

POPE WORRIED ABOUT “FAGS” IN THE VATICAN

This is the article that appeared in the July/August 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Pope Francis is obviously worried about “fags” in the seminaries, and even in the Vatican.

On May 28, it was reported that in a private meeting with 250 Italian bishops the week before, the pope said he opposed having openly homosexual men in the seminaries. He said the seminaries were already too full of “frociaggine,” or “faggotry.” After being criticized, the Vatican said the pope “extends his apologies.”

Later the Italian news agency, ANSA, reported that when the pope met privately with priests at the Pontifical Salesian University in Rome on June 11, he said, “In the Vatican, there is an air of ‘faggotry.’”

The use of the gay slur is not the real issue, though it is surprising to hear the pope speak this way twice within three weeks, and just two weeks after his apology was issued for the first infraction. The real issue is the prevalence of homosexuals in the seminaries and in the Vatican.

As Bill Donohue recounts in his book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*, the damage that homosexuals—not pedophiles—have done to the Catholic Church cannot be overstated. They are responsible for 81 percent of all the cases of the sexual abuse of minors from 1950 to 2002; almost all of the males were postpubescent.

Pope Francis didn’t need the data to know that homosexuals have taken over too much of the Catholic Church. He has

previously spoken openly about the “gay lobby” and the “gay mentality” in the Church.

When a bishop told the Holy Father that it was no big deal that several priests in his diocese were homosexuals—it was just an “expression of affection”—the pope strongly disagreed. “In the consecrated life and in the priestly life, there is no place for that kind of affection,” the pope said. He also warned priests against aligning themselves with the “gay movement.”

Pope Benedict XVI has also warned of the damage that homosexuals have done to the priesthood. This explains why he said that those with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” should not be ordained. Pope Francis has continued this policy.

It is not just Pope Francis who has expressed concern about the number of homosexuals in the Church. Father Andrew Greeley said in 1989 that “Blatantly active homosexual priests are appointed, transferred and promoted. Lavender rectories and seminaries are tolerated. National networks of active homosexual priests (many of them administrators) are tolerated.” In 2000, he testified that seminary professors “tell their students that they’re gay and take some of them to gay bars, and gay students sleep with each other.”

In 2002, Bishop Wilton Gregory (now a Cardinal) said, “One of the difficulties we do face in seminary life or recruitment is when there does exist a homosexual atmosphere or dynamic that makes heterosexual men think twice” about joining the priesthood. He said it is “an ongoing struggle” and that the Church must be careful not to be “dominated by homosexual men.”

Pope Francis is clearly worried that there are still too many homosexuals in the priesthood. Calling gays “fags” should not mask what is bugging the pope. His critics are trying to

divert attention from the real problem.

BIDEN GUILTY OF CULTURAL IMPERIALISM

This is the article that appeared in the July/August 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

The Biden Administration never stops telling us about the virtue of diversity and how we must respect it. Yet when it comes to the diversity that foreign countries exhibit, especially in matters relating to sexuality, it shows nothing but contempt. Instead of respecting the diverse cultural norms and values that exist in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia, the Biden administration is shoving down their throats the corrupt sexual agenda of western nations.

[We prepared a report, “Biden Admin LGBT Imperialism,” that documents the extent to which the administration is guilty of cultural imperialism. See our website.]

President Biden hit the ground running, rolling out a slew of radical LGBT policies literally two weeks after he was inaugurated. He issued a memorandum on “Advancing the Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer and Intersex Person Around the World.” It was given a national security number (NSM-4) to show its importance.

But who asked Biden to promote his queer agenda around the world? And why the urgency? Aside from elites and wealthy left-wing advocacy organizations—who do not represent the masses—no one did.

Secretary of State Antony Blinken is enthralled with this agenda. Early on he bragged that “We are engaging around the world in cultural diplomacy.” Wrong. The administration is engaging in cultural imperialism.

When U.S. embassies fly Pride Flags in countries that are averse to this indoctrination—including the Holy See—they are showing how little they respect the diversity that these nations represent. When the United States Agency for International Development tells educators what pronouns to use, and advises that when they learn of a girl who thinks she is a boy that they are under no obligation to tell her parents, this is a classic example of cultural imperialism.

The manipulation of religious groups, as has been done in Botswana, to promote LGBT policies that they reject, is another example of this malady. It got so bad in Ghana they even threatened to withhold funding unless officials there adopted laws on sexuality that the Biden administration favors. And why was it necessary to fund a film to be distributed in Portugal that features drag queens and depictions of incest and pedophilia? Do we have perverts working for us?

Most of the world wants nothing to do with this sick agenda. We need to respect it.

DEBUNKING SLAVERY MYTHS

This is the article that appeared in the July/August 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

We recently celebrated the Fourth of July, and as usual some

sages told us how slavery is as American as apple pie. They have no idea what they are talking about.

As Harvard sociologist Orlando Paterson has shown, there is not a place on the globe that has not known slavery. Aristotle thought it was so much a part of the human condition that he justified it on the basis of the natural law. It took the Catholic Church to proclaim that slavery violated the natural law.

The *New York Times*' "1619 Project" tells readers that America was founded in slavery. Wrong. It was founded in a revolution in 1776. Just as wrongheaded is Linda Thomas-Greenfield, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations under President Biden. She told reporters in 2021 that "the original sin of slavery weaved white supremacy into our founding documents and principles." This is a bastardization of history.

Those who accept the ambassador's view claim that the Constitution justified slavery and that it regarded blacks as three-fifths human. This is false.

The Constitution makes no mention of the words "slave," "slavery," "race," "white," "black," or "color." And nowhere does it say that blacks are three-fifths human. The three-fifths language is in Article I, Section 2, which speaks to the issue of apportionment. To determine the number of representatives each state should have, the total was to be determined by "adding to the whole number of free persons, including those bound to service for a term of years, and excluding Indians not taxed, three-fifths of all other persons." In other words, count free persons, do not count those Indians not taxed, and add three-fifths of the slaves. This last part has been grossly distorted.

The Northern delegates did not want to count slaves at all, and the Southern delegates wanted them counted as equal to free persons. According to the twisted logic offered by left-

wing ideologues, this would suggest that the North was more pro-slavery than the South. This is absurd.

If blacks weren't counted at all, it would weaken the Southern base: the slave states would have only 41 percent of the seats in the House of Representatives. If they were counted as equal to whites, the slave states would have 50 percent of the House seats. The compromise—counting slaves as three-fifths—meant that the slave states wound up with 47 percent of the seats. That is the truth of the story.

The Constitution, without mentioning slavery directly, provided that the international slave trade would end on January 1, 1808. The president who made good on that pledge was Thomas Jefferson.

When the United States was founded, the only place in the world that had banned slavery was Great Britain. It was abolished in the United States in 1865. Africa banned it in 1981, yet it still exists there today in Mauritania and Somalia.

The Europeans did not kidnap African slaves. They bought them. Moreover, the African slavemasters facilitated the transfer by bundling the slaves in cages for the white boys. Common sense should tell us that if a handful of white boys showed up in Africa looking for slaves, why didn't the Africans say to them—they vastly outnumbered the Europeans—yes, there is going to be slavery, but you are going to be the slaves and we are going to be the masters?

Defending slavery were white “progressives.” George Fitzhugh was America's first sociologist. He railed against capitalism but defended slavery.

In his work, “The Universal Law of Slavery,” written in 1850, Fitzhugh explained that “the Negro is but a grown up child and must be governed as a child, not as a lunatic or criminal. The master occupies toward him the place of parent or guardian.”

He said slavery had a positive effect. "The negro slaves of the South are the happiest, and in some sense, the freest people in the world."

Blacks, he said, could not compete with the white man under capitalism, so it was better to keep them in slavery.

"The negro is improvident [and] would become an insufferable burden to society. Society has a right to prevent this, and can only do so by subjecting him to domestic slavery. In the last place, the negro race is inferior to the white race..."

During the Progressive Era, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Richard T. Ely was one of the most prominent leaders in the social-justice crusade. He was considered sympathetic to blacks, yet he expressed the same views as Fitzhugh. "Negroes, are for the most part grown up children, and should be treated as such."

It must be said that not much has changed. Today's "progressives" have low expectations for blacks, which is why they are bent on lowering the bar for black students—they should instead be helping them to clear it! White liberal racism is endemic.

America bashers love to ruin our Fourth of July. They are as ignorant as they are malicious.