

ALTERNATIVES TO DISNEY

Universal Parks and Resorts: Poor Alternative

Universal Parks and Resorts is the theme park unit of NBCUniversal, a subsidiary of Comcast. Universal Parks and Resorts is best known for attractions and lands based on famous classic and modern pop culture properties (movies, television, literature, cartoons, comics, video games, music, etc.).

It operates Universal Studios Hollywood, Universal Orlando Resort, Universal Studios Japan, Universal Studios Singapore, and Universal Beijing Resort. In 2017, approximately 49,458,000 guests visited Universal Studios theme parks, making it the third-largest amusement park operator in the world.

While its parent company is not as vocal in their embrace of “woke” causes, Comcast-NBCUniversal tacitly supports initiatives that run counter to traditional values. For instance, Comcast is a corporate sponsor of the Equality Act, one of the biggest threats to religious liberty ever considered by the United States Congress. Comcast also supports the Respect for Marriage Act, which would redefine marriage as something other than a union between one man and one woman on the national level. Comcast also announced they would pay for their employees to travel for abortions.

Both Universal Studios Hollywood and Universal Orlando host Pride Month events. Universal Studios Hollywood hosted a drag show in June of 2022.

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment: Better Alternative

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment is a subsidiary of SeaWorld Entertainment Inc. and owns and operates thirteen recreational destinations in the United States. In May 2018, Themed

Entertainment Association and the global management firm AECOM reported that SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment ranked ninth in the world for attendance among theme park companies.

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment's parks include: SeaWorld Orlando, Discovery Cove Orlando, Aquatica Orlando, Busch Gardens Tampa Bay, Adventure Island Tampa Bay, SeaWorld San Diego, Sesame Place San Diego, SeaWorld San Antonio, Aquatica San Antonio, Discovery Point, Busch Gardens Williamsburg, Water Country USA, and Sesame Place near Philadelphia.

SeaWorld Parks & Entertainment, along with its parent company, are not vocal on social issues. For instance, they are not corporate sponsors of the Equality Act, and we could not find a public pledge to pay for their employees to travel to undergo abortions.

While Orlando has become a popular destination for LGBT tourists, SeaWorld does not appear to have any events specifically designed for that audience. Numerous LGBT oriented travel magazines note that Orlando is a popular place and recommend a visit to SeaWorld, but we could not find specific events sponsored by the park.

Six Flags Entertainment Corporation: Better Alternative

Six Flags Entertainment Corporation owns the most theme parks and water parks combined of any amusement-park company and has the seventh highest attendance in the world. The company operates 27 properties throughout North America, including theme parks, amusement parks, water parks, and a family entertainment center. In 2019, Six Flags properties hosted 32.8 million guests.

Six Flags has largely remained silent on social issues. It is not a corporate sponsor of the Equality Act, and we could not find any public statements on paying for employees to travel to undergo an abortion. Several people on the left condemned Six Flags for making political contributions to Texas

officials that were pro-life or opposed to the transgender agenda. While this is not dispositive that the corporation is for these issues, we could not find any statements of trying to spin these contributions as just the cost of doing business. Rather, Six Flags appears to have ignored the controversy.

In 2022, Six Flags Mexico rescinded its bans on homosexual couples showing public displays of affection. Additionally, several Six Flags parks in the United States offer private LGBT/Gay Nights; however, we could not find evidence that minors are allowed to attend.

PHYSICIAN POLITICS NEEDS TO BE CHECKED

There has always been an element in the medical profession that has been given over to politics, but in recent years it has become more common and more aggressive.

It would be harder to find better proof of physician politics than the letter signed by over 1,200 health officials in the spring of 2020. With Covid-19 raging, and lockdowns everywhere, these doctors reacted more like left-wing activists than professionals.

The good doctors threw caution to the wind, suspending their support for social distancing, all because they vigorously endorsed the cause of “social justice.” To be specific, many protests were launched following a few controversial incidents of police interactions with black men. That some of the protests turned into a riot—killing and injuring innocent persons, many of whom were cops—did not seem to matter.

The signatories were outraged by the “emerging narratives that seemed to malign demonstrations as risky for the public health because of Covid-19.” That was their number-one concern—bad mouthing the protesters—not the spread of Covid. They added that their goal was “to present a narrative that prioritizes opposition to racism as vital to public health, including the epidemic response.” Not only that, these protests—not all protests—were deemed “vital to the national public health and to the threatened health specifically of Black people in the United States.”

This backdrop helps us to understand why so many in the medical profession have said very little about the legalization of marijuana. It comes down to politics. Some issues galvanize them; others do not. To cite another example, consider their strong support for sex-reassignment surgery. Physician politics has never been more apparent.

In early January, the Health and Human Services’ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration released the findings of its annual survey and found that over 16 percent of the population, more than 46 million people, suffer from substance abuse disorder. Almost all of them did not receive any treatment.

In December, CFAH, a health advisory organization, issued a report on the legal status of marijuana in the states. The drug is fully legal in 21 states and the District of Columbia; it is legal in another 23 states, but with restrictions; it is illegal in 6 states.

The American Medical Association (AMA) is opposed to marijuana legalization, but not in a vigorous way. In fact, the last statement it issued on this subject was to call for expunging prior marijuana arrest records, a decision that smacks of politics, not science.

On the issue of state restrictions on sex-reassignment

surgery, the AMA is quite vocal, making it clear that such legislation “represents a dangerous governmental intrusion into the practice of medicine,” insisting that “trans and non-binary identities are normal variations of human identity and expression” (our emphasis).

The Centers for Disease Control (CDC) lists several health concerns with marijuana use, but stays away from commenting on the wisdom of legalizing the drug.

When it comes to gender identity, the CDC offers a full-throated endorsement, imploring health providers to “create welcoming environments that facilitates disclosure of gender identity and sexual orientation.” Furthermore, clinics should work to “improve sexual health for transgender and gender nonbinary persons.”

Our leading medical guru, Dr. Fauci, has not commented on the legalization of marijuana, even though he has spent the past three years warning us about respiratory illnesses.

Interestingly, Anthony “Double Mask” Fauci, in his role as Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, has come under considerable criticism for spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to finance attempts to turn monkeys transgender.

To be specific, he has used public monies to inject male monkeys with feminizing hormone therapy. His interest in sex is longstanding, beginning with AIDS in the 1980s. Moreover, at the height of the pandemic, “Double Mask” could not bring himself to tell gay men not to have sex with anonymous men, saying only that it is risky. Apparently, this was not as risky as going to church during the Covid outbreak, which is why church doors were shut.

Most doctors and those who work in the medical profession are good men and women who have served the public well. But there are more than a few—especially in elite positions—who have

shown themselves to be charlatans, or worse. Politics has no more legitimate role to play in medicine than it does in sports.

Those who are looking for reliable medical sources should go to the websites of the Catholic Medical Association (they cover a wide range of subjects—see their journal, *The Linacre Quarterly*), the Charlotte Lozier Institute (a pro-life institute) and the National Catholic Bioethics Center.

CARDINAL PELL, R.I.P.

Cardinal George Pell died on January 10th at age 81.

We mourned his death at the Catholic League. No priest of his stature was victimized in recent times more than him. He suffered mightily, spending over 400 days in an Australian prison for crimes he was later acquitted. The anti-Catholicism that drove his conviction was obvious to all with eyes to see.

His conviction on five counts of sexual abuse was unanimously overturned by Australia's High Court in 2020. He was never guilty of these charges in the first place.

Pell was the victim of outrageous lies. He had been smeared, spat upon, and forced to endure solitary confinement for crimes he never committed.

This was a sham from the get-go and should never have made its way through the Australian courts.

Pell was charged with abusing two boys in 1996. One of the boys overdosed on drugs but not before telling his mother—on two occasions—that Pell never abused him. The other boy's accusation was undercut by the dead boy's account: they were

allegedly abused at the same time and place. There were no witnesses to an offense that supposedly took place after Mass in the sacristy of a church.

The High Court concluded that the charges against Cardinal Pell strained credulity. It was based on assumptions that simply didn't add up.

We defended Cardinal Pell for many years. Indeed, we issued approximately two dozen news releases defending him from his critics. He was sustained by his faith, and his courage was exemplary. May he rest in peace.

MEET THE CATHOLICS IN THE NEW CONGRESS

Catholics comprise 28% of the seats in the 118th Congress, the largest of any religious affiliation. But just how Catholic are these Catholics?

We reviewed the scorecard of incumbent representatives and senators as tallied by National Right to Life and NARAL, the two most authoritative sources measuring congressional support for the right to life and the right to abortion, respectively, in the nation. For newly elected members, we consulted their stated record on this subject when they were candidates. Here is what we found.

There are 65 Democrats who claim a Catholic identity in the House of Representatives, 54 of whom have a perfect pro-abortion record; and all 10 of the newly elected members are in the pro-abortion camp. Of the 56 Republicans who claim a Catholic identity, 48 have a perfect pro-life voting record;

one has a mostly pro-life record; and the seven newly elected members espouse a pro-life position.

This means that 98% of the Catholic House Democrats are pro-abortion and 100% of the Catholic House Republicans are mostly pro-life.

In the Senate, there are 15 Catholic Democrats, 12 of whom have a perfect pro-abortion record. Of the 11 Catholic Republicans, 7 have a perfect pro-life record.

This means that 80% of Catholic Senate Democrats are pro-abortion and 100% of Catholic Senate Republicans are pro-life.

In the last two years, both parties have become more entrenched in their positions. Even people known to be more moderate on this issue ventured closer to their party's extreme. For instance, Lisa Murkowski of Alaska and Susan Collins of Maine moved more to the pro-life camp. However, moving in the opposite direction was Joe Manchin of West Virginia: he had a perfect pro-life rating in the 116th Congress but dropped down to a 67% score in the last congress.

Similarly in the House, Jeff Van Drew (R-NJ) became more pro-life after leaving the Democratic party. Henry Cuellar (D-TX), who was widely seen as the last pro-life Democrat in the House, earned a higher score from NARAL and a lower score from National Right to Life.

Does this mean that Catholic Republicans are better Catholics than Catholic Democrats? On the issue that the bishops regard as the "preeminent" issue of our time, namely, abortion, it certainly does. It must be said, however, that as a true measure of one's Catholic status, one's voting record on one issue is not necessarily dispositive.

Some argue that a congressman's record on social justice issues is a more accurate gauge of his Catholicity. The problem with that contention is that it is much more difficult

to make comparisons on such matters. To wit: Catholics who favor more government welfare programs contend that their position is better aligned with Church teachings, yet Catholics who oppose more government dependency maintain that they are more faithful to the Church's teachings on the poor. Climate change is another issue that is difficult to score.

Ultimately, whether one is a "good Catholic" depends on factors of a more intimate nature. But it is not wrong to suggest that elected Catholic officials who maintain a decidedly pro-abortion voting record are an embarrassment to Catholics. They most certainly are. After all, the right to life is the most foundational of our natural rights. This is not an observation—it is a fact of life.

PRO-LIFE MEASURES SHOT DOWN

On January 11, all but two congressional Democrats voted against a bill that would mandate medical care for infants born alive following a botched abortion (one voted with the Republicans and one voted present).

The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act says that an infant born alive following an abortion is a "legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States," and as such must be attended to by medical staff or transported to a nearby hospital for care.

Democrats offered two arguments against the bill: (a) they said it is already illegal for doctors and nurses not to care for any individual, therefore no new legislation is necessary, and (b) it may actually be dangerous to transport an infant to a hospital.

When it comes to combating racial discrimination, or discrimination against LGBT persons, Democrats can never get enough legislation on the books, but for some reason when it comes to infants born alive following a botched abortion, no new laws are necessary.

On the same day Democrats voted against the bill to provide health care for babies who survive an abortion, they voted against a resolution condemning violence against crisis pregnancy centers and churches following the overturning of *Roe v. Wade*. Yet these sites have been firebombed and vandalized by Jane's Revenge and others.

Not a good sign. Votes like this should not be along party lines.

INSIDE THE HEAD OF AN ABORTION LOVER

Most people who call themselves pro-choice do not support abortion-on-demand, and indeed favor restrictions on when and why a woman should be able to abort her child. But there are some extremists who want no restrictions. There are even some who really love abortion.

Patricia Lunneborg is a woman's study professor and author of the book, *Abortion: A Positive Decision*. Atheist queen Anne Nicol Gaylor is the author of *Abortion Is A Blessing*. Ginette Paris, a French author, wrote, *The Sacrament of Abortion*. And in the U.S. Congress we have Massachusetts Democrat Sen. Ed Markey.

Markey showed up at the State of the Union address wearing a

Planned Parenthood pin (he was apparently the only one in the chamber to do so). It simply said, "ABORTION"; right in the middle of the two "O's" was a heart. He was not referring to the baby's heart—it was just an expression of his love for abortion.

What makes people like Markey tick? What's going on inside his head?

Markey's pedigree is that of an all-star Irish Catholic. He attended Immaculate Conception School and then went to Malden Catholic High School. Next up was Boston College, followed by Boston College Law School. It makes you wonder—what happened to this guy?

Markey's voting record sports a 100% approval rating from Planned Parenthood and NARAL, the two pro-abortion giants. Predictably, he earned an "F" from Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America.

His lust for abortion is so strong that he even voted against a measure to prohibit taxpayer funding for abortions for unborn babies diagnosed with Down's syndrome. He also does not support bills that would provide medical services to children born alive as a result of a botched abortion. Doctor-assisted suicide merits his approval as well.

It would be a serious mistake to think that Markey categorically devalues human life. Not at all. When it comes to rapists and serial murderers, he is very supportive of their lives.

During the 2020 riots, Markey voted to defund the police by moving money slated for cops to nurses and social workers; how they were supposed to be a credible substitute for armed cops he did not say.

He also sought to ban the police from using tear gas, a non-violent way to subdue violent thugs, calling it a "weapon of

war.” Again, he did not say what the police were supposed to do when fired upon by criminals who knew in advance that using tear gas was off the table. Call the nurses and social workers?

What about serial murderers sentenced to death? “Abolish the death penalty,” he tweeted in 2020. The following year he voted to prohibit the death penalty at the federal level, and demanded that we re-sentence those on death row.

What about the Boston bomber, Dzhokhar Tsarnaev, the convicted domestic terrorist who killed three innocent persons and wounded hundreds of others at the 2013 Boston Marathon? Markey said he should not be given the death penalty.

In other words, the unborn have no rights that we need to respect, even though they have never harmed anyone, but convicted murderers have rights we need to respect, and not simply the right to due process—the right to be spared capital punishment.

In 1957, psychologist Leon Festinger published, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. He sought to understand how people manage to hold two or more contradictory ideas at the same time (the definition of cognitive dissonance). How a person manages to resolve the inconsistencies varies, but it includes ignoring their source and changing one’s beliefs.

Diagnosing Markey’s cognitive dissonance is fascinating. It appears that what he was taught in Catholic schools about life and death issues has been ignored, allowing him to develop a militantly secular moral code. Either that or he was taught by those who sought to subvert Catholic teachings.