

PROBE OF FETAL RESEARCH; UNIV. OF PITTSBURGH TARGETED

In September, the University of Pittsburgh agreed to have its fetal tissue research practices independently reviewed by the Washington, D.C. law firm of Hyman, Phelps & McNamara. In August, we called upon the Pennsylvania Auditor General to launch such an investigation. We are delighted that our effort was successful.

Over the summer, we learned that Judicial Watch was representing the Center for Medical Progress in a quest to obtain documentation of alleged human organ harvesting at Pitt. According to their probe, organs have been harvested while the baby's heart is still beating. The University has steadfastly denied wrongdoing.

On August 17, Bill Donohue wrote to Pennsylvania Auditor General, Timothy L. DeFoor, asking him to determine whether state and federal funds are being used by Pitt for arguably criminal activity.

Donohue wrote in support of State Rep. Kathleen Rapp, and Sean Parnell, who is running for a U.S. Senate seat; both initially called for an investigation. He also wrote to Patrick Gallagher, Pitt's Chancellor, Dr. Anantha Shekhar, Dean of the School of Medicine, and David Seldin, Assistant Vice Chancellor for News.

In our news release that same day, we printed the email address of the Auditor General, asking our subscribers to contact him. Thousands did, and their effort paid dividends.

Is Pitt involved in a fetal organ "chop shop"? We do not know. But we need to find out without delay.

"If it is true," Donohue said in his letter to the Auditor

General, “as some doctors have said, that in order to perform some of these procedures, ‘The baby’s going to have to be either born alive or be killed immediately prior to delivery,’ then justice demands that a thorough investigation take place. I urge you to do so.”

In February, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Committee on Pro-Life Activities issued an excellent statement on the propriety of human fetal tissue research. It began by emphasizing that “the dignity and inviolability of human life at every stage of development is a foundational principle of any truly civilized society.”

Regarding this kind of research, it implored the government, which allows abortion, not to “add injury to insult by treating the innocent abortion victim as a convenient laboratory animal for research protocols deemed unethical when applied to other members of the human family.”

If Pitt has nothing to hide, then so be it. But if some of the horrible accusations are true, then it must cease and desist and be held accountable. We are pleased to have played an important role in getting to the bottom of this issue.

DIMARZIO EXONERATED

The Most Reverend Nicholas DiMarzio, Bishop of Brooklyn, was exonerated in September by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith at the Vatican of charges that he sexually abused minors. Anyone who knew anything about him, as well as the lawyer who sued him, knew he was innocent from the get-go.

It is a credit to New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan, who was authorized by the Vatican to conduct an investigation, that he

took this assignment seriously by hiring a law firm that retained former FBI Director Louis Freeh to do this job.

In November 2019, Mitchell Garabedian, an unethical lawyer, announced that he was suing DiMarzio for abusing an 11-year-old boy, Mark Matzek, when he was a young priest in the 1970s.

DiMarzio categorically denied the charges and Garabedian took several months before he acted.

In June 2020, Garabedian said he found another “victim” who said he was abused around the same time as Matzek. Once again, the Boston-based attorney did not move quickly against DiMarzio, settling for a PR smear of the bishop; he eventually followed through.

The alleged second victim, Samier Tadros, said DiMarzio abused him in Holy Rosary Church in the Archdiocese of Newark. Yet as the bishop said, Tadros “did not attend the parish or the parish school and does not appear to have been Catholic.”

Bishop DiMarzio is an honorable man. He should never have had to go through these ordeals.

ELITES ARE BENT ON DIVIDING US

The ruling class wants to divide us. They can't seem to get enough division, whether it be along racial, ethnic, class, or sex lines. Their favorite weapon is race, and they are very good at exploiting it.

The NFL began the new football season by dividing us along racial lines. They did not begin the first game between Tampa

Bay and Dallas with the national anthem: they began by playing the black national anthem. All the players were told to lock arms, and they dutifully obliged.

The NFL has ordered every football game this season to begin with the Black national anthem. In other words, they believe that our allegiance to the nation is an anachronism, a relic from the past that must be discarded.

There is nothing that upsets the ruling class more than our national motto, "E Pluribus Unum." "Out of many, one" is seen as offensive by these people. What they prefer is "out of many, many." Unity is their enemy.

Where did NFL chief Roger Goodell get these ideas? From the grand wizards of higher education, of course. That's where anti-Americanism is seeded. It all starts with the Ivies.

Princeton University started its new academic year by mandating all in-coming freshman to sit through a barrage of presentations designed to make them hate the country, beginning with their own school. For example, they had to sit through a video that featured a Princeton professor, Dan-el Padilla Peralta, who instructed them to "tear down this place." Why? Because President Woodrow Wilson was once president of Princeton and he is accused of being a racist.

Peralta told the students that free speech should not be seen as a First Amendment right; it should instead be seen as a "privilege." The only speech he approves of is "free speech and intellectual discourse that is [sic] flexed to one specific aim, and that aim is the promotion of social justice, and an anti-racist social justice at that."

It does not matter that this man is an illiterate: what matters is that he is seen by his white superiors as a useful idiot who is doing their bidding. His job is secure.

The graduating class of 2021 at Columbia University did not

come together last spring to celebrate their achievement. Instead, multiple ceremonies were held, all designed to divide students. There were graduation events for Native Americans (whose ancestors migrated here like the rest of us), Asians, "Latinx" (the ruling class hates Latino and Latina, which refer to male and female, so they invented a sex-neutral term), and African Americans.

Columbia even had a ceremony for "first generation and/or low-income community" students. Nor did they forget homosexuals or the sexually challenged: they held a "Lavender" graduation for the "LGBTIAQ+" community. (So glad they inserted the plus.) The reason why southpaws didn't have their own event is because they have not been recognized as an aggrieved segment of society. But who knows what the future might bring?

Harvard was one of the first colleges or universities to hold separate graduation ceremonies for blacks. When Harvard is not busy denying Asian students admission because it has too many of them, it is concentrating on dividing white and black students. What it started has now been mimicked by dozens of colleges, and many offer segregated residential halls as well. "Separate but equal," which was once seen as racist, is now being seen as laudatory. No doubt the Klan would agree.

The quest for racial division has crept into the elementary and secondary schools as well. It would be hard to beat the curriculum adopted by the public school system of Evanston, Illinois.

Students in grades three through five are told that "it is important to disrupt the Western nuclear family." Why? Because of the assumption that this is "the best/proper way to have a family." And you know where that idea came from—white people.

In the third grade lesson plans on "whiteness," students learn that "There is a belief that a 'normal' family consists of a mom, dad, son, daughter, and pet. We've learned that this

isn't true." In other words, "broken homes" are as good as intact ones (that this is a cruel lie means nothing).

Why are they doing this? The deep thinkers sincerely believe that inequality can be overcome by convincing blacks, and others, that they are victims. The victimizers, naturally, are white people, especially white heterosexual Christian males. They invented sin.

Victimhood, however, does the very opposite of what the elites desire. It doesn't empower anyone to succeed—all it does is convince people that they are not responsible for their condition. But it does award them power of a sort: they can lay claim to special treatment, citing instances of discrimination that their ancestors endured.

This also empowers elites. It allows them to become social engineers, the ones who decide which group gets what. If Asians are too successful, adopt quotas to keep them in line. If African Americans are unsuccessful, adopt policies to push them ahead.

What we are witnessing is the ideological corruption of the ruling class. They are entitled to our wrath, not our respect.

INVENTING THE ENEMY

Ideological foes sometimes find it necessary to exaggerate the threats posed by their adversaries. In some cases, they may sincerely believe the worst about their foes, and conclude that it is not unethical to engage in a little hyperbole. Or they may do so because they want to make money by ginning up their base, hoping to cash in on their false narrative. There are also times when they get so creative as to come close to

inventing an enemy.

Two current examples of this propagandistic ploy can be seen in the writings of those who are issuing dire warnings about Christian nationalists and white supremacists. The former is a clear example of inventing the enemy, and the latter is a gross exaggeration. But this hasn't stopped left-wing authors and organizations from their bogeyman thesis.

Hardly a week goes by without some pundit claiming that the United States is being taken over by Christian nationalists. Accusations are being made that are completely without foundation, and few in the media are taking them to task.

Proponents of this view like to point to the presence of a few Christian signs that were evident in the Jan. 6 Capitol riot. This has had almost no effect on most Americans, and with good reason: those who stormed the Capitol were men and women who came to express their anger at the American ruling class. It was not an exercise in Christian nationalism. But to those who distrust white Christian patriotic Americans, the signs were proof that Christian nationalists are on the march.

No one beats Samuel L. Perry, a sociologist at the University of Oklahoma. He said, "The Capitol Insurrection was as Christian nationalist as it gets." His baseless charge was endorsed by the likes of Thomas B. Edsall of the New York Times and Americans United for Separation of Church and State. Merely asserting that culpability belongs to Christian nationalists is all that matters these days. No proof is required.

Robert P. Jones is another author who is sold on the threat of Christian nationalists. Looking at the Capitol riot, he is convinced that "a significant number of the attackers on Jan. 6 were Christian nationalists and white supremacists." He said he spotted a Christian flag at the event, adding that "Many people may not be familiar with it." Good point: We took a

poll of our Catholic League staff and no one had ever heard of it.

If the presence of a little-known Christian flag is enough to convince some activists and pundits that Jan. 6 was a Christian nationalist uprising, then it should follow that the burning of the American flag at Black Lives Matter and Antifa rallies—it happened regularly—is overwhelming proof of their anti-American agenda. They are the real threat to peace and safety, not Christian nationalists, whoever they are.

Author Katherine Stewart also maintains that Christian nationalists are a menace to society. In March last year, she cited evidence that Christian nationalists are “running the country.” Her proof? A remark made by President Trump that “by Easter” the Covid crisis would ease. That was all the evidence she needed—his dropping of the “E-word.”

Andrew Whitehead is a sociologist at Indiana University-Perdue University Indianapolis who wrote a book on Christian nationalists with Samuel Perry. Two years ago he said that Christian nationalists “think you have to be Christian to be truly American.” He did not quote anyone to that effect. Quite frankly, as one who runs in Christian circles, I never heard anyone make such a stupid comment.

Perry and Whitehead are quite the dynamic duo. They argue that if someone believes the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution are divinely inspired documents, that proves they are Christian nationalists. The bar is obviously not set very high.

According to Perry, no one epitomizes the mind-set of Christian nationalism better than evangelical pastor Greg Locke. Edsall was so impressed by Perry’s observation that he cited Locke’s book, *This Means War*, as the definitive source of this dreaded movement.

Having never heard of Locke, I bought the book, which was

published last year before the election, and searched in vain for anything Locke said about Christian nationalism. He never mentions the term. The best I could find was one throw-away sentence near the end of the book where he says, "When it comes to an election, you'd better be a Christian first and a Christian last."

That was it. Most of the book is comprised of Protestant musings on the need for Christians to stand fast against challenges to our Judeo-Christian heritage. If this is supposed to be Exhibit A in the arsenal of those convinced that Christian nationalists are about to take over the nation, they had better retire before more people find out about their fairy tales.

The lies about Christian nationalism have real-life consequences. Three months ago, Anthea Butler, who teaches religious and African studies at the University of Pennsylvania, accused white evangelicals of posing "an existential crisis to us all." She said their ideas "may end up killing us all." It is this kind of incendiary comment that should be challenged with regularity, but never is. That's because Butler is black and white liberals don't have the guts to confront her.

Just as unnerving is the spectacle of states bent on adopting a new curriculum wherein teaching the truth about our Judeo-Christian heritage is considered taboo.

In Florida, one of the items deemed problematic for 7th graders holds that students should "Recognize how Judeo-Christian values influenced America's founding ideals and documents." Also found objectionable is the requirement that "Students will recognize the influence of the Protestant work ethic on economic freedom and personal responsibility."

Both of these declarations are indisputably true. The problem is with those who object to them, not those who applaud them.

Christian nationalism is not only a myth, it is a pernicious lie. We should be celebrating patriotic Americans who are Christian, not castigating them.

White supremacists do exist, but they are few in number and pose little danger to the Republic. This hasn't stopped those with a left-wing agenda from inflating their power. Wild generalizations about white people are being made with regularity, and not simply by radical authors.

Let's face it, white people, in general, have a difficult time defending themselves against racist comments. That's too bad because their reticence begets more attacks on them.

In his inaugural address, Joe Biden singled out white supremacy as a force to be reckoned with. He did not define what he meant by this term, nor did he offer any examples, though many reporters noted that he was referring to the January 6 Capitol riot.

David Horowitz, the former left-wing activist turned conservative, slammed Biden's remark as a "monstrous lie." The evidence supports him.

Are white people a threat to safety? The latest FBI statistics reveal that blacks, who are 12.5% of the population, comprise 58% of all murder arrests and 40% of all violent crimes. In New York City, whites are 33% of the population but account for only 2% of shootings. Blacks, who are 23% of the population, commit 75% of all shootings.

Christian Picciolini was a leader in the skinhead movement for a quarter century, so he should know who the white supremacists are. "It's the average American. It is our mechanics, it's our dentists, it's our teachers, lawyers, doctors, nurses and unfortunately that's the way it's turned into the last 30 years."

What is really unfortunate is the bigoted swipe at virtually

every white person. If what he said were true, then, to take one index, we should expect that the rate of violent crimes committed by whites would be very high, but it isn't. That's because the "average American" is not a white supremacist.

New York Times columnist Charles Blow is also guilty of making wild generalizations. In his piece on August 16, he says that the latest census figures are "terrifying" for "white nationalists." He does not explain who these people are, nor does he provide a scintilla of evidence that the "white power acolytes"—whoever they are—are terrified about the census.

The Anti-Defamation League (ADL), which was founded to combat anti-Semitism, but has more recently evolved into a left-wing activist organization, is leading the way with charges of white supremacy killings. It offers as an example of white supremacist violence the shootings at a Parkland, Florida high school, the Tree of Life synagogue killings in Pittsburgh, the shootings at the Poway Chabad in California, and a violent attack at a Walmart in El Paso, Texas.

The ADL's analysis is sophomoric and misleading.

Nikolas Cruz, 22, killed 17 and wounded 17 others at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland in 2018. He had been expelled from the school for disciplinary reasons and was a known racist, but he was not active in white supremacist organizations. When he was jailed, he attacked an officer.

In 2018, Robert Bowers entered the Tree of Life Synagogue and yelled "All Jews must die" as he opened fire on the congregants. When the National Council of Jewish Women issued a statement about the deadliest attack on the Jewish community in American history, they cited his anti-Semitism but said not a word about him being a white supremacist.

The Poway synagogue shootings in 2019 were committed by John Earnest, a young man who hated Jews and Muslims. The San Diego ex-nurse, who killed one woman, had no criminal record and had

no connection to any white supremacist group.

Patrick Crusius killed 22 people at a Walmart in El Paso in 2019. He said his targets were “Mexicans.” He was known for his anti-Mexican rants and most of those whom he killed had Spanish surnames.

These four tragedies were the work of very sick men, all of whom were bigots. But if we are to call every white racist shooter a white supremacist—when there is no evidence of ties to any such group—then we are not dealing with reality. Klansmen are white supremacists, and they are not your “average American.”

To be sure, there are violent white supremacists, but to slap the label “white supremacist” on every white bigoted thug is positively absurd. Those who do so are furthering a political agenda, and are not interested in telling the truth.

What is perhaps most disconcerting about this contrived scare-mongering about Christian nationalists and white supremacists is the relatively little attention given to Antifa and Black Lives Matter. They were responsible for over 600 riots last year, resulting in death and destruction. Yet we only hear about calls to investigate the Jan. 6 riot, and not these serial acts of violence. This is pure politics, having nothing to do with a sincere interest in law and order.

SO WHEN DOES LIFE BEGIN, MR. PRESIDENT?

“Life begins at conception, that’s the Church’s judgment. I accept it in my personal life.” That is what Vice President

Joe Biden said in 2012, echoing what he said in 2008.

"I respect those who believe life begins at the moment of conception. I don't agree, but I respect that." That is what President Biden said recently.

The science did not change, Mr. Biden, and neither has the Catholic Church's teaching on this subject. So why did you?

If life does not begin at conception, Mr. Biden, then when does it begin?

Does life begin when the baby's spinal cord, nervous system, gastrointestinal system, heart and lungs develop? That would be during the first four weeks from conception.

Does it begin when the heart begins to beat? That would be four weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby's head develops? That would be five weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby's nose forms and his or her fingers begin to develop? That would be six weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby's toes appear? That would be seven weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby's elbows bend? That would be eight weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby's genitals develop? That would be nine weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby's fingernails form? That would be ten weeks after conception.

Does it begin when the baby kicks, can hear, has a strong grip and a strong heartbeat? That would be during the second trimester.

Does it begin at birth?

Does it begin sometime after birth?

When, Mr. Biden, does life begin? And why is science, and the teachings of your religion, wrong on this subject? Where is your evidence, Mr. Biden, that they are wrong? We need to know as this is literally a matter of life and death.

SLANDERING ST. SERRA

The California legislature recently passed a bill that was based on a vicious lie: it contends that St. Junípero Serra was responsible for the mass murder of Indians in the 18th century. The purpose of the bill is to replace a statue of Serra at the Capitol in Sacramento with a new monument that celebrates the indigenous population. It was sent to Gov. Gavin Newsom for him to sign.

The bill is not only based on bad history, it is a slanderous attack on the one man who actually did stand up for the rights of Indians at the time.

Here's what it says: "Enslavement of both adults and children, mutilation, genocide, and assault on women were all part of the mission period initiated and overseen by Father Serra."

In 2014, a year before Pope Francis canonized Serra, Bill Donohue read many books on the priest. He did so knowing that some of the Church's detractors would exploit the occasion in 2015, seeking to blame Serra for the offenses committed by the Spaniards. The result was the publication of a monograph, "The Noble Legacy of Father Serra." (It can be found on the Catholic League's website; a shorter version is also

available.)

Known as the greatest missionary in U.S. history, Serra traveled 24,000 miles, baptizing and confirming thousands of persons, mostly Indians (in 1777 the Vatican authorized the Franciscan priest to administer the sacrament of confirmation, usually the reserve of the bishop). He had one goal—to facilitate eternal salvation for the Indians of North America.

Not only did Serra not initiate or approve the inhumane treatment of the Indians, he led the protests against it. Importantly, the Spanish Crown ultimately agreed with his position.

Some of the Spanish colonizers did mistreat the Indian women. But Serra not only objected, he took specific measures to stem the tide of abuse.

Charging Serra with genocide is obscene. Genocide is what Hitler did to the Jews. Serra never killed anyone. Those making this mind-boggling accusation are literally creating a narrative that has no basis in fact. Hitler put Jews in ovens; the missionaries put the Indians to work, paying them for their labor.

Serra employed Indians as teachers, and the missionaries taught them how to be masons, carpenters, blacksmiths, and painters. They were also taught how to sell and buy animals, and were allowed to keep their bounty. Women were taught spinning, knitting, and sewing.

Does this sound like the Nazis?

Professor Gregory Orfalea, author of *Journey to the Sun: Junípero Serra's Dream and the Founding of California*, published by Scribner in 2014, writes that “To the Indian, he [Serra] was loving, enthusiastic, and spiritually and physically devoted.”

Salvatore J. Cordileone and Jose H. Gomez, the archbishops of San Francisco and Los Angeles, respectively, wrote a great piece on St. Serra in the Wall Street Journal. They recommend that the statue of Serra, which was torn down last year during the riots and is now in storage, be returned to the state's Capitol, along with a new monument honoring the indigenous Californians.

The bill sent to Gov. Newsom is the product of disinformation promoted by Black Lives Matter. It is propaganda, not scholarship.

We enlisted our email subscribers to contact Gov. Newsom about this outrageous bill.

THOUGHT CONTROL IN SCHOOLS MUST END

The Virginia Supreme Court made a wise decision when it said it would not accept a challenge to a lower court ruling that required Loudoun County Public Schools to reinstate a teacher who was punished for not acknowledging that boys can be girls, and vice versa.

The victim in this case, Tanner Cross, argued that his Christian convictions did not permit him to lie about sex transitioning. He knows it is child abuse. So does every honest person who knows anything about the subject, which unfortunately excludes many in the healthcare profession and education.

The school district violated this teacher's freedom of speech as well as freedom of religion. It had the gall to maintain

that Cross was suspended not for his speech but for the “disruption” he caused at a school board meeting in May.

He was being sanctioned because of what civil libertarian Harry Kalven once called the “heckler’s veto.” In short, this means that those who are upset about someone’s speech can effectively veto his First Amendment right by holding him responsible for their planned, or actual, disruptive behavior.

This is not a matter of speculation. In 1949, the U.S. Supreme Court overthrew the conviction of a suspended Catholic priest who gave an incendiary speech in Chicago. A riot took place outside the hall where he spoke, and he was held accountable for the mob’s behavior. The high court overturned his conviction. Had it not done so, it would have been the death knell to robust speech of any kind.

There was another dustup in June in Loudoun County when parents objected to the adoption of critical race theory (CRT). School officials mandated, without offering any proof that there was a problem with racism in the district, that all teachers accept the racist dogma associated with this ideology.

An economist who lives in this area, Max B. Sawicky, recently defended the school district for ordering teachers to abide by CRT. In an article posted by The New Republic, he lashed out at parents and teachers who objected to it. He denied that CRT was racist. He is wrong.

“White identity is inherently racist; white people do not exist outside the system of white supremacy.” Those are the words of Robin DiAngelo, one of the gurus of this pernicious brand of hate speech.

Ironically, those who live in Loudoun are mostly white privileged people, the very ones seen as racists by CRT activists. Sawicky brags that “Loudoun is one of the richest counties in the United States,” where “Joe Biden received 62

percent of the vote.”

These are precisely the kind of people who are most likely to deny that there are only two sexes. Not surprisingly, Sawicky berates “Christian fundamentalist teachers” who object to having their religious rights abrogated by sexually confused elites. He also rails against “anti-CRT fanatics” who object to branding all white people as racists.

More important, there is no shortage of left-wing totalitarians who want to use the power of the state to dictate how people think about transgenderism and CRT. Their penchant for thought control makes these people the most dangerous segment in American society today. They need to be resisted and defeated.

NEW YORK TIMES OBJECTS TO CHAOS!

No newspaper in the country likes protests more than the New York Times. There is a qualifier, though, as made clear in the September 8th edition.

Michelle Cottle is a member of the editorial board of the New York Times. “Chaos at the School Board Meeting” is the title of her editorial-page column. She does not like chaos. To be more precise, she does not like the politics of those creating chaos at school board meetings, many of whom object to mask mandates and left-wing exercises in thought control.

Cottle opens her diatribe with this screamer, “America’s school board meetings are out of control.” What’s wrong with that? After all, the Times all but cheered Black Lives Matter

and Antifa last year when they took to the streets engaging in mayhem. These thugs took part in over 600 riots, resulting in a considerable loss of life and property.

Why is “chaos” at school board meetings objectionable, but not the truly “out of control” violence of Black Lives Matter and Antifa?

Cottle cites as an example of school board “chaos” the meetings in Loudoun County, Virginia. She says, quite rightly, that critical race theory and a transgender-laden curriculum have “drawn the wrath of parents.” With good reason.

Unlike her, these “chaotic” parents object to teachers being forced to accept the racist dogma that defines critical race theory. They also object to teachers being punished for refusing to call a boy a girl, and vice versa (the school was forced by the courts to reinstate the teacher). Another problem for Cottle are parents who worry about their children being “indoctrinated or otherwise manipulated” by educators. What she says is actually worse than this—the indoctrination is in full swing at our nation’s leading colleges and universities.

The good news is that Cottle and her colleagues admit that conservative parents are pushing back against highly politicized school boards. If there is one good thing that the pandemic has wrought, it is a new awareness on the part of previously unsuspecting parents of the extent to which education is being corrupted by left-wing ideologues. What the New York Times fears most is “power to the people.”

GARLAND SMEARS PRO-LIFE ACTIVISTS

The controversy over a Texas pro-life law has led some to make irresponsible remarks, and no one has topped Attorney General Merrick Garland. The law, which forbids doctors from performing an abortion on a mother carrying a baby whose heartbeat can be detected, provoked Garland to make totally unfounded claims of violence on the part of pro-life activists.

On September 6th, Garland said, "We will not tolerate violence against those seeking to obtain or provide reproductive health services, physical obstruction or property damage in violation of the FACE Act." This indictment of pro-life activists is without merit. Indeed, it is a despicable smear against them.

If pro-life Americans are so violent, Garland should be able to rattle off the names of abortionists whom they have killed. In the 21st century, there have been four such killings: one in 2009 and three in 2015. Two men, both ex-cons, were responsible, and neither was assisted or associated with a pro-life group. They acted alone.

In 2009, Dr. George Tiller was killed by Scott Roeder. When it happened, Bill Donohue condemned it. "We have to get the message out that life means we have to respect all life," he told CBS Evening News, "including somebody as bad as Dr. Tiller was."

Tiller, by his own admission, performed over 60,000 abortions. His specialty was killing babies in utero who were nearly born, or were partially born. Hence his nickname, George "The Killer" Tiller.

Roeder was a deranged man who was hardly representative of pro-life activists. He had been diagnosed as schizophrenic,

and got into trouble when he stopped taking his medication. His wife testified that she thought he was bipolar, and his brother also spoke about his mental problems. He had previously been arrested for carrying explosives, and he spent time in prison for other violations.

In 2015, Robert Lewis Dear Jr. killed three people in a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado. He had previously been arrested and convicted for carrying a "long blade knife" and illegal possession of a loaded gun.

His mental state was worse than that of Roeder's. A judge ordered him to undergo a mental competency exam to see if he was sufficiently competent to represent himself. After fielding the results, the judge ruled that Dear was not mentally fit to stand trial: he cited findings that he suffered from a "delusional disorder." Dear was sentenced indefinitely to a Colorado state mental hospital.

It makes no sense for anyone who champions the abortion-rights cause to worry about being killed because of the Texas law. Roeder and Dear were lone wolves, both of whom had a criminal record and mental problems.

Garland, being a pro-abortion proponent who works for our "devout Catholic" pro-abortion president, has been noticeably silent on threats against pro-life activists. Yet just this summer innocent pro-life Catholic demonstrators were harassed by pro-abortion militants in Brooklyn, New York, and a Catholic church in Louisville, Colorado was defaced with pro-abortion slogans.

On September 13th, U.S. Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, who dismissed a challenge to the Texas law, was subjected to intimidation when his home was descended upon by pro-abortion activists. This came following a threat by extremists from ShutDownDC to "directly" confront Kavanaugh and his family.

If Garland were even-handed, he would know that pro-life

Americans have been violently attacked and been subjected to death threats for many years. There have been bomb threats against Catholic churches, firebombings of Catholic school busses with pro-life signs, calls for violence against pro-lifers on college campuses, and widespread acts of church vandalism.

And lest we forget, while the killing of unborn babies is legal, the fact remains that abortion clinics are a much more deadly place for children than they are for those who do the killing. Think about that, Mssrs. Garland and Biden.

MEDIA EXPLOIT THE POPE AGAIN

It is not the Catholic Church that is obsessed with sex, it is the media.

Of the six questions Pope Francis was asked aboard the papal plane on September 15, half were on sex: there were two questions on homosexuality and one on abortion. Yet the pope was not returning from a conference on sexuality and the family—he was returning from Budapest and Slovakia after addressing issues that had absolutely nothing to do with the media's obsession.

Most media accounts said nothing about the pope's comments on homosexuality, and they gave brief mention to his remarks on abortion. That's because most in the big media strongly disagree with the Catholic Church's teachings on these issues. Therefore, we will tell you what the media will not.

When asked about "the recognition of homosexual marriages," Pope Francis was quite blunt. "Marriage is a sacrament, the Church has no power to change the sacraments as the Lord has

instituted them.” In reference to civil unions, which are open to many parties, not just homosexuals, he said he understands that “the States have the possibility civilly to support them.” What he said next was salient. “But marriage is marriage.”

The pope continued with his comments on homosexual marriages. “The Lord is good, he desires the salvation of all, but please, don’t make the Church deny its truth,” he said. “Many people with a homosexual orientation approach penance, they seek counsel from the priests, the Church helps them, but the sacrament of marriage is something else.”

The pope was even more precise when he spoke about abortion.

“It’s more than a problem, it’s murder, whoever has an abortion kills, no half words. Take any book on embryology for medical students. The third week after conception, all the organs are already there, even the DNA...it is human life, this human life must be respected, this principle is so clear! To those who cannot understand, I would ask this question: is it right to kill a human life to solve a problem? Is it right to hire a hitman to kill a human life? Scientifically it is a human life. Is it right to take it out to solve a problem? That is why the Church is so hard on this issue, because if it accepts this it would be like accepting daily murder.”

While the media downplayed the pope’s comments on some subjects, they gave much profile to his statement on pro-abortion politicians in the United States. He was asked about the propriety of them receiving Communion.

However, the brief statement that Pope Francis made on this subject lacked the clarity of what he said about homosexual marriage and abortion. Regrettably, this allowed the media to spin his words to suit their politics.

The pope acknowledged that there are Catholics who are “not in the community” and therefore “cannot take Communion.” He

certainly made plain his preference for priests to address this issue in a pastoral manner, but his comments were anything but precise.

“I am not very familiar with the details of the United States...But if you’re close, tender, and give Communion? It’s a hypothesis. The pastor knows what to do at all times. But if you go beyond the pastoral dimension of the Church you become a politician, and you can see this in all the non-pastoral condemnations of the Church.”

The media were not put off by his rambling response. Instead, they seized upon it to defend their man, Joe Biden.

“Pope: No Place for Politics in Biden Communion Flap.” This headline, courtesy of the Associated Press, was picked up by literally dozens of media outlets across the nation. But is it accurate? At best, it was a stretch; at worst, it was dishonest. However, the media know that many people only read the headline, so they have a vested interest in spinning things their way. In short, the pope’s ambiguous remarks were quickly given clarity by his fans in the media.

The media do not want American bishops to criticize, much less sanction, pro-abortion Catholics such as President Biden and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. They know that if their favorite politicians are tagged as Catholic phonies, it will hurt their ideological agenda. So they jump at every chance to protect them, even if it means twisting the pope’s words. It’s really not hard to figure out.

We have seen this game played many times before. When the pope says something the media don’t like, such as on homosexual marriage and abortion, they either don’t report it or they give it short shrift. But when he says something they like—or when his imprecise language gives them an opening to interpret things their way—they give it much attention.

The media have been using Pope Francis from the beginning of his pontificate. He doesn’t deserve this treatment from

anyone, especially not from those who identify as objective journalists.