

PROBE OF FBI REQUESTED; PRO-LIFERS TREATED UNJUSTLY

Why does the FBI severely overreact to Catholic pro-life protesters for minor infractions while doing practically nothing to apprehend pro-abortion activists who have engaged in violence against Catholics and Catholic churches?

This explains why Bill Donohue twice wrote to Sen. Charles Grassley, Ranking Member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, asking for a probe or hearing on this issue.

The occasion for doubling down was a letter sent on October 12 by 40 Republican lawmakers to FBI Director Christopher Wray asking him to grant them a hearing on this matter. Donohue's initial letter to Grassley was sent September 26. He also wrote to these lawmakers, led by Rep. Chip Roy and Sen. Mike Lee, urging them to pursue this issue. Those two letters were sent on October 14.

The occasion for these letters was what happened to Mark Houck on September 23.

Houck is a pro-life activist from Kintnersville, Pennsylvania. He was arrested by some two dozen FBI agents—they came to his house with guns drawn—on grounds that he assaulted an abortion-rights patient escort at a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic in Philadelphia on October 13, 2021. He is being charged with violating the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act (FACE).

Houck says he shoved a man who had been harassing his 12-year-old son in front of the clinic during one of his sidewalk counseling sessions. The charges were dismissed by the District Court in Philadelphia.

Donohue said that “it surely seems that the FBI overreacted in

its handling of this matter. Houck had seven children at home as the SWAT team pounded on his door, showing up fully armored, yelling at him to open it.”

Donohue added, “This kind of overreaction for a minor infraction of the law is deeply troubling, and it becomes even more troubling when paired with the underreaction by the Department of Justice when the pro-life side is targeted.”

He said he previously wrote to U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland asking him to apprehend and prosecute domestic terrorists who have attacked Catholic individuals and churches, as well as crisis pregnancy centers.

Donohue said, “We have witnessed a rash of vandalism against Catholic churches, firebombings of crisis pregnancy centers (many of which are run by Catholics), Masses being interrupted, illegal protests outside the homes of Catholic Supreme Court Justices, and an attempted murder of one of the Catholic Justices.”

There is something seriously wrong with the leadership of the FBI. A congressional probe is long overdue. Our civil liberties are at stake.

THANKSGIVING CHEERS

Militant secularists are in high gear the last quarter of every year.

They don’t like October because they don’t like Columbus. Why? He symbolizes Western civilization, which they loathe. They don’t like Christmas because it reminds them of Jesus Christ, whose divinity they reject.

Now that Thanksgiving is upon us, radical atheists are bent on discrediting the holiday, all because it represents Christianity.

Not all atheists are haters. But the activists among them tend to be that way. Most of them are unhappy people. They are unhappy with their lives, their country, Western civilization and God. What makes them feel good is perverse: They take joy in tearing down America's religious heritage.

They do this by promoting propaganda. They are masters at taking words out of context, or literally fabricating, stories about Thanksgiving that put a negative face on it. Their goal is to spoil the holiday by expressing an affinity with Native Americans, about whom they know nothing and could care less.

Thanksgiving is a family celebration, and that is one more reason why militant secularists want to destroy it. From the period of the Enlightenment in the late 18th and 19th centuries, to the latest rants by radicals, the family has always been in their sights: They resent the idea that children should be raised exclusively by their parents. Why? Parents can thwart their social engineering ambitions.

Happy Thanksgiving! Don't let the malcontents get in your way.

INTOLERANCE FOR FREE SPEECH IS SPIKING

William A. Donohue

There have always been extremists on the right and the left who are completely intolerant, and while both sides need to be

condemned, the real danger comes more from the left. Not because the right-wing extremists are less intolerant, but because those on the left are more numerous and they occupy the command centers of our culture.

I know from a lifetime of working with those in education, activist circles and the media just how intolerant the left can be. Indeed, I could fill a book with my personal experiences. They have kept me from getting jobs, and have tried to get me kicked out of jobs, including this one. They are masters of the politics of personal destruction.

More objectively, we have the wholesale attacks on free speech and the destruction of property conducted by the likes of Antifa, the urban terrorists. Let's not forget about the Silicon Valley elites who gave us the cancel culture. We also have recent polling data that prove my point.

In 2020, a Cato survey found that 77 percent of conservatives, 64 percent of moderates, and 52 percent of liberals were afraid to say what they think. Why are conservatives the most afraid? It's not because the moderates are guilty of creating a "chilling effect" on the free speech of conservatives. We know who the guilty are.

An even more recent survey, conducted in February, and commissioned by the *New York Times* and Siena College, found that only 34 percent of Americans said they believed that all Americans enjoyed freedom of speech completely. It also revealed that 84 percent said it is a "very serious" or "somewhat serious" problem.

As we shall see, Republicans and conservatives are the least likely to enjoy freedom of speech.

On several issues, respondents were asked, "Do you feel more free, less free, or as free as you did before to express your viewpoint in most situations on a daily basis today than you did 10 years ago?" What they found was striking.

When it comes to expressing yourself on politics, 28 percent of Democrats and 13 percent of Republicans said they felt more free; the figures for liberals and conservatives were 29 percent and 16 percent, respectively.

On the subject of religion, 33 percent of Democrats felt more free as compared to just 14 percent of Republicans; it was 32 percent for liberals and 18 percent for conservatives. We know from many studies that Democrats and liberals are much more likely to be secularists, therefore Republicans and conservatives, who are more likely to be religious, suffer the most.

The findings of the Catholic League's survey, which were released in September, found that 62 percent of Catholics agree that "it is getting harder to practice your faith publicly in America." While two out of three practicing Catholics (weekly and monthly churchgoers) say it is getting harder, even 58 percent of those who rarely or never go to church agree that it is.

When asked how free they are about discussing gender identity, the majority of Democrats (54 percent) said they felt more free today but only 20 percent of Republicans felt that way. Similarly, the figures for liberals and conservatives were 58 percent and 18 percent, respectively. That's quite a difference. In other words, those who have the greatest reservations about gender identity are the most afraid of speaking their mind.

When asked about race relations, more than twice as many Democrats (37 percent) as Republicans (15 percent) felt they were more free to discuss this issue today than they were 10 years ago. This suggests that those who don't follow the thinking set by elites on racial issues are seen as a problem.

None of this is hard to figure out. The ruling class has adopted the politics of the left, making it harder for

conservatives and people of faith to speak their mind in public.

Further proof of the intolerant streak on the left can be ascertained by examining the responses to a question about the limits of free speech. “While I support free speech, sometimes you have to shut down speech that is anti-democratic, bigoted or simply untrue.”

The poll found that 41 percent of Democrats and 16 percent of Republicans agreed with this statement; the figures were 39 percent for liberals and 25 percent for conservatives.

Notice that respondents were not asked if they supported the abridgement of speech for reasons that threatened public safety: the issue was speech that someone might object to, and that is a very different matter.

It is this kind of thinking that led the University of California, Berkeley, to recently create “Jewish-free zones” on campus, places where students can safely discuss support for Israel. That’s just how sick this state of affairs has become. This proves a point I have long made: there is more free speech allowed in neighborhood pubs than in neighborhood colleges and universities.

We are at a serious juncture in American history. If people cannot express their political views—especially on college campuses—the entire nation is at risk.

DRAG QUEEN STORY HOUR IS

PERVERSE

This is the article that appeared in the November 2022 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

Throughout the Western world, the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender movement is at a gallop pace. Men and women think they can change their sex and men are told they can get pregnant. It's all a lie. Worse, many who believe this madness have set their eyes on children. Take, for example, Drag Queen Story Hour (DQSH).

There are some parents and grandparents who think that DQSH is a fun-loving way for kids to appreciate diversity. What's wrong with men dressed as women reading to kids in the local library?

Upon closer inspection, it becomes quite clear that these events were founded to promote an agenda, the goal of which is to normalize aberrant sexual behavior.

No place in the U.S. celebrates DQSH more than San Francisco. Here is what a writer for The Federalist had to say about this last year. "DQSH has brought not just one, not two, but at least three convicted sex criminals, two of whom are convicted pedophiles, into confined spaces with large numbers of young children on multiple occasions. Its events also have been sponsored by a man who's been charged with seven counts of child pornography possession."

DQSH was founded in San Francisco in 2015 by Michelle Tomasik, who goes by Michelle Tea. Though she has no academic credentials—she never even went to college—her standing in the lesbian community led to a post at Tulane University as a Writer-in-Residence.

Growing up in Chelsea, Massachusetts she recalled how her stepfather spied on her through a hole that he drilled in the wall; he never disputed the abuse. When her mother decided to stay with him nonetheless, she bolted and left for Boston with her female lover. After her girlfriend became a prostitute, she followed suit.

Then Tea “married” Dashiell Lippmann in 2013. It wasn’t a happy day. Following the ceremony, she aborted her five-month-old baby who had died within her (doctors mixed Dashiell’s eggs with donor sperm and implanted the embryo in Tea.) She tried to abort the baby before the wedding but was afraid of miscarrying “all over” her bridal gown. “I wanted this clot of cells taken out of me so I could go on with my life,” she said.

Why did Tea found DQSH? Gaytimes said it was to introduce kids to the “LGBTQ+ culture.” She could not do so without the backing of the American Library Association (ALA). Those who run it are 87% white and 81% female, and virtually all of them are on the left.

The ALA is responsible for the spread of DQSH throughout the country; local libraries pay gays to run the events. A blog post to the ALA a few years ago encouraged librarians to promote the LGBT agenda by “sneakily fit[ting] stuff in current programs.”

One of the most popular books stocked by libraries is *The Gender Fairy*. It is meant for infants. It tells them “only you know whether you are a boy or girl. No one can tell you.” That means parents, of course. Similarly, a teacher was caught on video telling her class, “It’s OK to be different. There is no such thing as ‘boy’ or ‘girl’ things.” The students were first-graders.

What’s going on? Why have these librarians and teachers become activists for the LGBT cause? Lil Miss Hot Mess is one of the

nation's leading drag queen authors and activists promoting DQSH. She says she loves it when kids realize "that things aren't necessarily the way they've always been told they have to be." Again, a clear shot at parents. Who are they to tell *their children* what's right and wrong?

L. Ron Hubby, a San Francisco drag queen, likes to sing to kids and tell stories. He says DQSH seeks to "capture the imagination and play of the gender fluidity in childhood." Not quite. It would be more truthful to say these programs are designed to plant the seeds of gender fluidity in children. A New York leader of DQSH also named "gender fluidity" as the number-one concept he seeks to instill in kids.

Another DQSH activist said she wants children to understand they don't have to be a "cookie cutter kid," meaning it is okay to rebel against the norms and expectations set by their parents. A psychology professor from the University of Kentucky echoed this saying, DQSH "ultimately provides children with a really flexible model of gender." In other words, being a boy or a girl is interchangeable.

Kevin Roberts is president of The Heritage Foundation. He is concerned about our culture creating a "new generation of drag kids." He's right. This past summer a video emerged of a young girl gyrating to music at a drag show as adults tossed dollar bills at her. It got so bad at a Brooklyn gay bar a few years ago that a reporter who covered a drag event said, "I left after seeing a child dance on stage for money at nighttime."

When a six-year-old boy saw a tall man dressed as a woman at a library drag event, he asked, "Are you a boy or a girl?" "Well," he said, "I guess I was born a boy. But I like to dress like a girl." The message sent was not hard to understand.

In July, after a topless drag queen at a Miami bar sought to entertain a girl—she was "between three and five years

old”—the performer boasted, “Children belong at drag shows!!!! Children deserve to see fun & expression & freedom.” This is why another drag queen in Pennsylvania showed up shirtless teaching children how to spin on a stripper’s pole at a Pride Festival.

This is the face of freedom for drag queens—watching little kids be sexualized by perverts.

The sexual libertinism that is at the root of DQSH is, of course, notoriously anti-Catholic. The most famous drag queen of all, Ru Paul, likes to parade around in garb that mocks Catholics. Unsurprisingly, he calls his relationship with Georges LeBar an “open marriage,” explaining that he would not want to “put restraints” on the man he loves. That way both can cheat with abandon.

RuPaul’s fans at Slate reviewed his more famous gigs, saying of his of his assembly of queens, “you might have thought they were processing into a house of worship rather than a drag competition reality show set. Our Lady of Guadalupe embroidered tops, Sacred Heart of Jesus hats, cross appliques, rosary-adorned boots, and a crown of thorns were just some of the looks served.” RuPaul offered his customary closing, “Can I get an amen up in here?”

In August, I sent a letter to the president of Tennessee Tech University complaining about a drag queen performer dressed as a Franciscan friar who pranced on stage while children showered him with cash (the president took the matter seriously). The most common drag events that assault Catholic sensibilities are those put on by the San Francisco-based Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, a group of homosexuals dressed as nuns.

They regularly hold DQSH events in urban libraries. Princeton professor Robert P. George, a member of the Catholic League’s board of advisors, knows what they are doing.

“It’s a message of power. The group in question, the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, is sending a message that they have the power to enter into the public domain, a publicly funded institution, I believe, not a private one, and to essentially hold a catechism class for this new religion that they’ve created, a religion of hedonism, of self-indulgence....”

It does not speak well of corporate leaders and politicians, virtually all of whom are Democrats, that they back DQSH events. Target, Wells Fargo, Citibank, and Hewlett-Packard sponsor such fare, knowing that children are the key audience. Two San Francisco-based entities, the Zellerbach Family Foundation and the Walter and Elise Haas Fund, do likewise.

Over the past summer, the Democratic Party hosted several DQSH events. Michigan Attorney General Dana Nessel says her goal is to have “A drag queen for every school.” New York City funds DQSH performances, and its mayor, Eric Adams, justifies the spending saying that “literacy” is a “core to what our city embraces.” Note: the majority of students in grades 3-8 in New York City public schools are unable to read at grade level.

No one beats Scott Wiener, a California state senator who represents San Francisco. A homosexual radical, he is a strong advocate for DQSH. He is also known for sponsoring a bill that says adults who have oral and anal sex with minors should not be required to register as sex offenders.

There are those who worship at the altar of non-judgmentalism, tolerance and diversity who regard all critics of DQSH as a secular sacrilege. Their creed—and that is what it is—does not allow for criticism of any gay or transgender event short of violence. They should listen to what honest persons involved in DQSH have to say.

Drag queen Kitty Demure warned parents last year about taking their kids to such events.

“I have no idea why you want drag queens to read books to your

children... What in the hell has a drag queen ever done to make you have so much respect for them and admire them so much? Other than put on makeup and jump on the floor and writhe around and do sexual things on stage? I have absolutely no idea why you would want that to influence your child. Would you want a stripper or a porn star to influence your child?"

Demure wasn't finished with his reality check. "A drag queen performs in a nightclub for adults. There is a lot of filth that goes on, a lot of sexual stuff that goes on. And backstage there's a lot of nudity, sex, and drugs... So I don't think this is an avenue you would want your child to explore... But to actually get [your children] involved in drag is extremely, extremely irresponsible on your part."

He also warned against taking kids to Pride events, saying "they don't belong there. There's a lot of adult activity that is going on at gay Pride events and in the nightclubs. And I think it's just irresponsible—they're all like that. Children should not be a part of this culture."

Last year the San Francisco Gay Men's Choir sang a song with a message to parents.

"We'll convert your children. It happens bit by bit. Quietly and subtly, and you will barely notice it. We'll convert your children. Yes, we will. There's really no escaping it. We'll convert your children. We're coming for them! We're coming for your children! We're coming for your children! We'll convert your children!"

It would be so nice to think that these are just throw-away lines designed to pull the chain of uptight parents. And for some gays, that's probably true. But for many others, this is exactly what they mean. Why would anyone in his right mind want to give the jokers the benefit of the doubt?

AP STORY ON CLERGY ABUSE IS A SCAM

On September 28 the Associated Press ran a story about mandatory reporting laws that didn't get much traction. That's because it broke no new ground.

Written by Jason Dearen and Michael Rezendes, they found that 33 states exempt the clergy from mandatory reporting laws governing the sexual abuse of minors. "This loophole has resulted in an unknown number of predators being allowed to continue abusing children for years despite having confessed behavior to religious officials."

The reason why no one knows how many predators have continued to abuse children for years "despite having confessed behavior to religious officials" is because no one has been able to identify a singular instance when this has happened. The real story here has less to do with legal loopholes than it does with crashing the confessional.

The AP story mentions legislation on this issue that was sponsored in recent years by Democrats. Utah Rep. Angela Romero, and California state Sen. Jerry Hill, both sought to close the loophole, but ran into fierce resistance. They both lost. The Catholic League played a major role in both victories.

Bill Donohue wrote to Romero in January 2020. "You are treading on dangerous territory. When the government seeks to police the sacraments of the Catholic Church—or encroach on the tenets and practices of any world religion—it is gearing up for a court fight. The First Amendment secures religious liberty, and that entails separation of church and state."

In his letter to Romero, Donohue said there was “*no evidence*” showing that breaking the seal of the Confession would result in prosecuting molesters. Just as he expected, she provided none.

The year before Donohue wrote to Hill. His bill said that “the clergy-penitent privilege has been abused on a large scale, resulting in the unreported and systemic abuse of thousands of children across multiple denominations and faiths.” Donohue asked him for the evidence that supports this outrageous claim. He offered none.

There’s a political game going on here. For years, Family Planning Advocates, the lobbying arm of Planned Parenthood, fought legislation in New York State that would require its counselors to report instances of statutory rape to the authorities. It was supported by the New York Civil Liberties Union. Yet there was no AP story or public outcry about their effort.

Moreover, in 2015 the Alliance Defending Freedom issued a report documenting “multiple instances” where Planned Parenthood failed to report statutory rapes to the authorities. Why didn’t the AP do a story on this?

The AP stance is untenable. Consider the 2014 study published by the University of Michigan Law School. Two professors, one from Michigan Law School and one from New York University School of Medicine, authored, “Effects of Clergy Reporting Laws on Child Maltreatment Report Rates.” They found that states that mandated religious leaders to report cases of child maltreatment had 10 percent *fewer* confirmed reports of child maltreatment.

Father Roger Landry, a well-respected priest and writer, says it is preposterous to think that a child abuser is going to confess his sin in the confessional. “No abuser, not to mention others guilty of serious crimes, would come to

confession if he knew that the confessor was basically a state informant who would betray his confidence.”

On September 29, Donohue asked Catholic League communications director, Mike McDonald, to email AP reporter Rezendes (he was part of the *Boston Globe* “Spotlight” team that reported on clergy abuse in the Boston archdiocese). Donohue wanted to know his response to two questions.

“Do you know how many cases have been reported by the clergy, especially priests, to the authorities involving the sexual abuse of minors in the 17 states that do not afford such an exemption? Has anyone ever been prosecuted after the clergy reported the abuse?”

Donohue knew he had no evidence and that explains why he never answered. This is a scam. The AP’s record of reporting on the Catholic Church has long evinced a bias.

AIR FORCE ACADEMY FALLS FOR A HOAX

Catholic League president Bill Donohue sent the following letter to the Superintendent of the United States Air Force Academy:

September 28, 2022

Lieutenant General Richard Clark
Superintendent
2304 Cadet Drive, Ste. 3300
USAF Academy, CO 80840-5001

Dear Lt. Gen. Clark:

In my role as president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, I regularly address contemporary cultural issues that are of interest to the Catholic League's constituency. I am writing to you because there is something going on at the Air Force Academy that merits a response.

To be specific, the Brooke Owens Fellowship is problematic on several levels. The problem is not that it discriminates against men—there are legitimate reasons to have programs that are exclusive to men, or to women—the issue is who qualifies for the program. The application form says it is targeted at “undergraduate women and gender minorities interested in aerospace.”

Gender minorities? Who are these people? The form says the following persons may apply: “cisgender woman, transgender woman, non-binary, agender, bigender, two-spirit, demigender, genderfluid, genderqueer, or another form of gender minority.”

Why is the Air Force Academy peddling this fiction? There is no need to call women “cisgender women.” Nature, and nature's God, have made it crystal clear that there are only two sexes: man and woman. Transgender women are men who for some psychological reason consider themselves to be a woman. They do not menstruate and they cannot get pregnant. If you have evidence that disputes this, please forward it to me.

I am serious in wanting to read the scientific evidence that proves I am wrong. I can assure you I will provide you with the scientific evidence that proves I am right.

The fiction doesn't end there. There is no such person—in the history of the world—who is literally non-binary, agender, bigender, two-spirit, demigender, genderfluid, or genderqueer. They are concepts made up by academics. They may exist on the blackboard, but in the real world they do not exist.

As a sociologist, I am well aware of the postmodern roots of transgenderism. It is a pernicious ideology that rejects the

existence of truth. It is not based on scholarship, empirical evidence or data of any kind. Indeed, it defies reason. To be frank, it is a hoax.

I think you know that what I have said is true. The shame of it is that you have succumbed to pressure stemming from activists who have no interest in the noble mission of the Air Force Academy. As someone who was honorably discharged from the U.S. Air Force, I find your position irresponsible and indefensible.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

cc: Gen. Mark Milley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
Frank Kendall, Secretary of the Air Force
Gen. Charles O. Brown, Jr., Air Force Chief of Staff

BIDEN EXPLOITS DOBBS RULING

Ever since the Supreme Court overturned the *Roe v. Wade* decision that legalized abortion, the Biden administration has seized on the ruling in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* to scare Americans about their access to abortion. They did so in a grand way on October 4 at the White House.

President Joe Biden, Vice President Kamala Harris and Education Secretary Miguel Cardona sounded the alarm over a new policy issued by the University of Idaho. According to Biden, officials at the University of Idaho "told the university staff that they could get in trouble just for

talking or telling students about where they can get birth control.”

This is utter nonsense. No such policy exists.

What Biden was referring to is a September 23 memo by the University of Idaho’s General Counsel to university employees titled, “Guidance on Abortion Laws.” The memo was issued to comply with a new restrictive abortion law passed by Idaho lawmakers that banned the use of state resources to promote abortion.

The memo focuses almost exclusively on abortion. It lists six “prohibited activities” under the law: “Counsel in favor of abortion; Promote abortion; Provide institutional facilities or institutional funding for providing an abortion or abortion training; Provide referrals for abortion; Contract with abortion providers; Dispense emergency contraception as classified by the FDA.”

Regarding emergency contraception, the *New York Times* said in 2012 that RU-486, a popular emergency contraception medication, “is prescribed for terminating pregnancies” by “destroy[ing] implanted embryos.” It is therefore an abortifacient, not a contraceptive.

Biden’s characterization of the free speech issue is not supported by what the memo says.

“University employees may, with certain limitations: Direct students to sources of information outside university; Have classroom discussions on topics related to abortion or contraception limited to discussions and topics relevant to the class subject and instructor neutrality; Provide condoms for the purpose of helping prevent the spread of STDs and not for purposes of birth control.”

The General Counsel is correct to note that the law that his memo addresses “is not a model of clarity.” Indeed, it needs

to be refined. For example, classroom discussions, on any topic, should be robust and not subject to irrational limitations.

Having said that, Biden's comment that university employees can "get in trouble just for talking or telling students about where they can get birth control" is absurd. In fact, the memo says, "Counselling on birth control, as well as providing the means of birth control, can be done through licensed physicians and their health care workers at Student Health locations run by Moscow Family Medicine, our Student Health provider."

Why, then, did Biden say they had a gag rule on campus? It's because he and his administration are furious with the *Dobbs* decision and are engaged in fear-mongering before the mid-term elections.

Notice, too, that he mentions a gag rule on contraception, not abortion, even though the memo says very little about contraception. This is not a coincidence.

Under ObamaCare, there was a Health and Human Services "contraception mandate" forcing Catholic non-profits like the Little Sisters of the Poor to pay for contraception in their healthcare plans.

This was a misnomer. As the Catholic League pointed out on many occasions, the mandate covered abortifacients. Therefore, it should have been called the "abortion-inducing drug" mandate. Obama and Biden knew that contraception was much less controversial than abortion, and that is why their policy was dubbed the "contraception mandate."

The same reasoning is behind Biden's characterization of the University of Idaho's policy—he cites contraception, not abortion, as the key issue, knowing it is more likely to set off the alarms.

What Biden is doing is playing on people's fears. It's just that simple, and just that diabolical.

VANDERBILT DODGES A BULLET

An incident recently occurred at Vanderbilt University that merited our attention. The good news is that the president, Daniel Diermeier, put the fire out just before we decided to pounce. Just to make sure something like this doesn't happen again, Bill Donohue shared his concerns with the president.

The issued involved a very serious threat to the conscience rights of those who work at the Pediatric Transgender Clinic. Dr. Ellen Wright Clayton told staff members who invoke conscientious objections to performing sex-reassignment operations that they were out of line.

"If you are going to assert conscientious objection," she is said to have commented to staff members, "you have to realize that that is problematic."

She is also quoted as saying, "I just want you to take home that saying that you're not going to do something because of your conscientious—because of your religious beliefs, is not without consequences, and should not be without consequences." She then told them that "if you don't want to do this kind of work, don't work at Vanderbilt."

The statement that was subsequently released by Vanderbilt said, "Our policies allow employees to decline to participate in care they find morally objectionable, and do not permit discrimination against employees who choose to do so. This includes employees whose personal or religious beliefs do not support gender-affirming care for transgender persons."

Donohue was happy with the statement, but was still wary.

“My only concern is why Dr. Clayton would think that what she allegedly said could ever be seen as legal, never mind ethical. One would think that someone in her role as a health law expert would know better. I trust she has been told that conscience rights are integral to religious liberty and must be protected.”

Interestingly, a few weeks later Vanderbilt announced that it was suspending gender-transition surgeries for minors following a backlash. We hope we had something to do with that.

NO SUPPORT FOR RADICAL PRO-ABORTION AGENDA

The *New York Times* reported on September 17 that those who want limits on abortion are “out of step” with public opinion. The *Times* is wrong. Consider the data from four different polling companies.

In June 2018, a Gallup poll found that only 13 percent of Americans said abortion should be legal in the last three months. In May 2022, a Pew Research Center survey revealed that only 19 percent said abortion should be legal in all cases. In June 2022, a Rasmussen poll reported that only 5 percent believe abortion should be legal in all cases. In July 2022, a Harvard poll found that 72 percent opposed abortion generally after 15 weeks.

It is those who want no limits on abortion who are wildly “out of step” with public opinion.

What about the horror stories peddled by the media about abortion performed to save the life of the mother, or in cases of incest or rape? They make up an estimated 1-2 percent of all abortions, and almost all restrictive laws allow for such abortions.

If the media were fair, they would report on the most extreme defense of abortion being made by those on that side. For example, babies are being born alive as a result of a botched abortion and there is no national legislation banning it. Every time pro-life politicians seek to pass the "Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act," they are stymied.

Before he was hounded from office for being an alleged predator, New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo bragged how much he defended the rights of women by signing into law a provision that removed abortion from the criminal code. In practice, this meant that medical staff who did not act to treat a baby born alive as a result of a botched abortion could not be tried for this offense.

This is not abortion—it's infanticide.

In 2019, Virginia Gov. Ralph Northam famously commented on an abortion bill he was championing. "If a mother is in labor, I can tell you exactly what would happen. The infant would be delivered. The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother." In other words, the baby would be denied his or her inalienable right to life.

For the most part, the media downplayed this story. At that time, they were much more interested in reporting on Northam's blackface imitation of Michael Jackson, and other racist conduct he allegedly engaged in when he was a student in medical school. That was more important than his support for infanticide.

The media have also given short shrift to an incredibly extremist piece of congressional legislation, the “Women’s Health Protection Act.” As the bishops’ conference correctly notes, it “would impose abortion on demand nationwide at any stage of pregnancy through federal statute. Immediately upon passage, the WHPA would invalidate state laws banning abortion at any stage of pregnancy, including laws that prohibit abortion based on race, sex, disability, or other characteristics.”

So who is really “out of step”?

SEN. WARREN’S ANTI-CHOICE RECORD

No lie told by Senator Elizabeth Warren will ever top her effort to pass herself off as a Native American; however, her claim that she is pro-choice is a close second. While she may present herself as a champion of women’s rights, Warren does not believe they have a “right to choose.” In her rhetoric, voting record, and zeal for targeting pregnancy resource centers, she reveals a deep conviction that abortion is the only option.

Ever since the leak of the *Dobbs v. Jackson* draft opinion on May 2, 2022, Warren has taken to the warpath. Without missing a beat, Warren immediately took to Twitter declaring, “It’s time for the millions who support the Constitution and abortion rights to stand up and make their voices heard.”

Notice that she does not call on people who support a “right to choose.” Her entire Twitter profile is littered with her bombastic defense of abortion, but a keen observer would

discover that she almost never mentions a woman's "right to choose." Any time she talks about this issue, she often talks about abortion but gives scant mention of "choice."

That is because, in her mind, there is no choice. The decision has been preordained. She does not believe there could ever be an alternative to abortion.

Warren's enthusiasm for abortion is not just limited to her bellicose rhetoric. Her voting record exposes an unadulterated lust for abortion.

In 2016, Warren earned a 100 percent voting record from NARAL Pro-Choice America. Again in 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, NARAL's most recent scorecard, Warren earned 100 percent each time.

It is not just NARAL that gives Warren top marks. The Planned Parenthood Action Fund has also recognized her commitment to the pro-abortion cause. She earned a lifetime score of 100 percent.

While Warren is a consistent pro-abortion vote, her opposition to the pro-life side is equally unfaltering. The good Senator has earned an "F" from Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America, never once voting in favor of their recommendations. Similarly, Warren has received equally poor scores from the National Right to Life Committee. In the 114th, 115th, 116th, and 117th Congresses, Warren earned a zero percent score.

While Warren's rhetoric and voting record clearly show a zeal for abortion, her monomaniacal obsession with targeting pregnancy resource centers demonstrates how little she actually cares about giving women a choice.

On September 19, Warren, along with six of her fellow Senate colleagues, sent a letter to Heartbeat International suggesting the pregnancy resource center might use patient information to turn expecting mothers over to the authorities. While Heartbeat International only provides world class care

to pregnant women, Warren accused the organization of “luring pregnant people...to affiliate [crisis pregnancy center] facilities by using a variety of false and misleading tactics.”

Repeatedly, Warren has railed against pregnancy resource centers. On August 5, she gave a speech from the Senate Floor to call for a “crackdown on deceptive and misleading practices used by many crisis pregnancy centers.” Prior to this, on June 23, Warren introduced legislation that would direct the Federal Trade Commission to issue rules to prohibit “deceptive or misleading advertising” and collect penalties from pregnancy resource centers.

While Warren was speaking and acting with naked hostility to pregnancy resource centers, pro-abortion fanatics attacked approximately 70 of them. It might be a stretch to say that Warren directly inspired these attacks; nevertheless, she helped set a tone that encouraged radicals to vandalize and firebomb these centers.

Ultimately, Warren’s animosity for pregnancy resource centers, along with her voting record and rhetoric, stem from her belief that women should not have a choice. She does not see abortion as one option, but rather it is a predetermined decision.

She is, without a doubt, the most anti-choice member of the United States Senate.