

ATTACK ON CHIEFS' BUTKER; BIGOTRY IN PLAY

This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).

Harrison Butker, the phenomenal kicker for the Kansas City Chiefs, gave a commencement address at Benedictine College in Kansas on May 11 that espoused traditional Catholic values. The practicing Catholic was criticized by the NFL, slammed on social media and was the subject of a change.org petition.

The attack had three targets: Butker, Benedictine College and Catholicism. Make no mistake, the war on Butker was driven by anti-Catholicism.

Butker was condemned for his remarks about women, abortion, President Biden, Gay Pride Month, gender ideology, and the emasculation of men. Those who signed the petition didn't want to debate him—they wanted him fired. "We call upon the Kansas City Chiefs management to dismiss Harrison Butker immediately for his inappropriate conduct."

Bill Donohue responded by saying, "Spoken like true fascists. Moreover, they are plain dumb: they don't know the difference between speech and conduct."

Most of the vitriol aimed at Butker was about his comments praising moms who elect to work at home taking care of their children. He noted how blessed he is to have a wife who embraces "one of the most important titles of all: homemaker."

Butker actually spoke for most moms.

In a Gallup poll released in 2019, 50 percent of women with children under age 18 said they would prefer to stay at home;

45 percent disagreed.

Butker spoke the truth about abortion, IVF, surrogacy and euthanasia, referring to them as stemming from “the pervasiveness of disorder.” But to those who like abortion, this was grounds to fire him.

Butker referenced Biden when he took him to task for making the sign of the cross during a pro-abortion rally. He was also right to call attention to the “deadly sins” associated with Pride month. His reference to “dangerous gender ideologies” was understated—we are dealing with a child abuse crisis.

Bigotry was the driving force behind these attacks. It was Butker’s unabashed defense of Catholic moral theology that set his critics off.

The Associated Press let the cat out of the bag. It unleashed a string of red flags about Benedictine College being “part of a constellation of conservative Catholic colleges that tout their adherence to church teachings and practice—part of a larger conservative movement in parts of the U.S. Catholic Church.”

This comes on the heels of an AP story sounding the alarms about the growth of orthodox Catholicism.

We were happy to come to Butker’s defense. We did so with greater effect than any other Catholic organization in the nation. We had a list of email subscribers contact Stephen D. Minnis, president of Benedictine College, to show their support for him and for Butker.

NFL SIDES WITH BIGOTS

This is the article that appeared in the June 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 National Football League (NFL) sided with the anti-Catholic bigots in the Harrison Butker controversy. Speaking of the Kansas City football player, the NFL said, "His views are not those of the NFL as an organization." It cited its allegiance to inclusion.

Bill Donohue wrote a stinging letter to NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell. "So by stigmatizing Butker—in effect excluding him—for defending Catholic moral theology, you are flexing your inclusion muscles? Nice to know what you think about Catholicism—that is the real issue. Too bad you couldn't cite a single sentence that was objectionable."

Donohue then listed several instances where the NFL showed its duplicity, beginning with his letter to Goodell in 2011 about his decision to invite Madonna to perform at the 2012 Super Bowl. Donohue reminded Goodell that in 2004 it disinvited a rap singer from performing during the halftime of the Pro Bowl game because of his sexist lyrics.

Donohue drew a comparison with the NFL's handling of Madonna, citing her repeated mocking of "the heart and soul of Christianity: Jesus, Our Blessed Mother, the Eucharist and the Crucifixion." But none of that mattered.

Earlier this year the NFL gave a platform to an anti-Catholic organization, GLAAD, during the Super Bowl. This is the same group that heralded the decision of the Dodgers to honor the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, a viciously anti-Catholic group.

Goodell's phoniness is matched only by his tolerance for anti-

OUR PAMPERED ELITES

This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).

William A. Donohue

When I did the chapter on transgenderism for my upcoming book, *Cultural Meltdown*, I was struck by the fact that blacks are the least likely to believe in the fiction that the sexes are interchangeable. The biggest dopes are white people. Not just any white persons—those with post-graduate degrees are the dumbest.

Why are white well-educated people so stupid? To begin with, the ability to stay in school is not a good index of how bright someone is. Some of the brightest people I have ever met never went to college, and some of the biggest air heads I have ever met are college professors. This explains why I was not surprised to learn that those with post-graduate degrees are the most likely to believe that we can change our sex.

Does education corrupt? Depending on the course of study, and who the professors are, it may. For example, it can corrupt our cognitive faculties when we put common sense aside and allow ideology to run riot. Add to this the tendency of those with alphabets after their name to look down on the masses—it gives them a mantle of moral superiority—and the scene is set to ride off a cliff. Here's a real-life example.

A recent Rasmussen poll asked respondents if they agreed with

Disney official Karey Burke when she bragged how good it is for the company to have “many, many, many LGBTQIA characters.” Those who were the most likely to say this is appropriate for children under 12 were those in the highest income bracket—earning more than \$200,000 a year. They are among the most “well educated” in the country, having graduated from elite schools.

Are the rich morally corrupt? Some are. To be specific, they are more likely to be secularists, and this matters greatly: their distrust in God allows them to put their trust in themselves. And given their insular existence—they love gated communities, chauffeurs, and their own security—they can rest assured knowing that whatever the masses believe in is probably wrong.

Rich well-schooled young people have dominated the domestic news lately. From Berkeley to Columbia, they rioted, vandalized, burned American flags, camped out on campus property, attacked Jews, barricaded themselves in college offices, blocked traffic, assaulted the police and cheered for Hamas. According to the NYPD, most of those arrested at Columbia were students.

No one doubts, however, that outsiders played a key role, especially in organizing and strategizing how to win. Where did they get their money and training? From well-schooled rich people, of course.

It was hardly a shocker to learn that George Soros was involved. He loves to create anarchy, and uses his Open Society Foundations to great effect. David Rockefeller is another big player. Susan and Nick Pritzker are awash with left-wing money (Nick is the uncle of J.B. Pritzker, the billionaire governor of Illinois).

One of the most generous donors to left-wing causes is the Tides Foundation. According to Capital Research Center, which

does yeoman work tracking how the rich undermine America, "If the Left does it, Tides funds it." It is one of the masters of "dark money," funds that are hard to trace. It specializes in "pass-through funding," a mechanism that shuffles money to communist-inspired organizations such as the Working Family Party.

Not only has Soros lavishly funded Tides, so has the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Rockefeller Foundation, Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors, William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, Silicon Valley Community Foundation and K. Kellogg Foundation.

The Tides Foundation managed to grease two of the most pro-Hamas organizations responsible for the campus riots, Jewish Voice for Peace and IfNotNow. Another source of money for this crusade is Goldman Sachs, Wall Street's behemoth financial organization.

Here's how the game is played.

Goldman Sachs Philanthropy Fund funnels money to The People's Forum, a radical left-wing entity with ties to the Chinese Communist Party. It is backed by American businessman Neville Roy Singham. He uses Goldman Sachs' charity arm as a pass-through to The People's Forum. Though Goldman Sachs maintains it has no direct ties to this group, in a circuitous way it does.

Singham is a filthy rich socialist whose father was Sri Lankan and mother was Cuban. He is proud that The People's Forum is "a movement incubator" of extremist causes.

The protesting students on our campuses have much in common with their well-heeled donors. The rich live a secure pristine lifestyle, unaffected by the consequences of their ideas. Meanwhile, their student stooges take over university buildings with impunity, having food delivered to them by Uber drivers.

All of them have much in common with Mao (Singham adores him). The Chinese monster may have identified with the oppressed, but in reality he managed to kill 77 million of them. He also lived large—he had 50 villas to live in.

The elites live a pampered existence. What they learned, and what they are teaching, in the colleges and universities is more often than not subversive of the very institutions they govern. They are as vindictive as they are irrational.

BIDEN AND TRUMP ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).

Bill Donohue

In 1952, Congress designated the first Thursday in May as the National Day of Prayer; this year it fell on May 2. Predictably, every president since has said something positive about religion on this day. To judge their sincerity, however, we need to look at the policies they initiated that touch on religious liberty.

The National Day of Prayer was meant to be a day when Americans “may turn to God in prayer and meditation.” When Trump gave his Proclamation marking this day on May 4, 2017, he mentioned God four times. When Biden first addressed this day on May 6, 2021, he never mentioned God.

This may seem like small pickings, but in fact it is

suggestive of the religious liberty policies that each man issued. For example, we compared Trump's religious liberty initiatives to the ones promoted by Biden. To read the entire report on this issue, click [here](#).

In his four years as president, Trump addressed religious liberty issues 117 times. From the beginning of his presidency in January 2021 to May 1, 2024, Biden addressed these matters 31 times.

Quantitative data are important, and on this score, Trump wins easily: 117-31. But qualitative analysis is also important: the content of the religious issues that they addressed matters greatly.

The Biden administration's idea of religious liberty centers heavily on discrimination. Within this area of concern, much attention is given to instances of religious discrimination against minority religions. For example, Muslims, Sikhs, Tribal Nations, Buddhists, and Hindus are given more attention than offenses against pro-life Christians and attacks on Christian-run crisis pregnancy centers.

In many cases, religious liberty is not even a key element in the Biden administration's outreach to religious groups: transportation, mental health, nutritious food, drug abuse, suicide prevention, greeting refugee newcomers, "climate smart agriculture," internet service—these and related matters—occupy the centerpiece of their concern.

One of the more striking aspects of the religious liberty issues pursued by the Biden team is their promulgation of new regulations aimed at curtailing the religious liberty protections afforded by the Trump administration. For instance, with regards to federally funded social services, Trump sought to make it easier for faith-based providers to compete for federal grants. Biden is making it harder.

The welfare reform law of 1996 that President Bill Clinton

signed was the first presidential attempt to include faith-based social service organizations in federally funded initiatives. But it was President George W. Bush who institutionalized this effort. He launched the White House Office of Faith-Based and Community Initiatives.

President Barack Obama did not end these faith-based programs but he neutered them so badly—secularizing them—that in 2010 I issued a news release titled, “Time To Close Faith-Based Programs.” In 2011, my statement said, “Shut Down Faith-Based Programs.”

In 2021, the Biden team said that the Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships would not “favor religious over secular organizations.” That was a polite way of saying that secular social service organizations would continue to be awarded preferential treatment, thus undercutting the *raison d’etre* of faith-based programs.

Since that time, Biden regulations have sought to ensure that faith-based programs will not be used for “explicitly religious purposes.” This beckons the state to police these initiatives, looking to see how “religious” they are, thus creating major First Amendment problems.

The Biden administration also allows a beneficiary to raise religious objections if he feels uncomfortable with the operations of the program. This allows people of one faith who are seeking assistance from a provider of another faith to checkmate the provider’s religious prerogatives. In other words, the mere presence of a religious symbol in a faith-based facility is sufficient grounds to nix it.

In essence, Biden’s idea of faith-based programs is to gut their religious component, in effect secularizing them the way Obama did.

Trump expanded religious liberty—he did not contract it. Here are examples selected from ten different issues (some

overlapping is unavoidable).

Religious Liberty: In 2017, Trump signed an Executive Order promoting free speech and religious liberty. The order made religious liberty an administrative priority and required all federal agencies to take action to protect it.

Faith-Based Initiatives: On May 8, 2018, Trump signed an Executive Order establishing a White House Faith and Opportunity Initiative. The order directed agencies that didn't already have such an operation to start one.

In 2020, nine federal agencies proposed rules leveling the playing field for faith-based organizations wishing to participate in grant programs or become a contractor. The rules eliminated two requirements placed on faith-based organizations that were not placed on secular organizations. The rules were finalized on December 19, 2020.

In 2020, the Trump administration announced that Covid relief legislation (the CARES Act) must include churches and religious non-profits in the Paycheck Protection Program. Thus did Trump ensure that these religious entities would not be discriminated against in receiving financial assistance due to pandemic restrictions.

Conscience Rights: On January 18, 2018, the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) launched a new Conscience and Religious Freedom Division within the Office of Civil Rights (OCR). This new unit was established to enforce federal laws that protect conscience rights and religious freedom.

The next day, conscience rights were expanded again when HHS proposed a regulation implementing 25 laws that protect pro-life healthcare entities against discrimination by federal agencies—or state or local governments receiving federal funds. The issue in question was occasioned by attempts to force healthcare workers to participate in abortion, sterilization, and other morally objectionable procedures. The

proposal was finalized in 2019.

Abortion: The HHS OCR issued a notice of violation to the University of Vermont Medical Center for forcing a nurse to participate in an abortion despite a conscience objection.

On January 24, 2020, Trump became the first sitting president to give remarks in person at the annual March for Life in Washington, D.C.

In 2020, Trump signed an Executive Order that reinforced existing protections for children born prematurely, with disabilities, or in medical distress, including infants who survive an abortion.

Education: In 2020, guidelines were issued ensuring that prayer in schools is properly protected and not unconstitutionally prohibited or curtailed.

HHS Mandate: In 2017, HHS issued two regulations to deal with Obama's "HHS Contraceptive Mandate" that violated conscience and religious liberty. The new norms exempted organizations with moral or religious objections to purchasing insurance that includes coverage of contraceptives and abortion-causing drugs and devices.

In 2020, the Trump team celebrated the win in the Supreme Court upholding the right of the Little Sisters of the Poor not to buy contraceptive and abortion services.

Foster Care: In 2019, HHS issued a rule removing burdensome requirements that all grantees, including faith-based ones, must accept same-sex marriages and profess gender identity as valid in order to be eligible to participate in grant programs. This included adoption and foster care facilities; some were previously shut down because of these draconian measures. The rules were finalized in 2021.

Gays: In 2017, the Trump administration filed an amicus brief

with the Supreme Court defending the religious liberty of a baker who had been sued after he refused to inscribe a congratulatory message on a wedding cake for two homosexuals.

Transgenderism: In 2017, Trump rescinded Obama's dictum that required public schools to allow students who identify as transgender to use the bathrooms and showers of their choice, meaning boys could shower with girls.

International Issues: In 2019, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo announced a new global initiative, the International Religious Freedom Alliance. It was meant to provide a way for like-minded countries to work together to advance religious freedom.

On January 19, 2021, the last religious liberty issue addressed by Trump was to declare that China had committed genocide and crimes against humanity in its treatment of Uyghur Muslims.

The Republicans and Democrats used to be on opposite sides on these issues.

When it came to an issue like abortion, the Democrats in the 1960s were mostly opposed. It was the Republicans, led by the Rockefellers, who championed the abortion cause.

In the 1970s, Catholics were pushed out of senior posts in the Democratic Party. Some moved to the Republican Party, some chose to be independent, and many felt homeless. By the time Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, the Democrats were the party of abortion and the Republicans took up the pro-life cause. In short, the 1970s was the decade when the parties flipped sides on religious liberty and abortion.

Since the 1980s, the leadership in the Democratic Party has become increasingly intolerant of religious liberty. Thoroughly secularized, their passion for abortion rights is off-the-charts.

No one seriously believes that Trump is a man of deep faith. But his policies on religious liberty are a model of excellence. Biden, on the other hand, tries hard to convince the public that he is a “devout Catholic” yet his religious liberty rulings are unimpressive, and in some cases are subversive of this First Amendment right.

Four months after Biden assumed office in January 2021, his executive director of the White House Office of Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships met with leaders of six secular organizations, most of which had expressed virulent anti-Catholic statements for many years. Freedom From Religion Foundation, the American Humanist Association, American Atheists, Center for Inquiry, Ex-Muslims of North America and the Secular Coalition for America.

All of them are militantly secular and most are quite open about their contempt for religious liberty.

It would be one thing if White House staffers in domestic policy invited these representatives to discuss their concerns. But when an office of the administration that is expressly charged with promoting religious liberty extends the invitation, it would be like the Department of Education inviting the Flat Earth Society to engage them in conversation.

As president of the Catholic League, I was invited to meet with representatives of the Clinton administration in the 1990s. This was after I got a call from a White House staffer who said he did not like what he was reading in *Catalyst*.

When George W. Bush was elected, I, along with a few other Catholics, was invited to meet with him in the White House. I even flew on Air Force One with Bush to Notre Dame when he gave the Commencement Address in 2001.

I never met with Obama, but I did interact with those under him, specifically with regards to an IRS inquiry that sought

to intimidate the Catholic League. It failed miserably. Trump wrote a few nice things about me when he was campaigning, but I was not invited to meet with him. No one from the Biden administration has contacted me.

We are positioned right where we should be: we don't endorse candidates but we do address issues of interest to Catholics. It's going to be a rollicking summer and fall with the conventions and the election. Stay tuned.

NORTHWESTERN UNIV. CROSSES THE LINE

This is the article that appeared in the June 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 following letter by Bill Donohue to the president of Northwestern University explains why Catholics, as well as Jews, are concerned about concessions granted by the school to pro-Hamas students.

May 6, 2024

President Michael H. Schill
Office of the President
Northwestern University
633 Clark Street
Evanston, IL 60208-1100

Dear President Schill:

I am writing to you in my role as president of the nation's

largest Catholic civil rights organization. I am also a veteran, a former college professor, and former member of the board of directors of the National Association of Scholars.

It is one thing to learn that protesting students are insisting that Northwestern hire at least two Palestinian visiting professors, and offer scholarships for five Palestinian undergraduates; it is quite another to learn that their demands have been accepted.

The reason this matters to Catholics, as well as to Jews, is that it raises the specter of bringing hate-mongers to the campus. This is hardly a stretch given the open embrace of Hamas on the part of some of the protesters.

Let's face it—the protesters are looking for their ideological next of kin to fill these spots. They are not interested in bringing Middle Eastern scholars to the campus, especially those who might differ with their understanding of events. Their vision of history is the Hamas vision.

It is not a matter of debate what Hamas wants. The 1988 Covenant of the Islamic Resistance Movement, also known as the Hamas Covenant, is quite explicit. What it says about Christians explains why this is of particular interest to the Catholic League.

Here is a selection from the Hamas Covenant that details its overall objective.

“There is no solution for the Palestinian question except through Jihad.” It is very specific. “The Day of Judgement will not come until Moslems fight the Jews (killing the Jews), when the Jew will hide behind stones and trees.”

The Hamas Covenant also targets Christians. In a passage taken from the Koran, Muslims are advised how to deal with appeals for peace made by “the infidels.” The message is unambiguous. “But the Jews will not be pleased with thee, neither the

Christians, until thou follow their religion.”

Accordingly, Muslims are told the only answer is to have Jews and Christians live under Sharia law. “Under the wing of Islam, it is possible for the followers of the three religions—Islam, Christianity and Judaism—to coexist in peace and quiet with each other. Peace and quiet would not be possible except under the wing of Islam.”

More recently, in 2022, Mahmoud al Zahar, a co-founder of Hamas, said, “We are not liberating our land alone. The entire 510 million square kilometers of planet Earth will come under [a system] where there is no injustice, no oppression, no Zionism, *no treacherous Christianity* (our italics).”

No one who endorses this rhetoric should be teaching on any college campus. Not for a moment would someone be permitted to promote the agenda of the Klan. And not for a moment should anyone have a place in academia who seeks to promote the agenda of the Hamas Covenant.

Complicating matters for Northwestern is its record on free speech.

The 2024 survey of free speech on campus conducted by College Pulse and the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) gave Northwestern a “Poor” rating.

Indeed, it was listed near the bottom of colleges and universities on free speech measures: of the 254 that were studied, Northwestern ranked 242. Given this reality, how can we expect Christian and Jewish students to disagree with professors who adopt the Hamas worldview?

Giving into the demands of protesters has already created legal problems for Northwestern. It is being sued for violating the 1964 Civil Rights Act: offering almost \$2 million in scholarship funds, faculty positions, and student-organization space to Palestinian students and staff is not likely to pass muster in the courts. This is discrimination,

pure and simple.

I implore you, and the Board of Trustees, to reconsider your stance. It is wrong morally and legally to capitulate to highly objectionable student demands. It also sends a message to current and future students that if they engage in civil discord they will be rewarded for doing so. At that point, the purpose of the university—the pursuit of truth—collapses.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

cc: Peter M. Barris, Chair, Board of Trustees
Adam R. Karr, Vice Chair
Virginia M. Rometty, Vice Chair
Michael S. Shannon, Vice Chair

PRO-HAMAS QUEERS CHIME IN

This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).

No one knows exactly how many queers (the preferred word by the Associated Press for homosexuals) are pro-Hamas, but it is indisputable that some have joined the side of the terrorists. “Queers for Palestine” is only one such group.

Valley Families for Palestine recently held a Queer Storytime for Palestine event at the Northampton Center for the Arts in Massachusetts. It was intended for preschool through upper

elementary students. Lil Miss Hot Mess read stories to the children, shouting, "Free Palestine."

The ironies abound. Lil Miss Hot Mess is a Jew who hates Jews. People like that are routinely murdered by Hamas. And they even kill their own. Mahmoud Ishtiwi, a Hamas commander, was tortured and killed by his fellow terrorists in 2016 after he allegedly had sex with another guy. In 2022, Ahmad Abu Marhia, a 25-year-old Palestinian, had his head chopped off because he was a queer.

It would be a mistake to think that Lil Miss Hot Mess is a total freak, though one can be forgiven for thinking that way. No, there is a link between political and sexual revolution that has deep intellectual roots. Bill Donohue discusses this in his upcoming book *Cultural Meltdown: The Secular Roots of Our Moral Crisis*; it will be published June 18.

Wilhelm Reich, the 20th century Austrian intellectual, was the most sexually crazed member of the Frankfurt School, and that was quite a feat. This was a school of thought that took hold in Germany in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and later moved to New York City, laying anchor at Columbia University. It is a blend of Marx and Freud.

Reich is known as the "Father of the Sexual Revolution." He worked hard to convince Catholic children to abandon their religion and put their faith in Communism. He insisted that there could be no political revolution without first witnessing a sexual revolution.

In the 1960s, radical feminist Shulamith Firestone was also influenced by Freud—they both vigorously opposed the incest taboo. Like Reich, she posited a direct link between a sexual revolution and a political revolution. In fact, she blamed the failure of the Russian Revolution on the failure to "eliminate the family and sexual repression."

More recently, another radical feminist, Judith Butler, has

argued that we need to get rid of the incest taboo because incest is not necessarily a traumatic act; what is traumatic is the stigmatization itself. She is another intellectual—she likes to be called “they”—who ties sexual revolution to political revolution. She actively promotes transgenderism and anarchy.

There is now a subset of Antifa called Trantifa, militant activists who confront parents who object to drag queen shows. They have a particular hatred of girls and women who resist their agenda.

What they want is what Reich, Firestone and Butler want—the destruction of the family and the overthrow of the political order. And they are prepared to use violence to further their cause.

This explains why some queers have joined the Hamas crusade. In their mind, there can be no true liberation until they are free from sexual and political norms. And for that, they blame our Judeo-Christian heritage. This explains why queers for Hamas has chimed in, irrational though they are on many fronts.

MEET OUR BRATTY REVOLUTIONARIES

As encyclopedia.com explains, “Willingness to die for a religious or political cause has long been recognized as a key measure of an activist’s commitment.” Accordingly, the Pro-Hamas protesters should be prepared to die. Instead, they object to being arrested.

Student protesters and outside agitators like to hold signs that read, "Final Solution." They display swastikas. They shout, "We Are Hamas." They proclaim, "Intifada Revolution."

But real men and women don't engage in revolutionary protests and then demand amnesty. They don't demand that their arrest record be expunged. They don't hide under blankets when speaking to the press. They don't object if their picture is taken. They don't mind it if they are outed on social media. They don't insist on being given "chicken nuggets and applesauce" when they barricade themselves inside school buildings. And they sure don't wear masks and keffiyehs hiding their face.

The pro-Hamas protesters have much in common with the Ku Klux Klan. Both hate Jews and both wear masks while demonstrating. While some Klansmen wore masks in the 19th century, it wasn't until the turn of the century that they became commonplace. In response, states like New York passed laws banning protesters like the KKK from wearing them. This law is still on the books, but the cops are not allowed to enforce it, much to the applause of the Jew haters.

Masks have nothing to do with protecting against Covid (they don't even do that well). In 2011, well before Covid, Occupy Wall Street thugs wore them and less than a decade later Antifa terrorists did the same. Now it has gotten so crazy that at a tent site at the University of Michigan, the pro-Hamas crazies are being given masks upon entry. So brave.

Marx wanted a revolution and advocated violence—he said it was necessary to overthrow capitalism. But since the working class today is uniformly anti-Marxist (they love Trump), the cause of totalitarianism falls to Black Lives Matter, Antifa and Pro-Hamas crusaders. Unlike what Marx envisioned, they want to promote violence without being subjected to it. This is not manly.

One reason why this is not a manly exercise has to do with the overwhelming number of women who have joined these causes. What we are witnessing is the feminization of revolutionaries; the men have been castrated by their cowardly female counterparts. That's why they love masks.

Real revolutionaries know they have to have some skin in the game. Indeed, they have to commit to dying for their cause. But today's brand of revolutionaries can't be taken seriously: they are more worried about having an arrest record and how it may hurt their career than in making the ultimate sacrifice. And they sure don't want to give up their Apple phones and computers, even though Israel has been making them since 1985.

They want "revolution lite." Only brats think that way.

CATHOLIC COLLEGES GONE ROGUE

This is the article that appeared in the June 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 Catholic Church is opposed to segregation, homosexuality and gender ideology. Yet many Catholic colleges and universities are holding graduation ceremonies that segregate students on the basis of their sexual identities.

St. John's University in Queens, New York has long had a reputation of being a solid Catholic institution. When we learned that it was holding a Lavender Graduation this year (for the second consecutive time), we sought to learn how common this is on Catholic campuses. For the uninitiated, Lavender Graduation ceremonies exclusively honor homosexual students and those who mistakenly believe they belong to the

opposite sex.

What we found would surprise many Catholics.

We randomly chose 40 Catholic colleges and universities, from various geographic regions, to see if they have a separate graduation ceremony for lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender students. We found that 20 did and 20 did not. (The list is available on our website.)

In 2006, St. Mary's College of California was the first to have a Lavender Graduation. Three years later Georgetown and the University of San Diego followed suit.

Segregated graduation ceremonies at non-Catholic colleges and universities are nothing new: Harvard has long segregated on the basis of race (a win for the KKK) and Columbia intentionally divides students by holding a wide variety of segregated graduations. The commitment these Ivies have to separating students on the basis of ascribed and achieved statuses is outstanding.

But for Catholic institutions of higher learning to promote segregation—on the basis of sexual identity no less—is astounding: they are not only in open defiance of Catholic moral theology, they are working to undermine the work of Pope Francis. Consequently, these schools are virtually indistinguishable from secular colleges and universities. In short, these are rogue Catholic entities.

Bill Donohue once asked a well-known Jesuit priest if he could tell him the difference between Georgetown University and George Washington University. He knew what Donohue meant. He just stared at Donohue.

If students can't come together on graduation day, there is no reason to continue the fiction that colleges are a community. They are not. Welcome to the New Apartheid (with a sexual twist).

FBI INTERNAL PROBE STILL UNSATISFACTORY

This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).

On April 18, a report on the FBI's internal probe of Analysts involved in the investigation of Catholics was published. The next day, Bill Donohue wrote a letter to Rep. Jim Jordan, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee. He read Inspector General Michael Horowitz's report on this issue, and while he was satisfied with some aspects of it, serious issues remain. Here is an excerpt of Donohue's letter.

Horowitz begins by noting that the Richmond Field Office examined "a purported link between Racially or Ethnically Motivated Violent Extremists (RMVEs) and 'Radical Traditionalist Catholic (RTC)' ideology." He then cites the conclusion reached by the FBI Inspection Division.

While there was no evidence of malice, the probe of Catholics "lacked sufficient evidence" to establish a relationship between the aforementioned extremists and RTC ideology. The report also concluded that the FBI Analysts "incorrectly conflated the subjects' religious views with their RMVE activities...."

This begs the question: Why did the Analysts think there was a relationship in the first place?

It is as revealing as it is disturbing to note that the probe of Catholics was based on one person, namely, Defendant A. That he is clearly a violent, bigoted thug—he hates everyone

from Jews to cops—is uncontested. But where are the others? There isn't even a Defendant B.

More disturbing is the admission that Defendant A does not attend a Catholic church. The report admits that he attended a church “with an international religious society that advocates traditional Catholic theology and liturgy *but it is not considered by the Vatican to be in full communion with the Catholic Church* (my italics).”

Later in the report we learn that “there was no evidence that Defendant A was being radicalized” at the church he attended, and that “he had been on the radar ‘as an unstable, dangerous individual’ before ‘any association with any Catholic related entity whatsoever.’” That being the case, why was it necessary to investigate his fellow churchgoers? Since when does the FBI conduct an investigation of a world religion on the basis of one miscreant whom they admit was not radicalized by it?

To make matters worse, the report says that when those who attended church with Defendant A were questioned about him, they confessed that he “displayed ‘unusual’ and ‘concerning’ behavior.” In fact, the report does not note a single person who attended church with him who found him persuasive—they knew he was odd. Thus does this admission undercut the rationale for a further probe of Catholics.

We know from previous disclosures that “mainline Catholic parishes” were targeted by the FBI. Yet we now know that the Analysts couldn't even identify radicals within this breakaway Catholic entity, never mind rank-and-file Catholic men and women.

The judgment of both Analysts was more than flawed—it was totally irresponsible. Even more mind-boggling is what the FBI HQ Analyst had to say.

The FBI HQ Analyst said she was “really interested in this resurgence of interest in the [C]atholic [C]hurch from our

[DVEs].” The latter refers to Domestic Violence Extremists.

What occasioned this “resurgence of interest” in the Catholic Church? Was it something that someone did? Or does this reflect the ideological predilections of the Analyst? Notice she wasn’t referring to a “resurgence of interest” in breakaway Catholic entities. She was referring to the Roman Catholic Church.

There are many issues left outstanding. Moreover, if we are to believe that what happened was nothing of a serious nature, why was it necessary for the FBI to delete files? That suggests a cover up.

When the Catholic Church is subjected to scrutiny by the FBI because of the beliefs and behavior of one maladjusted individual—who does not attend a Catholic church—it cries out for a much more detailed response than what the Horowitz report affords.

SHOULD BOYS AND GIRLS SHOWER TOGETHER?

This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).

In May, Secretary of Education Miguel Cardona was asked about some proposed rules by the Biden administration on gender identity, strictures that would allow boys to compete against girls in sports and allow them to shower together.

Rep. Burgess Owens asked him, “Would you force your daughter

to undress in the bathroom with boys, who are also undressing.” Cardona said he had no comment.

Owens followed up with, “If your daughter was reported, she felt uncomfortable in a boy’s presence in a bathroom or locker room, would that be considered by your administration to be discrimination or bigotry.” Cardona refused to comment.

Owens then asked if a boy who considers himself to be girl should be allowed to box girls. “Would you allow your daughter to physically fight and get beat up by a boy who called himself a girl?” Again, Cardona had no answer.

This is just how far gone some members of the Biden administration are. They can’t define what a woman is and they don’t know if it is wrong for boys and girls to shower together.