California law professor recently died. More well

known was his father, I.F. Stone, whom the New York Times obituary on Christopher called a “crusading reporter.” They left out that he was also a Soviet agent.

Should trees have rights? Christopher D. Stone was convinced they should.

“I am quite seriously proposing that we give legal rights to forests, oceans, rivers and other so-called ‘natural objects’ in the environment—indeed, to the natural environment as a whole.” He specifically mentioned as worthy of legal rights “valleys, alpine meadows, rivers, lakes, estuaries, beaches, ridges, groves of trees, swampland, or even air that feels destructive pressures of modern technology and modern life.”

Stone made his case in a famous 1972 article, “Should Trees Have Standing?—Toward Legal Rights for Natural Objects.” He has not been without success.

Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas agreed with him, and cities such as Pittsburgh and Santa Monica have followed suit, offering legal protection to natural resources. New Zealand has gone further, declaring “all the rights, powers, duties and liabilities of a legal person” to a national park.

It is true that corporations are seen as legal entities deserving of rights, but they are made up of individuals.

If trees are deserving of rights, it seems logical that Stone would argue for the rights of the unborn. In fact he did not. In his classic article in the Southern California Law Review on the rights of trees, which was published the year before *Roe v. Wade* legalized abortion, he makes reference to abortion in a footnote.

He recognizes competing rights, but he never argues that the right of the baby to be born is paramount. The best he can do is offer a rather pedestrian observation. “The trend toward liberalized abortion can be seen either as a legislative

tendency back in the direction of rightlessness of the foetus—or toward increasing rights of women.”

Stone had a great influence on environmentalists, including John Holdren, who was President Obama’s science czar. He endorsed Stone’s thesis that trees have rights.

After Holdren was confirmed by the Senate, more was found out about him. His enthusiasm for population control led him to entertain plans to force single women to abort their babies or put them up for adoption. He also considered forced sterilization, even to the point of putting chemicals in food and water that would make people sterile.

Why is it that inanimate objects, along with animals, have gained the support of legal theorists and lawmakers but not unborn babies?

Consider, for example, a front-page story in the June 2nd edition of the New York Times about President Biden’s decision to suspend oil drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The area, the story notes, is “home to migrating waterfowl, caribou and polar bears.” The article continues inside featuring a picture of a polar bear in the area.

Biden has shown great interest in protecting the environment and showing respect for the rights of animals. When in the Congress, he co-sponsored legislation to label tuna “dolphin safe.” He urged the Canadians to end its commercial seal hunt. He supported legislation against commercial whaling and opposed some traps used to capture animals. He also co-sponsored a bill to prohibit some research practices on cats and dogs.

However, when it comes to the rights of the unborn, he says they have none. Zero. Some animal traps, he says, are “inhumane.” But not the practice of smashing the skull of a baby undergoing a partial-birth abortion.

There is nothing new to this line of thinking. Peter Singer is a Princeton University professor and the father of animal rights. He is also an atheist and a proponent of selective infanticide. He says that some defective children should undergo a trial period after birth while a decision is being made about putting them to death, and that in any event parents should be allowed to exterminate their disabled babies. He believes that “killing a newborn baby is never equivalent to killing a person, that is, a being who wants to go on living.”

Interestingly, he maintains that there is absolutely no moral difference between killing a baby in the mother’s womb and killing a newborn. If it is legal to kill an unborn baby, Singer concludes, it should be legal to kill infants. Just don’t forget to protect the turkeys.

To show how far we’ve drifted, Singer wants to give the same rights that humans enjoy to chimps, bonobos, gorillas and orangutans. He is also of the opinion that bestiality is not necessarily a bad thing: he argues that “sex with animals does not always involve cruelty,” and that “mutually satisfying activities” of a sexual nature should be respected.

Stone and Singer are known for their selective interest in the distribution of rights, and unfortunately this train of thought is now very much a part of our cultural and legal landscape.

PRESIDENT BIDEN’S POLICIES:

DEPARTURES FROM CATHOLIC TEACHINGS

- January 20, 2021 – Biden signed an executive order affirming that “children should be able to learn without worrying about whether they will be denied access to the restroom, the locker room, or school sports,” affirming his campaign promise to allow minors to use facilities and participate in high school sports opposite their biological sex. While campaigning, in response to a question from a parent of a transgender child, Biden said that there would be “zero discrimination” when it came to minors seeking to change their gender.
- January 20, 2021 – Biden issued an executive order requiring all federal agencies to implement the ruling in the Supreme Court decision *Bostock v. Clayton County*, which treats sexual orientation and gender identity as protected classes. This is a grave injustice that erases the differences and complementary relationship between man and woman.
- January 22, 2021 – Biden issued a statement on the 48th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* describing the 1973 U.S. Supreme Court decision as a “foundational precedent” to which all judicial nominees should commit. Biden called for *Roe*’s codification.
- January 23, 2021 – The Department of Justice announced that it would repeal a Trump administration memo that blocked the enforcement of the *Bostock* ruling in federal law.
- January 25, 2021 – Biden signed an order that would allow transgender persons to serve in the Armed Forces. As part of the order, Biden urged the Defense Department to create a process that would allow individuals to change sexes while serving in the military.
- January 28, 2021 – Biden issued the “Memorandum on

Protecting Women's Health at Home and Abroad." This memorandum revokes the Mexico City Policy, which is a U.S. government policy that requires foreign non-governmental organizations to certify that they will not "perform or actively promote abortion as a method of family planning."

- January 28, 2021 – Biden instructed the Department of Health and Human Services to immediately move to consider rescinding the Trump administration rule blocking health care providers in the federally funded Title X family planning program from referring patients for abortions.

- January 28, 2021 – Biden ordered that the necessary steps be taken to resume funding to the United Nations Population Fund, which promotes family planning through abortion.

- January 28, 2021 – Biden directed United States Agency for International Development and other United States government foreign assistance programs to ensure that adequate funds are being directed to support abortion rights.

- February 4, 2021 – Biden issued the "Memorandum on Advancing the Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex Persons Around the World." This will limit the ability of faith-based organizations to assist in foreign aid.

- February 4, 2021 – Biden signed an executive order allowing for non-married couples to be treated as married for the purposes of the refugee system in certain circumstances.

- February 25, 2021 – The House passed the Equality Act. Biden made enacting this legislation within his first 100 days in office a top legislative priority.

- The act would effectively gut the 1993 Religious Freedom Restoration Act, eviscerating important religious rights.

- State laws that protect religious liberty would be gutted.

- Freedom of speech, belief, and thought, as the U.S. Bishops have said, would be put "at risk." When conscience rights are attacked, all liberties are jeopardized.

- Taxpayer-funded abortions would become a reality.
- The bishops stress that "Houses of worship and other religious spaces will be turned into places of 'public accommodation.'"
- Adoption and foster care providers would have their rights stripped.
- Catholic hospitals would no longer be allowed to govern as Catholic facilities, threatening healthcare for everyone, especially the poor.
- Starting in kindergarten, students would be indoctrinated in the LGBT agenda.
- Parental rights would be decimated.
- Men who transition to female could compete in women's sports, effectively working against the rights of women.
- Privacy rights would be a thing of the past. As has already happened, a man who thinks of himself as a woman would be allowed to use the women's locker room.

- February 25, 2021 – Rachel Levine, a transgender born a biological male, was Biden's nomination for Assistant Secretary for HHS. When questioned about sex transitioning of minors during his confirmation hearing, Levine did not oppose the idea of allowing minors to receive hormone therapy and puberty blockers.

- March 4, 2021 – Biden supports the For the People Act (H.R. 1), a bill that calls into question the impartiality of those who have religious affiliations. The objectionable provision is directed at a person's suitability serving on a state's redistricting commission. It assumes that people of faith – but not atheists – are inclined to be partisan observers, thus coming dangerously close to invoking a "religious test."

- March 11, 2021 – As part of Biden's American Rescue Plan Act, there was no language that reflects the longstanding, bi-partisan consensus policy to prohibit taxpayer dollars from funding abortions domestically and internationally. The policy was needed because this bill includes many general references

to healthcare that, absent the express exclusion of abortion, have consistently been interpreted by federal courts not only to allow, but to compel, the provision of abortion without meaningful limit.

- March 18, 2021 – The Office of Population Affairs at HHS announced the Biden administration's plan to repeal the Trump-era Protect Life Rule governing Title X by the end of the year. This announcement was in direct response to President Biden's executive order issued on January 28.

- March 30, 2021 – Secretary of State Antony Blinken disbanded the "Commission on Unalienable Rights," because it overemphasized religious liberty. Blinken would rather treat religious liberty as a coequal right, diminishing its status, freeing the State Department to promote LGBT and abortion rights.

- March 31, 2021 – The Department of Defense released a statement affirming Biden's executive order on transgender persons in the military stating that the Department will "provide a path for those in service for medical treatment, gender transition, and recognition in one's self-identified gender."

- April 13, 2021 – Under Biden, the Food and Drug Administration is no longer enforcing the "in-person dispensing requirement" for chemical abortion pills.

- April 13, 2021 – Under Biden, the USAID Middle East Bureau renamed the "Religious and Ethnic Communities Office" to "Equity and Diverse Communities in the Middle East and North Africa Office" to shift the Bureau's focus away from protecting the rights of religious minorities in the Middle East and emphasize other groups such as LGBT.

- April 14, 2021 – HHS introduced the Title X changes outlined by Biden's "Memorandum on Protecting Women's Health at Home and Abroad." Under these new rules, grantees would be required

to refer for abortions, despite moral or religious objections, effectively banning otherwise pro-life grantees from participating.

- April 16, 2021 – Under Biden, the National Institute of Health removed restrictions on human fetal tissue research.
- April 20, 2021 – After a group of Catholic doctors and hospitals won a case over an HHS rule that would compel them to provide gender-transition surgeries, regardless of their conscientious beliefs, the Biden administration appealed to keep this mandate in place.
- April 22, 2021 – The Department of Housing and Urban Development announced changes to the Equal Access Rule, which would require participants in the Department's Office of Community Planning and Development programs to accommodate transgender persons based on their gender identity. This would compel Catholic shelters to house individuals of the opposite sex.
- April 25, 2021 – The DOJ issued a statement of interest in favor of a Georgia transgender prisoner who is suing the Georgia Department of Corrections for failing to house him based on his gender identity because Georgia does not want to house people of one biological sex with those of the other.
- May 10, 2021 – The Department of Health and Human Services announced that it would reinstate an Obama-era rule that would remove exemptions for religious and Catholic hospitals that refused to provide transgender services and procedures that go against their religious beliefs. The rule interpreted "sex discrimination" under Section 1557 of the Affordable Care Act to include "gender identity." This is a major blow to the religious liberty rights of Catholic doctors and hospitals. It would force doctors and hospitals to provide sex reassignment surgeries, even if these surgeries go against their religious beliefs, as well as cover these surgeries and procedures in

their insurance policies.

- May 12, 2021 – HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra, who voted against a law that banned partial-birth abortion when he was a congressman, was asked if he would respect this law. He made it clear he would not. He justified this stance by falsely claiming that there is no such law. In 2003 Congress passed the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act and President George W. Bush signed it.
 - May 17, 2021 – After the Supreme Court said it would take up a case involving Mississippi's ban on abortion after 15 weeks, White House press secretary Jen Psaki informed reporters that Biden was "committed to codifying" Roe v. Wade no matter what the Court decides.
 - May 28, 2021 – Biden released his budget proposal for FY2022, and it allocates money for abortions since it has no Hyde Amendment language. This is the first budget proposal since 1993 that does not include conscience protections to ensure federal funds are not used for abortions.
-

CHURCH'S TAX-EXEMPT STATUS THREATENED

In the late 1980s, the ACLU filed an amicus brief in a lawsuit that sought to revoke the tax-exempt status of the Catholic Church because of its teaching on abortion. Now abortion is the subject of a threat to do the same, this time coming from a sitting member of the House of Representatives.

Rep. Jared Huffman is a Democrat from California, an atheist, and an anti-Catholic bigot. He showed his real colors when he

recently tweeted the following: “If they’re [the Catholic bishops] going to politically weaponize religion by ‘rebuking’ Democrats who support women’s reproductive choice, then a ‘rebuke’ of their tax-exempt status may be in order.”

Huffman obviously objects to the First Amendment’s provisions on freedom of speech and freedom of religion. Accordingly, he should resign from the Congress of the United States. There are plenty of other countries where he would fit in just fine, ranging from Iran to North Korea.

In 2018, Huffman co-founded an atheist congressional group. He is so much in love with abortion and gay rights that he has received a 100% voting record from NARAL and the Human Rights Campaign. Not surprisingly, he was a co-sponsor of the Equality Act, the most anti-religious liberty congressional bill ever introduced.

It is important for the Catholic League to know how many other Democrats believe that the Catholic Church should lose its tax-exempt status. Hopefully, they will now come out of the shadows and let us know.

CATHOLIC DEMOCRATS LECTURE THE BISHOPS

Seems like everyone is lecturing the bishops these days.

The latest to do so are 59 Democrats who identify as Catholics. Leading the charge is Rep. Rosa DeLauro. On June 18, DeLauro issued a “Statement of Principles” that chastises the bishops for addressing the issue of Catholic public figures who reject core Catholic moral teachings; 73% of the

bishops voted to consider a document on the suitability of these self-identified Catholics to receive Holy Communion.

DeLauro has a long history of telling the bishops what to do.

In 2006, she issued a "Statement of Principles," signed by 55 self-identified Catholic Democrats, saying that one can be a Catholic in good standing and promote abortion rights. In 2007, she was one of 18 self-professed Catholic Democrats to criticize Pope Benedict XVI on this subject. In 2015, she led a contingent of 93 self-identified Catholic Democrats telling Pope Francis what issues he needs to address when he comes to the United States: the right to life was not among them, but climate change made the cut.

In the latest "Statement of Principles," DeLauro and company say they are proud to be part of the Catholic tradition that "expresses a consistent moral framework for life," adding that they "agree with the Catholic Church about the value of human life." Yet virtually all the signatories have a pro-abortion voting record.

DeLauro has voted for human embryonic stem cell research, a process that involves the killing of nascent human life. She opposes making human cloning for reproduction against the law. DeLauro has consistently voted against bans on partial-birth abortions, and has a 100% rating from NARAL on pro-abortion legislation.

The "Statement of Principles" expresses dismay over poverty, saying what is needed is greater "access to education for all." Yet DeLauro voted against requiring able-bodied welfare recipients to work. In other words, she wants to keep the poor on the dole instead of enabling them to work themselves out of poverty.

She has also voted against every school choice bill ever proposed, making it risible for her to suggest that she wants "access to education for all." In fact, she voted against

reauthorizing the Washington D.C. opportunity scholarship program, the initiative that has worked so well for poor African Americans.

DeLauro and her self-identified Catholic Democrats have made their biggest media splash saying how hypocritical it is of the bishops to focus on abortion and not the death penalty, both of which the Catholic Church opposes. Perhaps that is because they are not equal.

It is estimated that between 1973 and 2019, 61,628,584 innocent children were killed in their mother's womb. The number of convicted criminals who were executed during that time was 1,512.

Curiously, the "Statement of Principles" encourages "alternatives to abortion."

But why are alternatives needed if abortion does not kill? Is there something lurking inside these pro-abortion self-identified Catholic Democrats that is giving them pause? We need to know what it is, because if they do, in fact, understand that abortion kills innocent human life, they would be getting off easy if the bishops simply denied them Communion.

SEX ENGINEERING BILL IS INSANE

A sex education bill is being considered in some states that is the most wildly irresponsible assault on common decency and common sense ever proposed. In a stealth move, it was passed by Illinois state lawmakers on the Friday of Memorial Day

weekend; Governor J.B. Pritzker did not sign it, but if he does nothing, it becomes law after 60 days.

We fought it, enlisting our base of email subscribers. It has little to do with sex education as most people understand it; rather, it is a radical sex engineering bill. We are well aware that young family members may read Catalyst so we are not going to print some of the more graphic material that is in the curriculum.

The National Sexuality Education Standards is an initiative of the Future of Sex Education and the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States; the latter was established in the 1950s by disciples of the sex-abusing king of sexology, Alfred Kinsey.

The scope of the curriculum goes far beyond conventional sex education programs. Indeed, it is the most extreme attempt to transform the norms and values of young people ever envisioned.

By the end of the 2nd grade, when most students are 7-years old, they will be expected to list “medically accurate names for body parts, including the genitals.” They will also define “gender, gender identity, and gender-role stereotypes.” Bodily autonomy will also be stressed, as well as knowledge about different family forms, including “cohabiting” and “same-gender” variants.

By the end of the 5th grade, students will be expected to “distinguish between sex assigned at birth and gender identity and explain how they may or may not differ.” They will also learn about the “differences between cisgender, transgender, gender nonbinary, gender expansive and gender identity.”

By the end of the 8th grade, students will be expected to explain what it means to be “bisexual, lesbian, gay, queer, two-spirit, asexual, pansexual.”

By the time students are ready to graduate from high school, they will be taught to become an “advocate” for “all genders, gender expressions, and gender identities.”

There is another part of the curriculum that speaks to issues of anatomy and physiology. Fifth graders, for instance, will be taught about “hormone blockers on young people who identify as transgender.” Tenth graders will learn about “the role of hormones and pleasure.” By the time they graduate from high school, they will be instructed to become “advocates” for “people of all sexual orientations.”

There is a glossary for students to learn as well. Terms such as “gender expansive,” “gender nonbinary,” “gender nonconforming,” and “genderqueer” appear in the Appendix. “Gender pronouns” that are considered normal include referring to oneself as “they/them/theirs.”

Abortion is treated as a “pregnancy option.” “Sexual intercourse,” students learn, “may mean different things to different people, but could include behaviors such as vaginal sex, oral sex, or anal sex.”

The curriculum is a wholesale attack on parental rights and traditional moral values. Worse, it sanctions behaviors that are positively dangerous.

No one is ever “assigned” his or her sex. Fathers determine the sex of the child born as the result of a heterosexual union; hospital staff validate it. Not all family types are equal: not to tell students that there is a gold standard, one that provides the greatest opportunity for a boy and a girl to be a success in school, work and marriage—it is called the intact family—is intellectually dishonest and does them a disservice.

Terms such as “gender nonbinary,” “gender expansive,” “asexual,” “pansexual,” and the like are linguistic inventions that are not based on medical science; they are ideological

predilections. Moreover, no one in his right mind goes around calling himself “they” anymore than someone goes around calling himself “we.”

Teaching ten-year-olds about hormone blockers is done to advance the transgender movement. What will not be taught is how such therapies can create all sorts of long-term problems—they are irreversible—for those who take them. Just as irresponsible is to teach tenth graders about sexual pleasure. Why are they not instead being instructed on the merits of individual responsibility and the necessity of exercising restraint?

The curriculum crosses the line in a serious way when it instructs high school students to become “advocates” for the LGBTQ agenda. Students can advocate for any cause they want, but it is not the right of educators to tell them which cause they must adopt.

Finally, to teach students that anal sex is the equal of vaginal sex is pernicious. If they want to teach about this subject, they should teach what webmd.com says about it. It has a frank discussion on the health dangers that anal sex incurs. No wonder it concludes, “The only way to completely avoid anal sex risks is not to have it.” That is what students should be taught.

Educators need to know their place. They are employed to help students become literate, master the basics, and become good citizens. They are not there to sexually engineer them.

DISSIDENT CATHOLICS ATTACK THE BISHOPS

There is nothing new about the National Catholic Reporter working to undermine Catholic teachings, but their June 3rd editorial is in a class of its own.

The backdrop to the Reporter's angst was the June 16 virtual meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB). The bishops discussed, among other items, what to do about Catholic politicians who persist in flouting Church teachings on salient issues such as abortion. Our "devout Catholic" president, of course, has never found an abortion he could not justify. Indeed, now he wants us to pay for them.

The Catholic League is officially agnostic on what the bishops should do. Unlike the editors at the Reporter, we know our place and are not about to preach to them. But that doesn't mean we are blind to what Biden is doing. In fact, we detailed his departures from Catholic teachings on pp. 8-9.

The Reporter tried hard to be cute by encouraging the bishops to deny Biden Communion. "Just do it," they said. Why? So that way "if there happens to be a Catholic remaining who is not convinced that the bishops' conference, as it stands today, has become completely irrelevant and ineffectual, they will be crystal clear about that reality after the conference leaders move forward with this patently bad idea."

The Reporter did not speak to the bishops—it spoke down to them. The journalists love to lecture the theologians, as in telling the bishops that "excessive attention to the worthiness of those receiving Communion is contrary to a proper, traditional theology of the sacraments." Their arrogance is appalling.

According to the Reporter, it was not just the bishops who are

wrong—the Catholic Catechism is also wrong.

Here is what the Catechism says about abortion. “Human life must be respected and protected absolutely from the moment of conception.” It also says, “Formal cooperation in an abortion constitutes a grave offense.”

Regarding the paramount role of Communion, it lays out very clearly why it is the premier sacrament. It says, “the Eucharist occupies a unique place as the ‘Sacrament of sacraments’: ‘all other sacraments are ordered to it as to their end.’” It also says, “Anyone who desires to receive Christ in Eucharistic communion must be in a state of grace.”

If we had a racist Catholic president, the Reporter would be calling on the USCCB to excommunicate him. But when it comes to abortion, they swing the other way. The Church regards both abortion and racism to be “intrinsically evil.” It is the Reporter that is inconsistent, not the bishops.

The Reporter was not content to disagree with the bishops; no, it chose to insult them. They accused the bishops of creating a “MAGA church,” one that sees “Donald Trump instead of Jesus as its savior.” To top things off, they accuse them of being “lazy, out of touch” and “in the pockets of wealthy donors pushing a political agenda.”

Make no mistake about it—this is character assassination. The fact that it emanates from an alleged Catholic source makes it all the more despicable.

SOROS-FUNDED GROUP ATTACKS BISHOPS

President Biden says he is a “devout Catholic,” yet he continues to oppose many of the most serious Catholic teachings that bear on public policy. This is of great concern to the bishops, and a large contingent of them are considering whether Biden is deserving of Holy Communion. They took up this issue in a virtual meeting of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB).

Enter Faithful America. It sponsored a petition aimed at pressuring the bishops to “cancel your planned anti-Biden vote.” They claimed to have over 20,000 signatures.

Who is Faithful America? It is not an organization like the Catholic League. No one goes to the office because there isn’t any—it has a P.O. Box listed on its website. There is no one to call because it has no phone number. It says it is an “online community.” But it is not a community—it is simply a website that functions as a front group for Catholic haters.

Who funds it? George Soros, the atheist billionaire who hates Catholics.

Why did Faithful America launch this attack on the USCCB? Because it wanted to protect President Biden. They like his pro-abortion and anti-religious liberty record.

There is nothing “anti-Biden” about the USCCB. To be sure, the bishops are rightly concerned about the message that he is sending: The president of the United States can be a Catholic in good standing and still reject core Church teachings on the rights of the unborn, marriage, the family, sexuality, and religious liberty. Indeed, he can seek to force Catholic doctors to perform sex transition surgery and close down Catholic hospitals that refuse to perform abortions.

The USCCB will not be intimidated by phony “organizations” that have no anchor in the Catholic community.

THE BISHOPS ARE NOT PARTISANS

Critics of the bishops are accusing them of being political partisans. They are wrong. It is simply false to argue that the USCCB is a political tool of either the Republicans or the Democrats. The USCCB has praised and criticized the leaders of both parties, depending on their policies and how they mesh with Catholic teachings on public policy matters.

Bishops Pro-Obama

“We are heartened by a recent address delivered by President Obama on immigration reform reaffirming that it is a priority for his Administration, and that he is committed to supporting legislation and working for its enactment in the future.” – Bishop Gerald F. Kicanas (July 14, 2010)

“On behalf of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, I welcome the announcement by President Obama today that consistent with his executive authority, he will grant deferred action on a case-by-case basis to youth who entered the United States by age of 15 and have not committed certain offenses.” – Archbishop Jose H. Gomez (June 15, 2012)

“We, the bishops of the United States – can you believe it – in 1919 came out for more affordable, more comprehensive, more universal health care.” – Cardinal Timothy M. Dolan (December 4, 2013)

“Milwaukee Archbishop Jerome E. ListECKi responded to the Obama administration’s plans to legally permit 5 million

undocumented immigrants to stay in the United States temporarily, saying in the history of the Catholic Church, helping immigrants is not something new.” – Archdiocese of Milwaukee (November 21, 2014)

“The bishops welcome this important move by the [Obama] administration to adopt long-awaited standards to mitigate climate change and safeguard health, which are significant ways to live our responsibility to care for God’s creation.” – Archbishop Thomas G. Wenski (August 4, 2015)

Bishops Anti-Trump

“The President’s decision not to honor the U.S. commitment to the Paris agreement is deeply troubling... President Trump’s decision will harm the people of the United States and the world, especially the poorest, most vulnerable communities.” – Bishop Oscar Cantú (June 1, 2017)

“Yesterday, President Trump unveiled a budget plan, ‘Efficient, Effective, Accountable: An American Budget’ that again calls for deep cuts to vital parts of government, including underfunding programs that serve the poor, diplomacy, and environmental stewardship.” – Bishop Frank J. Dewane (February 13, 2018)

“We are deeply concerned about the President’s action to fund the construction of a wall along the U.S./Mexico border, which circumvents the clear intent of Congress to limit funding of a wall.” – Bishop Joe S. Vasquez (February 15, 2019)

“We are deeply disappointed that the [Trump] Administration continues to push forward to end DACA... We urge the President to reinstate the original protections that DACA provides to young people currently enrolled in the program, as well as begin accepting new prospective DACA applicants.” – Archbishop Jose H. Gomez (July 30, 2020)

“Sadly, we must call on the Administration yet again to stop

an execution.... We ask President Trump and Attorney General Barr, as an act of witness to the dignity of all human life: stop these executions.” – Archbishop Paul S. Coakley and Archbishop Joseph F. Naumann (November 18, 2020)

Bishops Pro-Biden

“We welcome the announcement preserving and fortifying DACA. For years, DACA youth have been enriching our country.... We applaud President Biden’s restoration of the DACA program....” – Archbishop Jose H. Gomez and Bishop Mario E. Dorsonville (January 21, 2021)

“We welcome [the president’s] Proclamation, which will help ensure that those fleeing persecution and seeking refuge or seeking to reunify with family in the United States will not be turned away because of what country they are from or what religion they practice.” – Cardinal Timothy Dolan and Bishop Mario E. Dorsonville (January 21, 2021)

“Biden signed an executive order requiring all U.S. residents to be counted in the U.S. census and reversed the prior administration’s unprecedented policy of excluding undocumented immigrants.... ‘We welcome this return to more than a century of American precedent that ensures all residents will be counted and included in the census and apportionment.’” – Bishop Mario E. Dorsonville (January 22, 2021)

“We welcome the Biden Administration’s actions to promote racial equity.” – Archbishop Paul S. Coakley and Bishop Shelton J. Fabre (February 1, 2021)

“Biden announced yesterday that the United States will rejoin the Paris Agreement on climate change. It is our hope that the United States will not only seize this challenge to meet the goal of net-zero emissions by 2050...but also become the global climate leader....” – Archbishop Paul S. Coakley and Bishop David J. Malloy (April 26, 2021)