

ABORTION FANATICS HIT CHURCHES; MEDIA BLACKOUT ENSUES

In the course of a few days, two of the most prominent Catholic churches in the nation were desecrated by pro-abortion fanatics. They chose the Basilica of the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception in Washington, D.C., and St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, to vandalize. The occasion was the run-up to the anniversary of Roe v. Wade.

On January 20, on the eve of the March for Life in D.C., there was a prayer vigil at the Basilica. An anti-Catholic group, Catholics for Choice, was responsible for what happened.

Led by lesbian activist Jamie Manson, this outfit managed to project pro-abortion slogans on the Basilica. "We have to talk back to the anti-choice movement in religious language," she said.

Bill Donohue responded, "In other words, her idea of religious language is to disseminate pro-abortion messages at a Catholic pro-life event. That would be like using racist language at a pro-racial justice rally."

On January 22, another anti-Catholic outfit, New York City for Abortion Rights, projected "God Loves Abortion" and other vile slogans on the exterior of St. Patrick's Cathedral. Supporters of the group shouted obscenities at pro-life Catholics entering and exiting the Cathedral.

Both of these shell groups are on the losing side of the abortion issue. Over the past few decades, more and more Americans having been moving in a pro-life direction, and the pro-abortion activists know it. They also know that the Supreme Court may overturn Roe v. Wade in June.

There have been a few legal challenges to light projection protests, but so far no court has ruled in favor of them. They are not seen as trespassing or in violation of nuisance statutes, nor have they resulted in economic harm. Therefore, they are seen as protected speech.

The media have a professional obligation to cover events like these ones, but they failed.

In a larger story on the March for Life, the New York Times and the Washington Post made mention of the desecration of the Basilica, but neither covered the assault on St. Patrick's Cathedral. None of the other newspapers covered anything about either event, and all the TV broadcast networks and cable news channels were equally silent.

Had a Jewish synagogue or a Muslim mosque been targeted in this fashion, it's a sure bet the media would have been all over these stories. But given their pro-abortion politics, and their hostility to Catholicism, it's not surprising what happened.

We were the only lay Catholic organization in the country to register a protest. We enlisted our email subscribers to let their voice be known, and they did not hold back.

NFL HOSTS “N” WORD FANS

We have crossed swords with the National Football League (NFL) before, mostly for hosting anti-Catholic entertainers during the Super Bowl and for criticizing religious liberty legislation in the states. This year's Super Bowl brought out the worst in the NFL.

Commissioner Roger Goodell said two years ago, “We at the National Football League condemn racism and the systematic oppression of black people.”

To that end, he approved such things this season as the singing of the black national anthem before games, end zone inscriptions that read “End Racism,” and a host of anti-racist messages printed on the players’ apparel.

What about the behavior of the players? After all, it is widely known that the “N” word is commonly used by black football players. In 2014, the NFL said that it would penalize players for using it. Moreover, Section 3 of the current NFL Rulebook prohibits using such language.

This sure looks like a PR stunt after what happened at the Super Bowl.

For example, why did the NFL showcase foul-mouthed singers—who specialize in using the “N” word—during the Super Bowl’s halftime festivities?

Three of the five musical celebrities who were featured at the Super Bowl, Dr. Dre, Kendrick Lamar and Snoop Dogg, have a long history of dropping the “N” word and using obscenities.

The message to young people is that it is okay to use filthy language and drop the “N” word. The NFL is a disgrace.

**PROUD TO DEFEND MOTHER
TERESA—AGAIN**

William A. Donohue

Sometime in the spring of 2021, I was asked by a distinguished movie production company from the U.K. if I was interested in being interviewed for a documentary they were planning to do on Mother Teresa. I agreed, albeit with reservation.

I agreed because I was honored to be chosen as her number-one defender. I did so with reservation because it begged the question: Why would they want me, unless, of course, the film was going to be a hit job on Mother Teresa? Was I not being used to “balance” the documentary. After all, if the film were a positive portrayal of her, there is no end to the number of persons they could have contacted.

In the end, I knew that if I took a pass, they would simply find someone else. That didn't sit too well with me—I believe I can defend Mother Teresa better than anyone. Indeed, it was the sole reason I wrote my 2016 book, *Unmasking Mother Teresa's Critics* (Sophia Institute Press). The timing was deliberate: Mother Teresa was to be canonized on September 4, 2016, and I wanted to get out in front of her critics who might seek to exploit the occasion.

The documentary on Mother Teresa is scheduled to open this March in the United Kingdom, Ireland, Germany and Italy; it may open in the U.S. this spring, but in what format I do not know. Minnow Films, along with Sky Group Limited, both out of London, are bringing it to the big screen.

When I signed an agreement to do a series of interviews in July, 2021, the film was called, “Mother Teresa: For the Love of God.” The period at the end of the title has now been changed to a question mark. That's not a coincidence: it was done to suggest that maybe she had an ulterior motive. Hence, the need to bring me in to defend her.

How will the movie flush out? From what I have learned, the script offers both positive and negative accounts, with a nod to the latter. It is a three-hour series. I have yet to see

it, though that will change shortly.

The interview I agreed to do was expected to last a day or two. Surprisingly, it turned out to be more like a week. The young men who did the shooting were extraordinarily cordial—even fun to work with—and very professional. Ditto for the young woman from England whom I conversed with about the project.

What is so controversial about Mother Teresa that she needs a defense? As I pointed out in my book on this saintly woman, her critics are mostly cranks, dabbling in conjecture and innuendo more than substance. Others are manifestly dishonest.

As recently explained to me, the first part deals with her childhood and her time in Calcutta. It explores the wide audience that she garnered, culminating in a Nobel Peace Prize. The next part covers her life in the 1980s. The third part examines her “dark night of the soul,” a period of time when she did not feel God’s presence and her dealings with a rogue financier is cited.

Evidently, I am featured quite often in the documentary. I certainly was given a lot of time to explain my position, and to vigorously rebut the many cruel myths voiced by her critics.

Mother Teresa’s most prominent, and unfair, critic was undoubtedly the late Christopher Hitchens. A video of our storied 2000 debate at the Union League Club in New York City is available online.

Why does anyone hate Mother Teresa? The reasons are varied, but much of what drives her critics is jealousy, pure jealousy. They are jealous that a diminutive nun was loved the world over for her selfless giving to the dispossessed. What’s wrong with that?

Many of her most strident critics were both atheists and

socialists (e.g., Hitchens). Her holy status does not sit well with atheists; her ability to serve the poor undermines the goal of socialists.

How so? Everything she did for the needy, the sick and the dying was voluntary, and she inspired countless others to follow in her footsteps. Socialists want the state to mandate programs for the poor, and do not look kindly on religiously motivated initiatives that work better than government welfare policies.

There is one other reason why she is despised. Her critics claim she did not try to conquer poverty. Guilty as charged. Her goal was to comfort the sick and dying in their waning years, not restructure society. Atheists and socialists cannot relate to that. That's their problem. It also shows how shallow they are—they need not have any skin in the game when government distributes goodies to the poor.

How ironic it is that the socialist ideas advocated by her critics have done more to promote poverty than any other policy prescription. More perverse, it was left to people like Mother Teresa to attend to their victims.

I am so happy I was given the opportunity to defend her—again!

APPARENTLY, NOT ALL RACISTS ARE EQUAL

Bill Donohue

It has been chic for some time to say things about white people that if said about blacks would be branded racist. Now

it is in vogue like never before.

The irony is that the racist comments are being said by those who consider themselves to be anti-racist. They are not—they are every bit as racist as George Wallace was. To top things off, many round out their bigotry by making anti-Christian and sexist remarks. In short, they have a special hatred of white Christian men.

Here are a few examples.

“White Christian nationalists may not physically attack the Capitol again, as on January 6. But the movement is assaulting the rights of atheists, racial and religious minorities, LGBTQ people, and many others with their extremist legislation.”

Nick Fish, president, American Atheists, January 4, 2022

“January 6th was very much a religious event—white Christian nationalism on display. We must remember that fact. Because evidence is mounting that white Christian nationalism could provide the theological cover for more events like it.”

Samuel L. Perry, Ph.D., and Andrew Whitehead, Ph.D., Time, January 4, 2022

“They’re white so-called Christian conservatives who feel like this country was built by them for them, and so everyone but them needs to suck it up and let them have their way or else.”

Joy Reid, MSNBC, January 3, 2022

“It’s not the messaging, folks. This country simply loves white supremacy.”

Jemele Hill, former ESPN anchor, November 3, 2021

“Glenn Youngkin’s victory proves White ignorance is a powerful weapon,” arguing that the “campaign discovered that this contingent of angry, willfully ignorant White people was the key ingredient needed to elect a GOP governor in Virginia for the first time since 2009.”

Ja’han Jones, MSNBC, November 3, 2021

"We have to stop demonizing people and realize the biggest terror threat in this country is white men, most of them radicalized to the right, and we have to start doing something about them. There is no travel ban on them. There is no ban – you know, they had the Muslim ban. There is no white-guy ban."

Don Lemon, CNN, October 25, 2021

"White Christianity is a Christianity that is based on the following: Jesus is white. Jesus privileges white culture and white supremacy, and the political aspirations of whiteness over and against everything else." **Anthea Butler, Ph.D., Salon, October 19, 2021**

"Practically, we must reject what have, for too long, been three articles of our faith: that the Bible is a blueprint for a white Christian America; that Jesus, the son of God, is a white savior; and that the church is a sanctuary of white innocence. Most fundamentally, we must confess that whatever the personal sins of white people, in the past and present, they pale in comparison to the systemic ways we have built and blessed a society that reflects a conviction that, to us and to God, our lives matter more." **Robert P. Jones, Ph.D., Time, September 2021**

The fall of Afghanistan to the Taliban was "a true cautionary tale for the US, which has our own far religious right dreaming of a theocracy that would impose a particular brand of Christianity, drive women from the workforce and solely into childbirth, and control all politics." **Joy Reid, MSNBC, August 14, 2021**

"All White people are at some level, at the unconscious level, connected to racism, its unavoidable. I think all men are sexist at some level. I think that's absolutely the case." **Marc Lamont Hill, Ph.D., Black News Tonight, July 11, 2021**

"This is the cost of talking to white people at all – the cost of your own life, as they suck you dry. There are no good

apples out there. White people make my blood boil....I had fantasies of unloading a revolver into the head of any white person that got in my way, burying their body and wiping my bloody hands as I walked away relatively guiltless with a bounce in my step, like I did the world a favor.” **Dr. Aruna Khilanani, guest lecturer at Yale, June 4, 2021**

“I will be exclusively providing one-on-one interviews with journalists of color....I have been struck...by the overwhelming whiteness and maleness of Chicago media outlets, editorial boards, the political press corps, and yes, the City Hall press corps specifically.” **Chicago Mayor Lori Lightfoot, May 19, 2021**

These people get away with making racist remarks because there is no penalty for doing so. In fact, what they are saying is music to the ears of the ruling class, which has become complicit in their racism.

A long-standing liberal tenet—that we should condemn all forms of prejudice and discrimination equally—came under attack in the 1960s when President Lyndon Johnson decided that equal opportunity was outdated: he said the new goal should be equal outcomes.

Ironically, this new thinking, which has since become a staple of liberal thought, was announced at the very moment when equal opportunity was finally emerging, thanks to the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

Affirmative action, and the quotas which it entailed, was the start of legally discriminating against white people. Today the idea of justifying racism against whites is expressed in many government policies, most of which have nothing to do with affirmative action.

On December 27, 2021, the New York State Department of Health issued a new policy on the distribution of anti-Covid treatments. To be a recipient, the patient must “have a

medical condition or other factors that increase their risk for serious illness.” One of the risk factors is being a “non-white race or Hispanic/Latino ethnicity,” meaning that white people have been shoved to the back of the line.

A doctor who justified the racism said that blacks and Hispanics were harder hit with Covid, which is true. It is also true that being overweight makes it more likely that one will acquire Covid, and both minority groups are more likely to be overweight than whites. Is that a function of racism, or is it a volitional outcome?

At the federal level, the Biden administration had been in office for just a month before it hit the ground running, going after white people. The Covid-19 relief bill offered debt forgiveness to farmers, provided they were not white. Recipients had to be “Black/African American, American Indian or Alaskan native, Hispanic or Latino, or Asian American or Pacific Islanders.”

Biden also punished white business owners. He explicitly said that his “priority will be black, Latino, Asian and Native-American-owned businesses” and “women-owned businesses.” Most white men also got the shaft when Biden said that restaurant owners would get priority in receiving federal funds if they were women, veterans and members of “socially and economically disadvantaged” groups.

These policies are a back-door way of granting reparations. Biden knows that the subject of reparations is divisive, so he is enlisting the support of the administrative state to accomplish this end.

It is not just in government where racism prevails against white people. Woke corporations have gotten into the act as well.

At American Express, complaints by white employees surfaced after it was announced that “marginalized” workers would be

given priority over “privileged” employees determining promotions. Critical race theory training sessions have convinced white workers that they are likely to be passed over for a promotion—no matter how competent they are—to satisfy this new policy. Some have quit as a result.

Walmart has gone even further in trying to brainwash its employees.

In 2018, it adopted a radical training program that was made mandatory for executives; it is recommended for hourly workers. It teaches that the United States is a “white supremacy system” that oppresses people of color. Whites, the employees learn, are guilty of “white privilege” and “internalized racial superiority.” The “white supremacy culture” is comprised of such elements as “individualism,” “objectivity,” “paternalism,” “right to comfort” and “worship of the written word.”

These nefarious qualities are considered “damaging to both people of color and to white people.”

It could therefore be argued that it is racist to insist that African American students learn how to read and write—that could be seen as “worship of the written word.” No doubt the Klan would approve.

I checked to see what the racial composition of Walmart is. There are nine members on the Executive Committee: eight of them are white. This means, according to their logic, that Walmart is a racist institution. If they had any decency, they would resign in mass. But instead they collect huge salaries while lording over their minimum wage workers. And it is a sure bet that they prize their “right to comfort” while commanding their yachts.

Making white people today pay for the sins of white people yesterday can run into problems with the courts. In October, a former senior officer at a North Carolina-health based care

organization won \$10 million when a jury found that his sex and race illegally led to his termination: he was canned so that a “more diverse” workforce could be achieved. Imagine trying that in the NBA—firing black basketball players so that more Pacific Islanders can play.

In 2019, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that white firefighters were discriminated against when a test was discarded after blacks didn’t do too well on it: eliminating the test prevented the white guys from being eligible for promotion. The decision, *Ricci v. DeStefano*, came about when Frank Ricci sought to get a promotion but was denied even though he scored sixth highest on the exam out of 118-test takers. He was so determined to succeed that he quit his second job so he could enlist in preparatory courses to pass the test. A dyslexic, he paid \$1,000 to have someone read textbooks onto audiotapes.

In 2017, a poll found that 55% of white people believed there was discrimination against white people in America. By the same token, last year researchers at Tufts University revealed that many whites believe “reverse racism” is a real problem. Yet there is precious little being said about this issue by the media, never mind activist organizations.

What is driving this condition? Elites believe that the best way to achieve racial equality is by mandating equal outcomes. They are thrice wrong: such attempts create a white backlash; they will never substantially yield black progress; and they deflect attention away from the root causes of racial inequality.

The latter have less to do with discrimination today than they do a host of serious familial and behavioral problems in the black community. Every honest person who has studied this issue knows this to be true, but most are afraid to say so. The failure of the ruling class to admit to this, and to act on it, is the number-one reason we have this problem today.

If the elites really wanted to help blacks, they would champion charter public schools and support school choice initiatives that include the right of black parents to send their children to a Catholic school.

In the end, whitey really is the problem, but not for the reasons attributed to him.

IN DEFENSE OF POPE BENEDICT XVI

This article and the one found [here](#), are Bill Donohue's response to critics of Pope Benedict XVI.

Ten years ago, Bill Keller, former executive editor of the New York Times, wrote an op-ed in the newspaper about me. He said I was a strong defender of Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger who, he accurately said, "used to be known as 'God's Rottweiler.'" Ratzinger is now Pope Benedict XVI, and Bill Donohue is the Rottweiler's Rottweiler."

Not sure whether Keller meant that as high praise or not, but I'll take it.

Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI is back in the news, and it is not flattering. He is being accused of not taking action against four molesting priests when he was archbishop of Munich and Freising from 1977 to 1982. Benedict defends himself against these accusations.

The news comes after the publication in German of a 1,900-page independent audit of the Munich archdiocese between 1945 and 2019.

It is important to note that the investigation was not something that government authorities commissioned—it was done at the behest of the Church. No other institution in Germany, religious or secular, has ever asked a law firm to probe its record regarding sexual misconduct.

It is also important to note that attorney Martin Pusch, who is also an author of the report, cannot be certain that Benedict's account is wrong. He explicitly said "we believe that this is not so (my *italic*)."

Of the four cases, two involve priests who were sanctioned by the courts but were permitted to do pastoral work. One was convicted in another country and was allowed to work in the archdiocese. Most of the media attention focuses on Peter Hullermann, a homosexual priest predator.

Regarding the Hullermann case, in his 82-page response to questions posed by the investigators, Benedict initially said he had no recollection of being at a 1980 meeting about the priest. He has since apologized for making a "mistake," saying that an "editing error" inaccurately conveyed that he was not there. The files document that in this meeting, no decision to transfer Hullermann was made.

In 1979, Hullermann was accused of sexual abuse with a postpubescent boy in Essen. After he was convicted, he was transferred to Munich for therapy. After the therapy, he was transferred to another parish. Who made that decision? It wasn't Benedict: it was Fr. Gerhard Gruber, the vicar general. Gruber admits that he, and he alone, was responsible, explaining that he never told Benedict (who was then known as Cardinal Ratzinger).

So what is the problem here? Benedict, we know, approved the transfer, but that's about it. We know that his office "was copied on a memo" about Gruber's decision, but even the New York Times in 2010 admitted that such memos were routine and

“unlikely to have landed on the archbishop’s desk.”

Ratzinger left the archdiocese in February 1982 to head the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. In August of 1982, Hullermann was reassigned to Grafting and in 1986 he was convicted of sexually abusing boys while he was there. Benedict was long gone.

If Benedict is guilty of anything, from what we know so far, it is that he did not always act like the “Rottweiler” he is accused of being. When he learned of a priest who was an exhibitionist, but who never physically abused anyone, he did not treat him the way he should have. He should have seen this as a red flag—normal men don’t act that way.

In all the news stories on this issue, never once do therapists come in for criticism. Yet they played a big role in persuading elites in every sector of society of their powers to transform miscreants, especially in the latter part of the 20th century. There was no one they could not “fix,” or so they thought. Their role was pivotal in the decision of elites, including bishops, not to crack the whip.

The Germans have also been duped by charlatan therapists. In 2020, Germany showed how “progressive” it is when it announced that convicted sex offenders would be allowed to visit prostitutes in brothels as part of their “treatment.”

It should also be known that Germany does not have a mandatory reporting law governing the sexual abuse of minors.

Bild is Germany’s biggest tabloid. It is known for running articles that questioned whether Benedict covered up sex crimes. Three months ago its editor, Julian Reichelt, had to step down after allegations that the publisher tried to cover up the findings of an investigation into his sexual misconduct and bullying.

For the record, no one in the Church has done more to stem

clergy sexual abuse than Benedict. It was he who took the initiative to issue a document barring men with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” from entering the priesthood. He was hated by “progressives” long before this, but this decision made him their biggest enemy.

In the first year of his pontificate, Benedict removed the notorious serial molester, Fr. Marcial Maciel Delgollado, founder of the Legionaries of Christ, from ministry. Significantly, he defrocked some 800 molesting priests from 2005 to 2013.

This is hardly the first time that Benedict has been treated unfairly. He is the scourge of the left, both in and out of the Catholic Church.

POPE BENEDICT IS RIGHT NOT TO APOLOGIZE

People who apologize for offenses they never committed—such as white people who apologize for being white—are either phonies or psychotic.

That is why it was so refreshing to learn that Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI did not apologize for offenses he never committed while serving as archbishop of Munich and Freising from 1977 to 1982.

In a letter Benedict recently released, he offered his “deepest sympathy” to the victims of clergy sexual abuse, saying he feels “great sorrow for each individual case.” But he did not offer a personal apology, and that is because none was warranted.

In an appendix to his letter, Benedict did, however, provide a much-needed rebuttal to accusations made against him by a Munich law firm; it had been commissioned by the archdiocese to examine accusations of sexual abuse that occurred between 1945 and 2019. He was assisted in this endeavor by some of his supporters.

Benedict takes issue with three outstanding accusations; they form the basis of the charges against him.

The first issue deals with Priest X (Peter Hullermann).

In his preliminary response, Benedict admitted that he erred when he claimed in his memorandum, drafted in response to the law firm, that he was not present at a meeting on January 15, 1980 in which this priest was discussed. He offers a lengthy, and pointed, commentary explaining how his collaborators made an honest mistake.

One of them, Dr. Stefan Korta, inadvertently made a transcription error noting that Benedict (then Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger) was not present at the meeting. He clearly was. In fact, the minutes show that he spoke at the meeting. But to call this a "lie" is malicious.

More important is what transpired at the meeting. The records show that the discussion did not revolve around sexual misconduct committed by the young priest. It focused on a request for therapy, which was granted. That is the sum of it. It is therefore scurrilous to charge that Benedict lied about the meeting.

The second issue is based on charges that Benedict did not act properly in handling the other three cases. The charges are false. Not only does Benedict dispute accusations that he knew of sexual abuse committed by these priests, the law firm report "provides no evidence to the contrary."

Benedict is unequivocal in his response. "The expert report

contains no evidence for an allegation of misconduct or conspiracy in any cover up." Indeed, if the law firm had proof, it would have provided it. It does not.

The third issue claims that Benedict minimized acts of exhibitionism. In fact, this is patently false. In his memoir, Benedict notes that abuse, including exhibitionism, are "terrible," "sinful," "morally reprehensible" and "irreparable." In other words, he clearly condemned such behavior.

I need to clarify something. In my news release of January 25 on this subject, I accepted the accusation that Benedict downplayed exhibitionism, saying, "he did not treat him [the priest in question] the way he should have. He should have seen this as a red flag—normal men don't act that way."

I was wrong to accept this accusation at face value—Benedict never sought to make light of exhibitionism. I apologize for doing so.

There are fair-minded critics of Benedict, but there are also many who are ruthless. They have hated him ever since he headed the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, enforcing the Church's moral strictures.

Consider the reaction to a homily he gave on April 18, 2005. In an address before the College of Cardinals, who had assembled to elect a new pope, he spoke forcefully about the "dictatorship of relativism" that had engulfed the West.

Georgetown professor E.J. Dionne condemned Cardinal Ratzinger for using "fighting words." Fr. Richard McBrien from Notre Dame said, "I think this homily shows he realizes he's not going to be elected." New York Times reporter Peter Steinfels announced, "Oh well, that gets rid of him."

The next day he was elected pope.

As I said in my new book, *The Truth About Clergy Sexual Abuse*, “No one has understood why the clergy sexual abuse scandal took place better than Pope Emeritus Benedict XVI.” That is largely because he correctly noted the effect of the sexual revolution on the Church, and the huge role played by homosexual priests.

I also said that he “does not get the credit he deserves for the actions he took. Quite frankly, no pope in the modern era worked to punish predator priests more than Benedict.” For example, when he was a cardinal, he pressed for a “more rapid and simplified penal process” in dealing with abusive priests. More importantly, he defrocked a record number of molesting priests. In point of fact, he not only removed the unrepentant serial predator, Fr. Maciel, from ministry, he did not hesitate to accept the resignation of former cardinal Theodore McCarrick when he turned seventy-five, the earliest possible date for him to do so.

Pope Benedict has nothing to apologize for. If anything, it is his vicious critics who owe him an apology.

HOW THE ROCKEFELLERS TEED UP ROE v. WADE

Fifty years ago, the findings of “The Rockefeller Commission Report on Population Growth and the American Future” was published. One year later, it got what it wanted when the U.S. Supreme Court legalized abortion. It is important to understand the role of the ruling class in making *Roe v. Wade* possible.

The process began on July 18, 1969 when President Richard

Nixon established a body to examine the effects of population growth on America's future. On March 27, 1972, John D. Rockefeller 3rd, chairman of the Commission, transmitted the Final Report to the president and the Congress.

The plea to legalize abortion was a foregone conclusion: the commission was stacked with pro-abortion members. In 1967, the chairman, John D. Rockefeller 3rd, was the recipient of Planned Parenthood's highest honor when he accepted the Margaret Sanger Award; the award was named after the white supremacist founder of Planned Parenthood.

John D. Rockefeller 3rd followed in the footsteps of John D. Rockefeller Jr. "Junior," as he was called, provided funding for eugenics, giving money to the Germans. Some of it was put to use by the Nazis.

The Commission staff was headed by Dr. Charles F. Westoff. He was a member of the American Eugenics Society and Planned Parenthood's National Advisory Council. One of the Commission's Special Consultants was Daniel Callahan, a pro-abortion eugenicist who tried desperately to convince Catholics of the merits of abortion and eugenics. When he failed he quit the Church.

In chapter 11, titled "Human Reproduction," the Final Report did not hide the pro-abortion sentiments of the Commission. "A few of the members of the Commission are opposed to abortion." It also said "the majority" are not.

The number-one population problem in the early 1970s, the Commission said, was "unwanted births." It admitted that only "one percent of first births were never wanted." So where's the problem? It found that "nearly two-thirds of all sixth or higher order births" were unwanted. That sounds plausible but that hardly constitutes a crisis. How many women, even back then, had six or more kids?

It has been historically true that those who can least afford

to have children tend to have the most, and vice versa. So it made sense that the Commission would find that "Unwanted fertility is highest among those whose levels of education and income are lowest." This, they said, leads to psychological, economic and health problems. "The Commission believes that all Americans, regardless of age, marital status, or income, should be enabled to avoid unwanted births."

The solution to this alleged problem was to (a) allow minors to receive contraception information and services (b) eliminate restrictions on sterilization and (c) liberalize abortion laws on the state level. Regarding the latter, much of its reasoning was based on faulty information.

The Commission maintained that there were between "200,000 and 1,200,000 illegal abortions per year in the United States." In fact, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimated that in 1972, "130,000 women obtained illegal or self-induced procedures, 39 of whom died." In other words, the Commission's estimates were way off base, and so were the horror stories about all the women who died in "back-alley" abortions.

The Commission was also wrong when it contended that "with the increasing availability of contraceptives and improvements in contraceptive technology, the need for abortion will diminish." We now know that following *Roe v. Wade* both contraceptive use and abortion rates increased dramatically.

If there is one demographic segment of the population that the Rockefeller Commission believed was a problem, it was African Americans.

The Report said that "if blacks could have the number of children they want and no more, their fertility and that of the majority white population would be very similar." The goal could not be more plain: get blacks to stop reproducing. What they need, the Report said, was greater access to "the various means of fertility control."

Some of the Commission members cited Planned Parenthood's efforts to meet this goal. Mission accomplished: It was reported in 2020 that Planned Parenthood locates 86% of its abortion clinics in or near minority neighborhoods. Though blacks are 13% of the population, they account for one-third of all abortions.

At one point in the Final Report it says, "We share with our fellow citizens an abiding concern for the sanctity of all human life," and therefore "we appreciate the moral decisions involved in abortion." It hastened to add that it shares "a deep commitment to individual freedom and social justice," making clear that this issue was paramount.

The Commission obviously did not have "an abiding concern for the sanctity of all human life," for if it did it would not argue for the legalization of abortion. It should be noted that in 1963, Planned Parenthood actually admitted that "An abortion kills the life of a baby after it has begun."

Abortion has always been one of the ruling class' preferred methods of solving "the urban problem." The Rockefellers epitomized this WASP solution. It teed up *Roe v. Wade* 50 years ago, making it easier for Supreme Court Justices to rationalize its abortion-on-demand ruling.

TWO ANTI-CHRISTIAN CASES BEFORE THE COURTS

There are two religious liberty cases before the federal courts that have much in common: (a) both evince a clear animus against Christianity, and (b) they emanate from the most militantly secular states in the nation, Oregon and

Washington.

The Oregon case will be appealed to the Supreme Court; the Washington case will be decided in the spring by the high court.

In 2013, the Court of Appeals in Oregon ruled that Aaron and Melissa Klein, who owned a bakeshop in Gresham, discriminated against a lesbian couple, Rachel and Laurel Bowman-Cryer, when they refused to make a wedding cake for them. The evangelical couple did so on religious grounds, citing Leviticus for support.

The lesbians filed a complaint with the Oregon Bureau of Labor. It said the Christians violated Oregon's accommodations statute barring discrimination based on sexual discrimination. The panel ordered them to pay \$135,000 in damages. The bakery owners appealed to the Oregon Court of Appeals in 2016, but they lost again. Then they appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 2019, the high court vacated the ruling and sent it back to the state court of appeals for reconsideration. It cited its ruling in a similar case, *Masterpiece Cakeshop*, (which was decided favorably to the religious liberty side), for review.

On January 26th, 2022, the Oregon appeals court told the Bureau of Labor to reconsider its order fining the Christian couple. It said that the state agency "acted non-neutrally" against them. But it insisted that the couple was still guilty of discriminating against the lesbians.

Attorneys for First Liberty Institute, joined by former White House Counsel C. Boyden Gray, will appeal this ruling, arguing that the same agency that showed an anti-Christian bias should not be allowed to try this case one more time. They maintain that the appeals court should have put an end to this case once and for all.

The appeals court showed cowardice when it said that the state

agency “acted non-neutrally.” This sanitized term is a ruse: it would be more accurate to say that flagrantly anti-Christian remarks were voiced by some on the panel.

The lawyers for the Christians contended that the panel’s “administrative prosecutor disparaged” their client, labeling their objections a mere “excuse” for discrimination. They also unjustly compared their clients’ objections to cases involving “physical violence, prolonged sexual harassment, and religious coercion.” The bakery owners were even enjoined from “speaking about their religious beliefs, despite the lack of any basis for such a gag order.”

The Washington case involves a football coach, Joseph Kennedy, who huddled with players for a prayer on the 50-yard-line after games at Bremerton High School, outside of Seattle. When he was asked by school officials not to lead the players in a prayer, he complied. When he decided to take a knee and say a silent prayer with the players, the school objected again, saying students could see him praying. Finally, the school banned prayer altogether.

The school said that if he wants to pray he should do so in a janitor’s closet or the press box; this way no one would construe his behavior to be a government-endorsed event. He refused, citing his First Amendment rights. The school fired him.

Kennedy sued and twice lost before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Ninth Circuit ruled that public speech of “an overtly religious nature” is forbidden, arguing that doing so gives the impression that the government is endorsing religion. Kennedy’s First Liberty attorneys charged that the Ninth Circuit was now saying that “even *private* religious speech by teachers and coaches violates the Establishment Clause (*italic in the original*).”

Kennedy has appealed to the Supreme Court but the justices declined the case; they asked the lower courts to review it. Now the Supreme Court has decided to hear the latest appeal.

Jeremy Dys, the First Liberty attorney for Kennedy, argued that the Ninth Circuit ruling sets a dangerous precedent. It would call into question whether “a public-school employee has a constitutional right to engage in brief, quiet prayer by *himself* (his italic.)”

Furthermore, if this ruling were to stand, it would mean that a teacher who bowed his head before a meal in the school cafeteria, or wore a crucifix or yarmulke, could be fired for giving the appearance of government endorsement of religion.

President Rachel Laser of Americans United for Separation of Church and State, who represents the school board, frames the issue in a patently dishonest way. “No child attending public school should have to pray to play school sports.” She’s right about that, but it is a red herring: No student is being compelled to pray as a condition of playing sports in any public school in the nation.

These two cases are driven by a hatred of Christianity, and that is why they have been banging around in the courts for so long. The totalitarian left, which occupies a sizeable presence in Oregon and Washington (home to the crazed 2020 Portland and Seattle riots), must be stopped if liberty is to prevail.

NO EQUITY FOR CATHOLICS AT

NBC

The January 15th episode of “Saturday Night Live” (SNL) was vile.

“Pope Francis said this week that getting vaccinated against Covid is a moral obligation especially since priests work so closely with kids.”

The writers could have chosen to make a nasty joke about blacks, but that would have violated its policy on “Diversity, Equity & Inclusion.” It could have made a nasty joke about Asians, but that would have violated this policy. It could have made a nasty joke about transgender persons, but that would have violated this policy. It could have made a nasty joke about homosexuals, but that would have violated this policy. It could have made a nasty joke about the disabled, but that would have violated this policy.

So it chose to nail Catholics, and that is because they are not covered by this policy.

“We stand for everyone. We believe that a diverse, equitable and inclusive company is a more effective company, leading us to approach diversity as a driver for business growth and innovation.”

That is the opening statement issued by NBCUniversal on its policy governing “Diversity, Equity & Inclusion.” It is also a lie. Its policy only covers “injustice and inequality against any race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, or ability.”

Why are religious groups left out? Because the company obviously doesn’t value them. And why were Catholics the butt of the joke, and not some other religious entity? Because “Saturday Night Live” writers hate Catholics. No other reason is plausible.

JESUIT PRIEST JUSTIFIES ABORTION

Fr. Pat Conroy, a Jesuit, is the former House Chaplain; he left that post in 2019. He is back in the news, this time for giving the green light to Catholics to be pro-abortion. Much of what he said in a Washington Post interview on January 5 is uninformed, and some of his comments are simply wrong.

"I want to know the American who thinks government should take away their choice in any area of their life—*any* area of their life (newspaper's italic)."

That's not hard to do. Simply read the surveys that reveal the support for Covid lockdowns—millions support allowing the government to take away the choices of citizens. Alternatively, go to Princeton or Yale and interview the administrators who are creating a police state environment in the name of combatting the flu.

Conroy says, "A good Catholic in our system could be saying: Given women in our system have this constitutional right, our task as fellow Christians, or as Catholics, is to make possible for her to optimize her ability to make the choice."

Let us pose an analogy, using slavery as the object of choice. "A good Catholic in our system could be saying: Given citizens in our system have this constitutional right [to slavery], our task as fellow Christians, or as Catholics, is to make it possible for them to optimize their ability to make the choice."

Conroy insists that "a pro-choice Democrat isn't a pro-abortion person." Tell that to the pro-abortion protesters who

were in the news recently holding signs that said, "I Love Someone Who Had An Abortion."

Similarly, Conroy says about the woman planning to abort her child, "she is the one to make her choice; we should not make it for her." But choice is a verb that has no moral meaning. It only takes on meaning when we know the object of choice. A doctor who chooses to bring life into the world is a good man. A doctor who chooses to kill it is not.

Conroy opines that "Thomas Aquinas says if your conscience says to do something the church says is a sin, you are bound to follow your conscience. That's Thomas Aquinas!"

That is a highly selective reading of Aquinas.

To be sure, Aquinas prized conscience rights, but he did so with the understanding that it must be a well formed conscience. If it were not, then *all choices*, no matter how murderous, could be countenanced. Which explains why he said, "If...we consider one action in the moral order, it is impossible for it to be morally both good and evil."

It is wrong to suggest that Aquinas said that conscience rights override Church teachings. "The universal Church," he said, "cannot err, since she is governed by the Holy Ghost, Who is the Spirit of truth." He also said, "Clearly the person who accepts the Church as an infallible guide will believe whatever the Church teaches."

Regarding abortion, Aquinas said that abortions are a "grave sin" and were not only "among evil deeds," they were "against nature." In the 12th century, science had not yet learned that life begins at conception, which is why Aquinas accepted the prevailing view that life begins at some time after fertilization. But that didn't stop him from condemning abortion.

If liberal Catholics regarded abortion to be as morally

offensive as racial discrimination—it is actually much worse—they would not strain to justify it. That they continue to do so while feigning an interest in social justice is positively nauseating.