

You may never have heard of CBR, but Barack Obama certainly has. A former Obama White House official has written a book in which he argues that CBR's fierce protests against Obama's 2009 commencement address at Notre Dame set in motion a series of events which led to the failure of Hilary Clinton's bid for the presidency.

By the start of his first term it was clear to Obama that the leaders of many of America's largest "Catholic" universities were self-promoting careerists who longed to appropriate the celebrity of his historic presidency. He understood that they would gleefully permit him to use their schools as forums from which to make thinly-veiled political appeals to Catholic voters. By repeatedly speaking on the campuses of these influential universities, he could subtly suggest the Church's blessing on his deceptive outreach to the Catholic electorate.

His message would be a quest for "common ground" on abortion and many of the purported "faithful" (including his adoring student fans) would be taken in by this scam. He would urge Catholic voters to overlook his belligerent promotion for radical abortion rights in exchange for his government programs which supposedly "reduced the need" for abortion." But the premise of his offer was painfully false: People may *want* elective abortion, but no one needs it. And the programs he touted were merely more liberal Democrat "free stuff," none of which has ever reduced the abortion rate even slightly.

The Obama official who rather unwittingly blew the whistle on this fraud is Michael Wear, and the title of his book is *Reclaiming Hope: Lessons Learned In The Obama White House ...* Thomas Nelson (2017). Wear had proposed the use of soothing compromise rhetoric in a campaign he called "Notre Dame vision." This flim-flam had already proven itself effective at deceiving marginal Catholics who (like many Evangelicals), lacked moral clarity.

But to Wear's dismay, Obama over-reacted to the intensity and duration of our protests at Notre Dame, and decided that all outreach to pro-lifers was futile. He mistakenly concluded that he was being opposed by the entire pro-life movement, but our protests were actually being waged only by CBR and a handful of coworkers. As a consequence of this misperception, he began to speak in the pro-abortion idiom which more accurately reflected the brutality of his true abortion sentiments.

Hilary Clinton, who theretofore had also been feigning moderation on abortion, quickly followed Obama's lead and adopted the harsh rhetoric of Planned Parenthood. She thereby drove out of the Democrat Party precisely the numbers of pro-life Catholic, Evangelical and Democrat voters by which she ultimately lost the presidency. Several political commentators have since confirmed this analysis:

A November 9, 2016 press release issued by Democrats For Life Of America asserted that "Hillary Clinton and the Democratic Party decisively lost Tuesday's election, thanks in large part to the party's extreme abortion position, which alienated would-be Clinton voters."

CatholicNewsAgency.com, November 11, 2016, "In the wake of Hillary Clinton's electoral defeat in Tuesday's presidential election, pro-life Democrats and faith voters criticized the party's pro-abortion support and lack of religious outreach."

Wear says this catastrophic political blunder was provoked by CBR's success in sabotaging what was to have Obama's victory lap at Notre Dame. The new president had never been forced to endure public criticism in the form of bad press. He didn't like it and he didn't know how to deal with it. For weeks, each embarrassing article about our protests deepened his anger.

The *South Bend Tribune*, on April 28, 2009, ran a story headlined "Anti-Obama protesters splash graphic abortion images by plane, truck around South Bend:" It read that "A group opposed to President Barack Obama's upcoming commencement speech protested high above the Notre Dame campus Tuesday.

The group, The Center For Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR), had a ... plane circle the campus starting about 5:30 p.m. with a 50-by-100 foot banner of a dead 10-week-old fetus behind it."

The *Chicago Tribune*, March 25, 2009, featured a headline which read, "Abortion debate dogs Obama's plan to deliver commencement address." An abortion debate was exactly what Obama was attempting to stifle.

The *Los Angeles Times*, March 25, 2009, had earlier published a story titled "Obama's scheduled Notre Dame speech draws criticism." Referring impliedly to CBR, it reported that Mr. Obama's use of Notre Dame as a vehicle through which to deceive the Catholic believers (our words, not theirs) regarding abortion resulted in the "triggering [of] protests by national antiabortion groups." The "national abortion groups" were basically CBR.

The *New York Times*, May 18, 2009, published a story headlined "At Notre Dame, Obama Calls for Civil Tone in Abortion Debate." The article reported that "A plane overhead pulled a banner with a picture of the feet of an aborted fetus." The article also noted that our protests "were amplified on national airwaves," and that visitors "approaching campus for the [commencement] ceremony were likewise greeted by photographs of mangled fetuses." By "civil," he meant no abortion photos.

NPR (National Public Radio) posted a similar story May 14, 2009, headlined "Obama's Notre Dame Visit Stirs Passions," with a photo of a CBR tow plane pulling an aerial billboard above a caption which read "A banner towed by a ... plane is seen flying past the Golden Dome and statue of the Virgin Mary at the University of Notre Dame campus in South Bend, Indiana, on April 29. Anti-abortion activists [read CBR] have stepped up such displays in the weeks leading up to President Obama's planned address on campus Sunday." The article also referred to "[CBR] Trucks imprinted with similar photos [which] ply the streets of the surrounding City of South Bend." The last thing Obama wanted regarding abortion was to stir passions.

WND.com, May 6, 2009, headlined "Turbulence Surrounds Notre Dame 'Abortion Plane.'" The story was described as an "Exclusive" report "... on the success of [an aborted] fetus banner protesting Obama speech."

The *Los Angeles Times*, May 18, 2009, headlined a story, "At Notre Dame, Obama tackles abortion debate." The article reported that "... cargo trucks with pictures of bloodied fetuses circled campus." Obama didn't "tackle" the debate; it tackled him.

The *Washington Post*, “Antiabortion Protesters Converge on Notre Dame Before Obama's Visit.” Wednesday, May 13, 2009. It reported that “As some students kicked a soccer ball and others stretched out on the bountiful lawns of the University of Notre Dame, the peace of a sunny graduation-week afternoon was broken by the incessant buzz of an airplane engine overhead.” Annoying, eh? “Churning in circles above the slate rooftops and the famous golden statue of the Virgin Mary, a small plane towed a banner depicting the remains of an aborted fetus and the words ‘10 Week Abortion.’”

Then it explained that “The graphic message is directed at President Obama, who will arrive Sunday to a campus that has been jolted by abortion opponents who object to the pro-abortion-rights Democrat delivering a commencement address at the nation's largest Catholic university.” This is not the sort of coverage the president was accustomed to suffering.

The *Washington Post*, May 18, 2009, ran a story titled “Obama Addresses Abortion Protests in Commencement Speech at Notre Dame.” CNN ran a story describing those protests headlined “Obama faces Notre Dame speech backlash,” May 15, 2009. That “backlash” was largely CBR.

Our initial goal had been to ruin Notre Dame’s graduation ceremony so thoroughly that no other Catholic school would dare to invite Obama to campus. Imagine the bogus legitimacy Obama might have garnered among Catholic voters had he, hypothetically, been the graduation speaker every year for eight straight years at Notre Dame, DePaul, St. John’s, Georgetown, St. Louis, Loyola, Fordham, and Boston College. But by God’s grace, we managed to dissuade every other Catholic university from risking the chaos we created at Notre Dame. Not a single Catholic school ever invited him again.

In fact, The *Washington Times*, December 5, 2016 (“Notre Dame waffles on Donald Trump invitation after Obama caused ‘circus’”), reported that university president Fr. John Jenkins, when asked by the campus newspaper if he would invite President Trump to deliver a commencement talk, was still so traumatized by CBR’s earlier assault that he admitted “the 2009 Commencement was a bit of a political circus, and I think I’m conscious that that day is for graduates and their parents – and I don’t want to make the focus something else.” “Something else” like dead babies.

Obama finally had enough of this humiliation and essentially said to h*** with the pro-life community. He and Clinton would try to win with pro-abortion millennials, single women, and minorities. The fallout from this stumble can be easily quantified: In 2008, Obama disingenuous courtship of pro-life Democrats was rewarded with 54% of the Catholic vote. By 2012, his stark abandonment of pro-lifers had driven his share of the Catholic vote down to 50%. When 2016 arrived, Clinton’s ill-concealed contempt for pro-life voters left her with only 45% of the Catholic vote. CBR wasn’t responsible for this entire electoral collapse, but Michael Wear, who watched his abortion plan unravel from his office at the White House, says CBR’s Notre Dame protests started it all.

TheDailyCaller.com, April 11, 2017 published a story called “Pence Makes Some Students Feel ‘Unsafe’ At Notre Dame.” The report says “Students ... are agitating to cancel ... [an invitation for Vice President Pence to speak at commencement]” because they believe he is “racist, sexist, homophobic, [or to quote one wag, what about arachnophobia?] xenophobic, offensive or ostracizing to members of our community.” The article suggests that “The anti-Pence campaign is just another insult to the Trump administration” and that “This year, apparently fearing student protest, the university invited Pence instead.”

TheDailyCaller.com, April 11, 2017 published a story called “Pence Makes Some Students Feel ‘Unsafe’ At Notre Dame.” The report says “Students ... are agitating to cancel ... [an invitation for Vice President Pence to speak at commencement]” because they believe he is “racist, sexist, homophobic, [or to quote one wag, what about arachnophobia?] xenophobic, offensive or ostracizing to members of our community.” The article suggests that “The anti-Pence campaign is just another insult to the Trump administration” and that “This year, apparently fearing student protest, the university invited Pence instead.”

Blogs.abcnews.com, “In the President's Hunt for 'Common Ground' on Abortion, a Fault Line

Emerges”
May 22, 2009

“White House officials said that they talk about reducing demand or the need for abortions, rather than reducing the number, because they're taking a broader view of the issue -- improving the women's lives, providing them with support.”

The Blaze, April 26, 2013, put up a piece on Barack Obama’s speech to Planned Parenthood that day which counted three times the president referred to abortion, but I noted that he couldn’t manage to actually say the word. He observed that “Forty-two states have introduced laws that would ban or severely limit access to a woman’s *right to choose*.” He then said “In North Dakota, they just passed a law that outlaws your *right to choose*.” He closed with “In Mississippi, a ballot initiative was put forward that could ... have outlawed your *right to choose* ...” To choose what, he never did not say. Abortion is the evil which dare not speak its name. The same was also once true of slavery.

The New York Times, March 27, 2017, ran a column headlined, “Can Democrats Win Back Catholics?” It was written by Thomas Groom, a professor of theology and religious education at Boston College. His analysis is important both for what he got right and what got wrong. Parenthetically, he calls himself a “traditional Catholic,” though he’s

nothing of the sort -- if opposition to candidates who glorify abortion is the standard which qualifies as “traditional.” In this regard, it might be fair to say that he is as genuinely Catholic as is Boston College (or for that matter, Notre Dame). He correctly notes, however, that “In heavily Catholic states like Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Michigan ... [Hillary Clinton] lost by a hair – the last by less than 1%.” He adds that “A handful more of Catholic votes per parish in those states would have won her the election.”

Invoking the equally specious claim that government stimulus spending boosts the economy and thereby reduces abortion rates, ReligionNews.com, June 28, 2016 ran a story named “How Some Abortion Opponents Get ‘Pro-Life’ Radically Right.” It cites the Guttmacher Institute for the proposition that “75 percent of abortions in America occur when families can’t afford a child.” To advance this manifestly dubious claim, the article argues that a recent decline in the abortion rate among higher-income women and a concomitant increase among the economically disadvantaged, means that poverty causes abortion, and therefore, it is “pro-life” to “vote for a candidate who is not ‘pro-life’ but will help the economy and the poor.” That *non sequitur* sounds suspiciously like a veiled reference to Barack Obama – except that Obama destroyed the economy, savaged the poor, and notwithstanding fraudulent abortion statistics to the contrary, almost certainly did not reduce abortion rates (or lower the sea levels).

Former Planned Parenthood clinic director Abby Johnson blogged on March 11, 2015 a post titled “Sorry Folks. Contraception Access Increases Abortions.” She quotes Ann Furedi, the president of The British Pregnancy Advisory Service (bpas), (whom I have debated), the UK’s largest abortion provider, who says that when anti-abortion activists contend that access to birth control does not bring down the abortion rate, “Arguably, they are right.” She then notes that author and abortion-supporting feminist Rosalind Pollack Petchesky actually claims that “extended practice of birth control will inevitably mean a rise in abortions!”

In the journal Public Discourse, September 13, 2012, in an article titled “Poverty, Abortion, and Budgets: Democrats For Life Need Better Arguments,” the authors debunk the notion that higher abortion rates among the poor mean poverty causes abortion. Political science professor Michael New goes further, saying “there is not one peer-reviewed study which shows that Medicaid spending or any other kind of welfare spending actually reduces the incidence of abortion.” He also contends that “There is ... no evidence that women respond to higher childbearing costs by obtaining abortions in greater numbers.

“I feel like its selfish on their part,” said Jonathan Boyle, a 21-year-old senior from Texas. “I guess ... protesters goals were to] try to ruin the graduation to make a point. I’m pro-life, but I think the money could be better spent by giving it to a local women’s shelter than by using it for a publicity stunt.” “Inside the Obama controversy,” May 14, 2009, CBS News.

Wear book: “Pro-life groups, most of which might as well be legally incorporated into the Republican Party, did not want to give a pro-choice president the victory of leading the charge to reduce abortions.” p. 111.

“Antiabortion Protesters Converge on Notre Dame Before Obama's Visit”

Washington Post Staff Writers
Wednesday, May 13, 2009

SOUTH BEND, Ind., May 12 -- As some students kicked a soccer ball and others stretched out on the bountiful lawns of the University of Notre Dame, the peace of a sunny graduation-week afternoon was broken by the incessant buzz of an airplane engine overhead.

Churning in circles above the slate rooftops and the famous golden statue of the Virgin Mary, a small plane towed a banner depicting the remains of an aborted fetus and the words "10 Week Abortion."

The graphic message is directed at President Obama, who will arrive Sunday to a campus that has been jolted by abortion opponents who object to the pro-abortion-rights Democrat delivering a commencement address at the nation's largest Catholic university.

The protests come at a time when the antiabortion movement is increasingly splintered amid a debate over goals and tactics. The activists' cause has been complicated by Obama, who has sought to ease tensions over an issue that has dogged politicians on the right and left for nearly three decades.

* * *

These days, however, a billboard greets drivers traveling to South Bend from Chicago. Trucks continually circle the campus bearing signs that say "Shame on Notre Dame" and "Judas and Jenkins Betrayed Jesus." Then there is the airplane, plying the skies several times a day for weeks.

‘People are weary of it,’ history professor R. Scott Appleby said. ‘I certainly feel this is not the best way to respect life. It makes the cause a circus.’

Wonkette.com, May 5, 2009, “A fringe Catholic group’s protest of Obama’s Notre Dame invitation is so nutty even conservative commentators disapprove.”

The article began “A Pew poll last week found that a majority of Catholics actually supported Notre Dame invitation to President Obama to give the commencement address.” The Wonkette blogger then observed that “conservative opponents are ramping up their outrage” but added that “nothing can hold a candle to the cuckoo ‘abortion plane’ which has been circling the campus for weeks now.” She reported that the plane was “Hired by the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform” (we actually owned it and four others before selling them off to a CBR supporter and our chief pilot – who still flies for us) and “trails a banner with a picture of a dead fetus and the words ‘10 Week Abortion.’” The story also describes “The group’s other banner [which] read, ‘Abortion is Terror’ [and includes another aborted baby photo].”

Then comes a rhetorical question, which she, of course, answers herself: “How crazy is this? So crazy that even David Brody, Christian Broadcasting Network commentator, thinks is a terrible idea: “Surely there has GOT to be a better way of communicating the pro-life message. Is abortion a nasty thing? Yes. But if you’re trying to win people to your side of the argument, these tactics don’t seem very helpful to the cause.”

We aren’t trying to “win people to our side;” we are trying to make abortion impossible to ignore or trivialize. It is a horrifying act of violence which kills a baby, and since millennials suffer acute failures of imagination (they who never need imagine anything because every image has been conceptualized for them -- on screens -- their entire lives), we must show them what they lack the vision to visualize.

CBS News reported a story May 14, 2009, which they called “Inside The Obama Controversy.” It characterized the president’s visit as having “prompted outrage from ... activists,” and as the activists who were most heavily invested in the Notre Dame protests, we can confirm that we were indeed “outraged.”

The article referred to a “special commencement issue” of the student newspaper (*The Observer*) which reported that “of the 345 letters it received on the issue authored by students, 74 percent were in favor of the invitation.” It also noted that the student groups who planned to protest the president’s visit “are pledging to be decorous.” CBR eschewed decorum and pledged to sabotage Mr. Obama’s snake-oil pitch with as much disruption as could lawfully be brought to bear. A spokesperson for “ND Response,” a “coalition of 12 anti-abortion student groups was

quoted as intending to be “careful not to detract from the seniors while remaining true to the Catholic pro-life mission of this university.”

But CBR believed that the best way to remain true to the Catholic mission of this university was to “detract from the seniors” with all of our might. This betrayal of trust couldn’t be permitted to work and we were determined to throw sand in its gears. We weren’t being petulant as we bore the students – even the most morally disoriented -- no personal animus, but we intended to reduce the odds of any other Catholic university extending a commencement invitation to the most viciously pro-abortion president in American history. By God’s grace, we did just that.

Someone named James Salt, who headed a group named “Catholics United,” claimed to oppose abortion but to support the speaking invitation in any event, because he saw Obama as a man of peace. He clearly didn’t like us because we had come to declare war. CBS News quoted him as complaining that “We believe the attacks on Notre Dame are really being orchestrated by those who’d like to make cheap political points rather than address the serious moral challenges facing our country” Cheap? The political points we worked so hard to score actually cost us a fortune! But every dollar proved to be money well-spent.

One graduating senior said “I guess” the aim of the protests “is to try to ruin the graduation to make a point.” Who says millennials lack analytical ability? Still perceptive, he then dismissed our protests as a “publicity stunt;” which is exactly what they were. We make no apology for generating the publicity required to convince every other Catholic college that inviting Barack Obama to deliver their commencement address would ruin their graduation as disastrously as we were now ruining Notre Dame’s.

The *Los Angeles Times*, March 25, 2009, had earlier published a story titled “Obama’s scheduled Notre Dame speech draws criticism.” Referring impliedly to CBR, it reported that Mr. Obama’s use of Notre Dame as a vehicle through which to deceive the Catholic faithful (our words, not theirs) regarding abortion resulted in the “triggering [of] protests by national antiabortion groups.” The White House issued a statement in advance of the president’s address which contained a revelation which was more ominous than the president’s staff may have realized: “Notre Dame” would be “one of the first universities President Obama will visit as president” Yes, but we made certain that none of them would be Catholic. “One of the first” signals more to come and as former Obama White House staffer Michael Wear implied, the initial plan was for as many of those future schools as possible to be Catholic. Thank God we disrupted this diabolical scheme.

Fr. Jenkins said “You cannot change the world if you shun the people you want to persuade.” Yet, after Notre Dame, Obama and Clinton changed the world by “shunning” the pro-life voters Democrats needed to persuade. They then defected to the pro-life presidential candidate in sufficient numbers to cost Clinton the White House.

On graduation day, the *New York Times* posted reporters’ comments describing commencement. One scribe remarked that “this is not a hostile crowd for President Obama and that “he was greeted by long, enthusiastic and sustained cheering” Perhaps recalling the CBR truck billboards which featured his photograph beside pictures of aborted babies, the president was quoted as saying “Each side will continue to make its case to the public with passion and conviction. But surely we can do so without reducing those with differing views to caricature.” Too late for that.

These posts described “about two dozen graduating seniors gathered at an anti-abortion vigil at the Grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes on campus.” Numbered among them were, no doubt, many who had expressed stronger opposition to our abortion photos than they had to Obama’s visit. A grotto is a cave, and these well-intentioned but misguided students couldn’t have made themselves more invisible or less relevant had they crawled into a hole in the ground. One is reminded of 1 Kings 19-17, in which the Prophet Elijah scurries into hiding in the face of the enemies he is supposed to be confronting: “There he went into a cave ... and the Word of the Lord came to him, ‘What are you doing here?’” God then commanded His prophet to wage war against those of God’s people who had betrayed His covenant. Why do liberals attack so aggressively and conservatives retreat so timidly?

CNN ran a story describing those protests headlined “Obama faces Notre Dame speech backlash,” May 15, 2009. Despite the demonstrations over the president’s appearance, the article reported that “Sixty percent of Catholic voters sampled in ... [a] Quinnipiac University said Notre Dame should not rescind its invitation” The White House said “This is a commencement ceremony, a special occasion for families to celebrate ... the president will understand that’s the most important aspect of the day” Translated from Obama-speak, that means Obama’s decision to spin abortion doesn’t diminish the celebratory aspect of the occasion, but our decision to protest his spin does.

The Weekly Standard, May 21, 2012, published a stunningly ironic story headlined, “Three Years After Honoring Obama, Notre Dame Sues Obama for Trampling First Amendment Rights.” The article describes Mr. Obama’s gleeful exploitation of his disingenuous commencement address as, “... an opportunity to speak to a bloc of swing voters (Catholics) in one of the reddest states that swung to Obama in 2008 (Indiana) about how we can work together despite our differences (the kind of rhetoric that launched his political stardom at the 2004

Democratic National Convention).” Just three years later, Notre Dame sued President Obama, arguing that the right of women to access abortion-inducing drugs “does not authorize the Government to force the University of Notre Dame ... to violate its own conscience by making it provide, pay for, and/or facilitate those services to others, contrary to its sincerely held religious beliefs.”

None of that seemed to matter much to Notre Dame Professor Jack Cowell, who claimed in an op-ed for the *South Bend Tribune*, that:

The Observer [school newspaper], deluged by letters to the editor, found that three-fourths of letters from students support the [Obama speaking] invitation. Support among graduating seniors was even higher. I teach a class at Notre Dame. This I cite to reveal that I have an interest in the welfare of the university and its students and to provide a basis for this observation: Opposition among students and faculty to hearing the president appears to be scant, even among those who did not vote for Obama.

The article ends with a quote from Alan Abramowitz, a political science professor at Emory University, who says, “Groups will use this [Notre Dame controversy and protest] to help their cause, but I am skeptical about the ability of any of them to influence public opinion on this issue” Wrong, wrong and wrong, professor. According to former Obama White House official Michael Wear, the ferocity of our protests decisively influenced the opinions of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton. They concluded (incorrectly) that CBR represented the entire pro-life movement (much of which actually opposed our plan to wreck Notre Dame’s Obama commencement) and that their fraudulent “abortion reduction” strategy, crafted to mislead and appease pro-life Democrats and left-leaning Catholics and Evangelicals, was likely to be rejected. This misunderstanding precipitated their decision to suspend virtually all “pro-life” outreach to the faith community, and they stopped trying to conceal their radical extremity regarding abortion. That miscalculation cost Hillary Clinton the support of just enough pro-life Democrat and independent voters to doom her candidacy. But thanks to lack of spiritual maturity in the confused minds (and hard hearts) of Frs. Jenkins and Reese, etc., she nearly pulled it off.

Widely read pro-life blogger Jill Stanek posted a related article at WND.com, May 6, 2009, headlined “Turbulence Surrounds Notre Dame ‘Abortion Plane.’” The story was described as an “Exclusive” report “... on success of [an aborted] fetus banner protesting Obama speech.”

For the past 10 days the Center For Bio-Ethical Reform [CBR] has been conducting and land campaign in, around and over the Notre Dame campus to educate students and faculty [as to] exactly what its intended May 17 commencement honoree, President Barack Obama supports by being pro-choice.

On the roads are CBR's 'Reproductive Choice Trucks,' six-paneled moving billboards with large signs ... [depicting various versions of Mr. Obama's face beside aborted baby photos].

Jill struck again on May 1 with a post titled "LIBS GO NUTS, REALLY NUTS, ABOUT 'ABORTION PLANE' FLYOVERS AT NOTRE DAME."

She quoted from what she called "Cunningham's absolutely fabulous, must read letter below," which I had addressed to students and parents angry and complaining that we forced Notre Dame to change the subject from celebration to shame:

Thank you for writing. As someone about to graduate from Notre Dame, you say you 'don't think it is fair to have your home bombarded with disgusting [and disturbing] images.' Come now, [REDACTED]: If these babies were just blobs of tissue, would you be so distressed at these pictures? How could the images be 'disgusting' unless abortion is 'disgusting?' And if you think abortion photos are "disturbing" who aren't you more disturbed by abortion itself? Why do you care more about your own 'comfort' than you care about the survival of the little children who are being slaughtered? Is that what the priests taught you at Notre Dame; that your comfort is more important than someone else's life?

You admit that the 'majority' of Notre Dame students voted for Mr. Obama. That means they must not be allowed to graduate in comfort. No one should be allowed to become comfortable with baby killing. Many of your classmates have had abortions and many more will have them in the future. Some of these students, at least those with functioning consciences, could be talked into saving their babies if they were forced to look at what abortion is and does. We know that from our extensive experience with these pictures. You can read their testimonials for yourself at www.abortionNO.org. These students need truth more than they need comfort. If pro-abortion students are going to revel in the presence of this serial-killer president, they need to squirm in the presence of the babies he is killing. Most abortion supporters want to be able to kill babies and have the evidence swept under the carpet. No more, [REDACTED]. It is only fair that pro-abortion students be forced to look at the carnage their votes are making possible. Then we will see if they are still so 'excited,' as you say, to have Mr. Obama address them.

You say Mr. Obama is coming to honor you. We are going to make your class look at the hidden reality for which he stands and then you can all better decide how much of an honor his presence actually confers upon you and your classmates. You say he is not coming to discuss abortion. That is correct, but he IS coming to signal that abortion should be of little concern to Catholics. We intend to forcefully rebut that contention, not with arguments, but with pictures. You find it 'disrespectful' that we would force our 'extremist' message on your class, but as I asked above, how could an abortion photo be 'extreme' unless abortion is 'extreme?' We find it disrespectful to butcher babies. If you think the use of the term 'butcher' is an exaggeration, then why do you find abortion photos so 'upsetting,' to use your term?

We want your family and the family of every graduating senior in Joyce Center to have these sickening pictures gaging them as they applaud the man who glorifies this carnage. Our avowed purpose is to respectfully, lawfully, ruin this ceremony; not to be vindictive but to force people to stop acting as though everything is normal at Notre Dame. It is not normal for a Catholic institution to honor a man who supports infanticide. The sewers of South Bend are literally running red with the blood of Notre Dame's children. We are going to figuratively pry open the manhole covers and force the entire university community to smell the stench of death. No more business as usual. I assure you that by the time the Class of 2009 has received their diplomas, both 'town and gown' will be more bothered by abortion than they ever dreamed possible. Every time they look at that diploma, framed on their wall, we want them to see a dead baby. Then perhaps they will take this issue as seriously as the graduate of a famous Catholic university is obligated to take it.

A December 8, 2016 post on LifeNews.com, headlined "Democrats Should Blame Planned Parenthood for Hillary Clinton Losing," contended that "The message is now clear: There is no room for pro-lifers in the Democrat Party."

A November 9, 2016 press release issued by Democrats For Life Of America asserted that "Hillary Clinton and the Democratic Party decisively lost Tuesday's election, thanks in large part to the party's extreme abortion position, which alienated would-be Clinton voters." The statement also contends that "We cautioned in our DNC [Democrat National Committee] Report – Make Room for Pro-Life Democrats & Achieve Party Goals Nationwide – that the party is slowly dying and on the way to being irrelevant if it does not start a dialogue with its pro-life members.' For years, Democrats have been eroding their base of pro-life voters as abortion opponents flee to the independent category and Republican Party." More to the point, the

release noted that “Standing on a severe party platform on abortion, Hillary Clinton lost soft Republicans, anti-abortion Independents, and millions of pro-life voters in her own party.”

CatholicNewsAgency.com, November 11, 2016, “In the wake of Hillary Clinton’s electoral defeat in Tuesday’s presidential election, pro-life Democrats and faith voters criticized the party’s pro-abortion support and lack of religious outreach.” The article adds that “Hillary Clinton and the Democratic Party decisively lost Tuesday’s election thanks in large part to the party’s extreme abortion position, which alienated would-be Clinton voters,” the group Democrats for Life of America stated in a press release Wednesday.” A spokesperson for the group asserted that “Clinton lost many voters like ‘soft Republicans; anti-abortion Independents, and millions of pro-life voters in her own party ...’” Robert Christian, editor of Millennial Journal said “‘I believe there was an absolute failure to reach out to people of faith by the Clinton campaign ...’” Christopher Hale, executive director of the group Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good tweeted that last year, “one Dem official told me that they were going to pursue a ‘post-Christian’ outreach strategy [meaning no resumption of the Christian outreach program Obama suspended in response to the Notre Dame protests].

In what is arguably the most remarkable achievement God has ever accomplished through our Center For Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR), the December issue of *Atlantic* magazine suggests that a 2009 anti-abortion project led by CBR cost Hillary Clinton the 2016 presidential election.

The Atlantic’s year-end issue featured an interview with Michael Wear, author of the book *Reclaiming Hope, Lessons Learned in the Obama White House About the Future of Faith in America*, Harper Collins (2017). Mr. Wear served as the White House staff member who directed Barack Obama’s 2012 faith-based community outreach programs. The Amazon publisher’s note begins “Learn how the seeds of the Trump presidency were sown in the Obama White House. It says the book offers “an insider’s view of the most controversial episodes of the Obama administration” including “the president’s ... failure to find common ground on abortion ...”

Mr. Wear asserts that the ferocity of the CBR led protests Mr. Obama encountered when he delivered his 2009 commencement address at the University of Notre Dame convinced the president to abandon his disingenuous attempt to find “common ground” on abortion with the pro-life Christian community. The former faith-based outreach director believes that those protests persuaded Mr. Obama to pivot hard left on abortion, openly adopting the rants and wishes of the feminist fringe. He sees this lurch left as a major stumble by the president.

Atlantic magazine asked Mr. Wear “... about the rare breed that is the pro-life Democrat.” Their reporter said “Some portion of voters would likely identify as both pro-life and Democrat, but from a party point of view, it’s basically impossible to be a pro-life Democrat.” She then asked

“Why do you think it is that the party has moved in that direction [abandoning even vaguely pro-life rhetoric and adopting the extreme language and policy prescriptions of Planned Parenthood], and what, if anything, do you think it should do differently?”

Mr. Wear answered “... I think Democrats felt like their outreach wouldn’t be rewarded. For example: The president went to Notre Dame in May of 2009 and gave a speech about reducing the number of women seeking abortions. It was literally met by protests from the pro-life community.”

He adds “... I think there was an expectation by Obama and the White House team that there would be more eagerness to find common ground.” CBR and our fellow protestors dashed those hopes. Mr. Wear also contends that “... [W]e’re seeing party disaffiliation as a way of signaling moral discomfort. A lot of pro-life Democrats were formerly saying, ‘My presence here doesn’t mean I agree with everything -- I’m going to be an internal force that acts as a constraint or a voice of opposition on abortion.’ Those people have mostly left the party.” And voted for Donald Trump.

Mr. Wear argues that “There are reports that high-level Democratic leadership was not interested in reaching out to white Catholics. And they sure didn’t have a lot of interest in white evangelicals. That’s a huge portion of the electorate to throw out.”

Mr. Wear thinks that Mr. Obama’s harsh repudiation of potential pro-life allies pushed pro-life Democrats, Catholics and Evangelicals away from the Democrat party in sufficient numbers to cost Hillary Clinton the election. He told the *Atlantic* that “... [H]e watched battles over abortion funding and contraception requirements in the Affordable Care Act with chagrin: The administration was unnecessarily antagonistic toward religious conservatives in both of those fights”

CBR was, by a wide margin, the most prominent factor in the Notre Dame protests. The ruckus we stirred up tricked Mr. Obama into halting his fake “common ground” outreach (which meant offering women free stuff (birth control, stimulus spending to create jobs, promotion of adoption, etc.) as a means of reducing the “need” for abortion).

National Review, July 26, 2016, “Democrats Continue To Drag The Country Left On Abortion.” The article reports that “In 2005 ... [Hillary Clinton] gave a speech calling abortion ‘a sad, even tragic choice’ and said that both sides of the abortion debate should work together to reduce the

number of abortions. She did not give an inch on policy ... [b]ut the news coverage emphasized Clinton's search for common ground."

The article also notes that "In 1994, Clinton strongly supported health-care legislation that included robust protections for abortion opponents: Employers who objected to 'abortion or other services' for moral reasons were not to be required to include it in their health coverage. Now Clinton, together with most of her party, condemns the idea that employers should be allowed to 'impose their religious beliefs on their employees' through their coverage decisions. Her abortion positions later became so fanatical that in a column headlined "Hillary Clinton is a threat to religious liberty" appeared in the *Washington Post* 13 Oct. 2016. It said "Speaking to the 2015 Women in the World Summit, Clinton declared that 'deep-seated cultural codes, religious beliefs and structural biases have to be changed.'"

The essay also explains that "In a [2012 email](#) that WikiLeaks says was sent to John Podesta ... [later] chairman of the Clinton campaign, Voices for Progress president Sandy Newman writes that 'there needs to be a Catholic Spring, in which Catholics themselves demand the end of a middle ages dictatorship and the beginning of a little democracy and respect for gender equality in the Catholic church' and proposed that the Clinton team 'plant the seeds of the revolution' to change Catholic teaching...."

Greer Hannan, executive editor of the Irish Rover, the independent Catholic newspaper. She has her reservations about Mr. Obama's visit but her real concern seems to be that "... groups will use the controversy to promote partisan political agendas and do it in bad taste,' using tactics like graphic posters of aborted fetuses." What this young woman fails to grasp (along with most of the rest of the pro-life movement) is that the reason Fr. Jenkins can get away with putting his thumb in the eye of pro-life bishops, students, faculty and alumni is because abortion is a total abstraction at Notre Dame. Why? Because confused adults have taught confused kids that it is "bad taste" to publicly expose that portion of the truth about abortion which is so awful that it can't be communicated through the written or spoken word.

Notre Dame isn't bothered by abortion because the pro-life student groups are shielding the university from the truth.

Very recently, when we participated in a pro-life planning conference call with Notre Dame students and other activists, the students reiterated their long-standing insistence that no abortion photos be displayed on their campus. In place of photos, they are handing out white carnations. What will anyone looking at a white carnation learn about the humanity of unborn children or the inhumanity of abortion? The same thing they will learn by looking at empty red envelopes. No so much. In fact, it unwittingly trivializes abortion.

A few years ago some college students came up to our display at the March for Life in Washington, D.C., and blocked our abortion signs with a large sign of their own. They lectured us angrily about how awful we were for showing these horrible pictures. I assumed they were

pro-abortion. It turned out they were pro-life. It turned out they were students from Notre Dame.

In a sense, it was these pro-life students who invited Mr. Obama to Notre Dame. They made abortion invisible, which allowed their adversaries to make it seem inconsequential. We want to show them how our pictures can change everything at Notre Dame. They won't let us onto their campus, but with your help, we can make everyone coming to graduation see the truth on the sides and backs of our billboard trucks as they drive onto the campus. With even more of your help, we may be able to fly one or more of our huge aerial billboards around the golden dome of the Main Building and the steeple of Sacred Heart Basilica!

one of the most influential political newspapers in Washington described our battle plan: "Anti-abortion rights group to pressure Blue Dogs on health bill language," *The Hill*, January 5, 2010:

An anti-abortion rights group Tuesday announced it will launch a billboard ad campaign pressuring Blue Dogs to halt further compromises on the healthcare overhaul's abortion language. The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR) said it will operate trucks mounted with the billboards containing graphic images in Blue Dogs' districts starting next week. A photo of the lawmaker appears on the signs alongside an image of a severed hand of an aborted fetus. The message "Abortion is not healthcare" underlines the photos.

GO



Obama Notre Dame invite stirs Catholic debate

March 28, 2009 11:34:17 AM PDT

March 28, 2009 (FARGO, N.D.) --

In American Catholicism, it doesn't get much bigger than Notre Dame. So when the university known for its golden dome, "Touchdown Jesus" mural and rigorous academics invited President Barack Obama to speak at its commencement and receive an honorary degree in May, it stoked both pride and anger on campus and nationwide. By giving a platform to a politician whose record on abortion and stem cell research clashes with core church teachings about human life, the private Catholic school on the plains of northern Indiana renewed an impassioned debate about what it means to be Catholic.

The Notre Dame administration knew it was entering a political minefield. But the intensity of the reaction in the week since Obama accepted demonstrates the depths to which Catholics are divided about how Catholic individuals and institutions should engage politics in a pluralistic society.

Adding to the rancor, the Obama invite comes after an election that frustrated the Catholic right and featured prominent Catholic voices making a case for Obama. Early moves by the Obama White House -- such as lifting restrictions on overseas family planning groups that perform abortions and on stem cell research that destroys embryos -- have prompted some U.S. bishops to challenge the new administration.

"This has sparked something beyond the usual right-left controversy," said David Gibson, a Catholic author of books on Pope Benedict XVI and the U.S. church. "Whether you're for or against the decision to invite him is morphing into kind of an X-ray of where everybody stands in the Catholic church."

On one hand, Notre Dame's overture to Obama is in keeping with the university's record of seeking newly elected presidents from both political parties as commencement speakers. Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush have spoken to Notre Dame graduates months after taking office.

Yet with Obama the outcry was swift and fierce. Protests were launched by the Pro-Life Action League and the Cardinal Newman Society, a conservative Catholic group that monitors Catholic universities and colleges for adherence to orthodoxy on abortion, especially. Some Catholics think that view is too narrow.

The Notre Dame president, the Rev. John Jenkins, has said Obama will be honored as an "inspiring leader" facing challenges from the economy, two wars, health care, and immigration and health care reform.

Jenkins also singled out Obama, the first African-American president, as a healer of racial wounds. That is of special significance at Notre Dame because retired university president the Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, 91, linked arms with Martin Luther King Jr. and served on the first U.S. Civil Rights Commission.

The Obama invitation, Jenkins has emphasized, does not condone or endorse Obama's positions on stem cells or abortion but the visit is "a basis for further positive engagement."

That argument has been assailed by Catholics for whom abortion is of paramount importance.

"Commencement is not an occasion for debate," said Catholic theologian George Weigel, a Pope John Paul II biographer. "Commencement is not an opportunity to set the foundations for a dialogue. Commencement and the award of an honorary degree is a statement on the part of the university this is a life worth emulating."

Most U.S. bishops have not spoken out on the matter, deferring to Bishop John D'Arcy of the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, who is boycotting the ceremony. Bishop Thomas Olmsted of Phoenix made public a letter to Jenkins labeling the invitation to Obama "a public act of disobedience" to U.S. bishops.

Five years ago, bishops adopted a statement that declared: "The Catholic community and Catholic institutions should not honor those who act in defiance of our fundamental moral principles. They should not be given awards, honors or platforms which would suggest support for their actions."

By inviting Obama, Notre Dame is thumbing its nose at the Catholic church and "forfeited its right to call itself a Catholic university," Ralph McInerny, a professor of medieval studies and philosophy, wrote on the Web site The Catholic Thing.

R. Scott Appleby, a Notre Dame history professor, said the last thing the university wants to do is thumb its nose at any bishop or the church. He said it's important to note that Obama is not a Catholic, and that most bishops have focused on dissenting views of Catholic politicians.

Past Notre Dame invitations have drawn protests as well, said Douglas Kmiec, a Catholic law professor and former Reagan administration lawyer whose endorsement of Obama last year was

controversial. Many on campus viewed Reagan as unsympathetic to the church's social justice mission, he said. When Bush spoke in 2001 about the disintegration of the family, many graduates wore white arm bands to protest the selection.

Kmiec, who taught at Notre Dame for 20 years and supports the invitation to Obama, called it a sign of a mature university and further evidence that religion is now firmly part of the public discourse.

"Religion has been invited into the public square," Kmiec said. "Our voice is being heard. But we now will presume to exclude from the religious venue the public voices that have the duty and responsibility to people of many different faiths and no faith at all? That seems to be an ironic way to return a favor."

Other Catholic campuses have been roiled by controversies over commencement speakers. In 2007, President George W. Bush's commencement address at St. Vincent College, a small Catholic school in Latrobe, Pa., triggered protests over the Iraq war, which was opposed by the Vatican and U.S. bishops.

This year's scheduled commencement speaker -- U.S. Sen. Robert Casey, D-Pa. -- canceled last week without explanation. Some Catholic conservatives have criticized Casey, who opposes abortion, for his positions on federal funding of contraception and legalization of same-sex marriages.

On the Notre Dame campus, where crucifixes hang in classrooms and more than 80 Masses are said every week, the Obama invitation is generating a range of responses.

"I don't think you have to cut yourself off from everyone who disagrees with you," said Cathleen Kaveny, a Notre Dame professor of law and theology who served on the Obama campaign's Catholic advisory committee.

"President Obama will see a wonderful graduating class of people who are supportive of his agenda of the common good and supportive of affirming the dignity of every human being, but who also want to say to him 'We want to extend that to another class of people -- those who are not born.'"

Most students are excited Obama is coming, and some are embarrassed by "the idea that Notre Dame is a radical place and that everyone is up and arms, when it's not," said Gavin Payne, a senior from Seattle.

"Commencement addresses are supposed to be optimistic: 'Go out in to the world and do good,'" said David Wilbur, a senior accounting major from Washington, who opposes abortion but supports the university's invitation to Obama. "He's not coming here to change us or try to make us be pro-choice."

Even among students staunchly opposed to the Obama invitation, there is angst. Greer Hannan, executive editor of the Irish Rover, an independent Catholic student newspaper, thinks the image of an abortion rights supporter dressed in Notre Dame doctoral robes standing next to the university president will not promote dialogue but rather honor positions in conflict with core Catholic teaching.

At the same time, Hannan worried that third-party groups will use the controversy to promote partisan political agendas and do it "in bad taste," using tactics like graphic posters of aborted fetuses.

"Here at Notre Dame we truly have an integrated understanding of respect for life and social justice -- respect for life at all stages," said Greer, a senior from nearby Mishawaka, Ind. "Some of these groups call themselves pro-life but in ways that are exclusive to other marginalized groups in our society."

Jefferson Davis falsely claimed his goal was to preserve "states' rights" and not slavery. Democratic senator Joe Donnelly, who represented Notre Dame in the US Senate and in whose Indiana Senate race we recently ran our voter education billboard trucks, falsely claimed he was pro-life, not pro-choice. Yet IndyStar.com, August 9th 2018, reported that the Planned Parenthood Action Fund rated Donnelly as "supporting its positions 67 percent of the time..." That is a lethal record which included voting for Federal funding for Planned Parenthood and opposing the Supreme Court confirmation of then judge Brett Kavanaugh. Donnelly said "all life is critical from conception to natural death," but he caused the unnatural deaths of countless babies by voting for Obama Care, which funded countless abortions. Thankfully, the voters finally put a stop to his fraud.

Pro-abortion Senate Democrats often call themselves things they are almost certainly not. Elizabeth Warren made a highly dubious claim to Native American heritage so she could obtain the preferential treatment accorded to racial minorities at Harvard. The New York Times, December 7th, 2018, quoted tribal leaders of the Cherokee nation who said "Ms. Warren's decision dishonored legitimate tribal governments and their citizens, whose ancestors are well documented and whose heritage is proven."

Then there's pro-abortion Senate Democrat Richard Blumenthal who falsely claimed to have served with the marines in Vietnam. The New York Times, May 17th, 2010 reported that "at a ceremony honoring veterans," Blumenthal told the audience, "We have learned something important since the days that I served in Vietnam." Then came the truth: "There was one problem: Mr. Blumenthal, a Democrat, never served in Vietnam." He, in fact, used five deferments to avoid service in Vietnam. If someone is comfortable advocating baby-killing, why would lying cause them discomfort?

But the untruth trophy must surely be awarded to Rachel Dolezol, whom CNN, May 25th, 2018, described as "the white woman who represented herself as black for years and once headed a local chapter of the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People]." She also taught "Black Studies" but she is now "facing charges of welfare fraud." The article says, "she maintains that she is a 'transracial "black woman.'" That rationale makes about as much sense as calling Ms. Warren a transracial Indian woman, or Mr. Blumenthal a transveteran Vietnam war hero.

On March 28th, 2009, ABC News published a story headlined, "Obama Notre Dame Invite Stirs Catholic Debate." It discusses "the intensity of the reaction in the week since Obama accepted [an invitation to receive honors and speak at the commencement] demonstrates the depths to which Catholics are divided..." It says, "the outcry was swift and fierce." That ferocity manifested itself in the protests led by CBR and our colleagues at The Chicago-based Pro-Life Action League.

Professor R. Scott Appleby is quoted defending Mr. Obama's speaking invitation on grounds that the Bishop's ban on honors for pro-abortion politicians was inapplicable to Mr. Obama because he is not a Catholic. This incoherent conclusion appears to suggest that it is dishonorable for Catholic politicians to support abortion but honorable if the abortion supporting politician is not Catholic.

Former Notre Dane professor Doug Kmiec, a longtime supporter of pro-abortion politicians, defended the Obama commencement address with an equally obtuse rationale: "Religion has been invited into the public square." He then suggested that "our voice is being heard. But we now will presume to exclude from the religious venue the public voices that have the duty and responsibility to the people of many different faiths and no faith at all? That seems to be an ironic way to return a favor."

Though ha law professor, Mr. Kmiec seems to miss the point that religion has a constitutionally protected right, not a “favor,” to enter the public square. It requires no invitation to exercise that right. No one argued that Mr. Obama should be “excluded from the religious venue.” His detractors merely contended that instead of receiving commencement honors, he should have been invited to participate in an abortion debate of the fractious sort he has long sought to avoid. A commencement address is no debate.

Notre Dame law professor Cathleen Kaveny is just as confused. She is also an Obama advisor who offered yet another straw man argument. “I don’t think you have to cut yourself off from everyone who disagrees with you.” But a decision to not honor someone who advocates abhorrent public policy is not necessarily a decision to cut them off. Nor are disagreements over child sacrifice an inconsequential matter. It was Mr. Obama who cut off Notre Dame by later attempting to force the school to pay for Obamcare abortions. He showed the institution his contempt for pro-lifers as soon as there was no longer any political benefit to be had from the political exploitation of Catholic universities. If only our enemies were as easily duped as our friends.

Then Notre Dame senior David Wilbur defended Mr. Obama’s invitation by suggesting that “He’s not coming here to change us or to try to make us pro-choice.” But if a student supports a pro-choice candidate, that student is pro-choice. And Mr. Obama’s goal was clearly to convince “pro-life” Catholics that his progressive social justice agenda somehow redeemed his pro-abortion candidacy.

Finally, Greer Hannan, the editor of the student newspaper, slammed CBR by worrying, “that third-party groups will use the controversy to promote partisan political agendas and do it in bad taste, “by using tactics like graphic posters of aborted fetuses.” She adds that, “some of these groups call themselves pro-life but in ways that are exclusive to other marginalized groups in our society.” That may be the ultimate straw man, because it postulates that no one can be authentically pro-life unless they support open borders, oppose traditional marriage and support ruinous welfare spending, etc. Martin Luther wasn’t concerned about “bad taste” when he used disturbing photos to expose injustice he knew could not be outlawed by covering it up. We find Dr. King’s tactics vastly superior to those advocated by Ms. Hannan. Under the Jesuit leadership of university president John Jenkins (and well before) left-wing political ideology has displaced biblically-anchored Catholicism at Notre Dame (as at many other Catholic universities). Along similar lines, Jesuit Pope Francis is striving to secularize the Vatican. Two respected journals of conservative political commentary recently published devastating critiques of the shocking heresy and corruption which have now poisoned the Papacy. National Review, October 29th

2018, penned an analysis titled “The Case Against Pope Francis.” The sub-headline read, “He has elevated immoral men in order to change the Catholic faith.” Equally damning was a Weekly Standard broadside, September 24th 2018, headlined, “The Rise of the (Catholic) Resistance, Pope Francis, Cardinal Wuerl, Theodore McCarrick and the Crisis of a Church Divided.”

Abortion is another child abuse scandal, and child abuse, which has long victimized children both born and unborn, is being trivialized and covered up by saboteurs who have infiltrated much of the Roman Curia. The faithful who complain about abortion child abuse are derided as being obsessed. Those who report clergy child abuse are discredited as “gossipers” given to “defamatory” exaggeration.

The Weekly Standard suggests that:

The pontificate of Francis can, perhaps, best be understood as a political prefect. His election in 2013 was...the result of a campaign planned out in advance by four radical cardinals who saw then cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio as the perfect vehicle for the revolution they wanted to launch within the church.

What were the “reforms” sought to be achieved by this revolution? The National Review notes a list which includes those who divorce and remarry being “admitted back to holy communion without repenting of the second adulterous union,” – a “situation which the Vatican admits does not correspond objectively to the overall demands of the gospel.” This absurd phrase gives new meaning to the term, “euphemism.”

Cardinal Godfried Danneels, “Belgium’s leading bishop from 1979 to 2010,” appeared “on the loggid [sic] next to the new pope” and was “invited by Francis to contribute to the synod on the family,” after “telling two newspapers that the church ‘has never opposed the fact that there should exist a sort of “marriage” between homosexuals.’” The Vatican views relationships of this sort not as sin but as “irregular” or “non-ideal states which are acceptable so long as they are stable.”

Monsignor Battista Ricca, reportedly Francis’s “eyes and ears at the Vatican bank,” was “widely known for engaging in affairs with men,” and “had to be rescued from an elevator in which he was trapped with a rent boy.” That does not sound very stable. Rent boys are homosexual prostitutes and those who are underage are also victims of child abuse and sex trafficking. Yet when a journalist asked Francis about Ricca, he replied with a flippantly amoral retort: “who am I to judge.”

Francis doesn't need to render "judgements" about homosexual liaisons because the Bible has already done that for him. And the condemnation is unambiguous. But Francis is quick to ignore politically inconvenient scripture.

One of the pope's "chief apologists," Fr. Thomas Rosica, has grandly claimed that:

"Pope Francis breaks Catholic traditions whenever he wants because he is 'free from disordered attachments.' He explains that the church has entered a 'new phase' and that with the advent of this first Jesuit pope, it is openly ruled by an individual rather than by the authority of scripture..."

The Weekly Standard adds that Francis has mocked Catholic women for "having way too many children and behaving 'like rabbits.'" He sent a "papal blessing to the lesbian author of the Italian version of *Heather Has Two Mommies* – a tract for children extolling the virtues of same-sex parenting."

As is the nonsensical custom of the political left, Francis is both a pacifist and a socialist. Allied victory in World War II brought the world decades of relative peace, but he strangely claims that "never has the use of violence brought peace in its wake." Centuries of capitalism have produced the unparalleled prosperity which enabled America to defend freedom and also fund generous social welfare programs, yet Francis argues that "the benefits of free-market growth have 'never been confirmed by the facts.'" His affinity for Marxist liberation theology (communists hiding behind a cross), (**sic – grammar issues**) "Francis posed for pictures with a crucifix made of a hammer and a sickle."

At the height of the clergy child abuse scandal, National Review says arch bishop Carlo Maria Vigano, former Vatican ambassador to the US, published a letter accusing the pope (and his closet advisors) of having knowingly covered up sexual misconduct "in order to pursue his progressive theological agenda." Vigano "called on the pope to resign in disgrace." The Vatican's response to Vigano has been "to denounce him forcefully" and "to accuse him of breaking communion with the pope." The Weekly Standard says that Francis claims Vigano was "the real villain" and that "the bishops [accused of abusing children and protecting abusers] were the real victims."

Francis was hailed as a reformer when he took office, but such naïve hopes have long since evaporated. National Review reports that "nearly half of pope Francis's reformist team have been pulled into sexual abuse themselves." The Weekly Standard speculates that "because there are so few high level progressives in the church, losing any of these men could endanger his succession

[the selection of an equally secular successor upon his death] which could endanger his larger [secularization] project.” Except in cases so egregious that public outrage can no longer be ignored, Francis protects and promotes predators and enablers who have shown themselves to be reliable political allies. For instance, after interventions by two influential allies of his theological agenda, Francis restored to ministry an infamous priest...who had molested children in the confessional and who had been defrocked by the relevant Vatican authorities. A Francis friend who was the arch-bishop of Bruges “was credibly accused of knowingly appointing a pastor who had molested a child.” Francis “made him a cardinal.” An archbishop “is set to stand trial in France for his role in covering up a child sex-abuse scandal in Lyon. Francis made him the head of the Vatican’s doctrinal office, which adjudicates abuse cases.” American cardinal Sean Patrick O’Malley, who heads the “Pontifical Commission for the Protection of Minors,” has been exposed as having passed the buck when a priest tried to inform him of the serial sexual predation of cardinal Theodore McCarrick against seminarians.

Notwithstanding all this canonical anarchy, Francis’s apologist Bill Donohue of the obsequious Catholic league assured CNN, September 20th, 2017, that Francis “is not about to turn the Catholic church upside down and inside out. Such tack is pure lunacy.”

Bishops are accountable only to the pope and the pope is accountable to no one. The pope’s response to endless child abuse scandals has been defiance of canon law and contentment for his critics. The Weekly Standard quotes him declaring dismissively, “I won’t say a word about it.” He doesn’t need to. “The Pope’s favorite American cardinal is Blasé Cupich, who heads the archdiocese of Chicago, and has been the most persistent cheerleader for the Francis project in America.” Cupich mouths the obligatory rhetoric about “the church’s agenda certainly” involving “protecting kids from harm,” but there is little evidence to support that claim, whether the kids being victimized are born or unborn.

Cupich reflexively changes the subject when confronted by proof of the church’s hypocrisy regarding child abuse. “...[W]e have a bigger agenda than to be distracted by all of this including helping the homeless and sick.” It requires a breath-taking lack of moral clarity to contend that inadequate housing grieves the heart of God more painfully than priests ignoring the annual slaughter of a million unborn children, priests facilitating and perpetrating the sexual exploitation of born children. Governments spend (and misspend) billions of dollars to mitigate the plight of the homeless, but nearly no one is doing almost anything to protect the children being killed by abortion, or emotionally (and spiritually) maimed by the perversions of predatory priests and prelates. Cupich seems to care little about their wellbeing but he seethes with resentment over the

“distraction” of being called to account for the church’s abdication of its responsibilities in pursuit of the secular political objectives which have displaced them.

“Between 2005 and 2007, three dioceses in New Jersey paid out large cash settlements to keep allegations of abuse by [cardinal Theodore] McCarrick quiet.” But McCarrick’s replacement, archbishop Donald Wuerl, absurdly claims to have been unaware of the open secret that then pope Benedict had placed McCarrick under a restriction resembling “house arrest.” Wuerl’s “first public comment on the McCarrick story was to say ‘I don’t think this is some massive, massive crisis.’” Wuerl may have felt safe in making this cringe-inducing inanity because Francis later released McCarrick from Benedict’s confinement and elevated him to the status of “trusted counselor.”

What qualifies as a “massive, massive crisis” in the minds of these liberal democrat politicians who masquerade as men of the cloth?

The Weekly Standard reports that Francis prioritizes homelessness, healthcare, global warming, the minimum-wage, a redefinition of marriage, and the abolition of capitalism. The National Review cites opposition to the death penalty, border walls, and air conditioning. This is the platform of a political party, not the theology of a church.

Francis wants a large lax church not a small strict one. But laxity drives away the devout believers most likely to attend church and appeals to the nominal believers least likely to worship. And Francis’s indifference to abortion means fewer children growing up to pay the taxes required to fund the expensive welfare programs he favors. The pope told The New York Times, September 19th, 2013, “I have never been a right winger.” But left-wingers don’t go to mass in large numbers. National Review, December 17th, 2018 (“What’s the Matter with White Liberals?”) predicts trouble for Francis by citing data which suggest “a precipitous foil in religious observation among white liberals” despite his “big tent” approach to religion belief.