

# POPE OPINES ON CANDIDATES

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Pope Francis recently ripped into Kamala Harris and Donald Trump, saying American voters were stuck with choosing “the lesser evil.”

He condemned Harris’ support for abortion rights as being an “assassination,” and he condemned Trump for his position on illegal immigration, saying “not welcoming the migrant is a sin.”

The Catholic Church regards certain acts to be “intrinsically evil.” Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, before he became Pope Benedict XVI, wrote that “Not all moral issues have the same moral weight as abortion and euthanasia.”

He said it was acceptable for a Catholic to disagree with the pope on issues such as war and capital punishment, adding that “he would not for that reason be considered unworthy to present himself to receive Holy Communion.” But that was not true of abortion or euthanasia.

The bishops’ conference also singles out abortion and euthanasia as being among the most non-negotiable issues. Other examples include genocide, torture, racism, and the targeting of noncombatants in acts of terror or war. They are always wrong.

Stopping migrants from entering a country illegally was not mentioned by either Pope Benedict nor the bishops.

Harris’ position on abortion is identical to that of President Biden. Yet after Biden met with the pope in 2021, he told the press, “We just talked about the fact he was happy I was a

good Catholic and I should keep receiving communion.”

Catholics will have to sort all of this out in November.

---

# TRUMP WAS RIGHT ABOUT ABORTION

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

**William A. Donohue**

Vice President Kamala Harris and ABC moderators made comments about abortion during the presidential debate that were factually incorrect. Former President Donald Trump was correct. Worse, the media, by and large, are siding with the false narrative.

Harris was asked by Linsey Davis if she supported any restrictions on a woman’s right to an abortion. “I absolutely support reinstating the protections of *Roe v. Wade*,” she said. She added that “nowhere in America is a woman carrying a pregnancy to term and asking for an abortion. That is not happening. It’s insulting to women of America.”

Trump responded saying, Harris “would allow abortion in the eighth month, ninth month, seventh month.” She replied, “Come on.” He followed up saying, “You could do abortions in the seventh month, the eighth month, the ninth month.” She answered, “That’s not true.”

Trump won the argument.

Late-term abortions, contrary to what Harris said, are more common than what she contends. In 1995, Dr. George Tiller told his fans, "We have some experience with late terminations; about 10,000 patients between 24 and 36 weeks and something like 800 fetal anomalies between 26 and 36 weeks in the past 5 years."

Ron Fitzsimmons used to tell the media that partial-birth abortions—where the baby is 80 percent born—were extremely rare. Then in 1995 he went on national TV and admitted that he "lied through [his] teeth," saying he was just spouting "the party line."

In 2019, the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute admitted that at least 12,000 late-term abortions take place annually in the U.S. In 2023, fact checkers at the *Washington Post* conceded that at least 10,000 late-term abortions take place each year.

Quite frankly, under *Roe v. Wade*, abortion-on-demand, while not a *de jure* right (it was not permitted after viability except in limited cases), was a *de facto* right. For proof, consider *Doe v. Bolton*, the companion case to *Roe*; it opened the door to abortion-on-demand.

In *Roe*, the high court said the states may outlaw abortion "except where it is necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother." The ruling in *Doe* defined what an "appropriate medical judgment" was. It entailed the "physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the women's age—relevant to the well-being of the patient."

Not surprisingly, every state law that attempted to limit post-viability abortions to those necessary for the *physical* health of the women failed in court when challenged. In effect, the joint decisions in *Roe* and *Doe* legalized abortion up until birth. So when Harris says she accepts *Roe*, that means she wants to make all abortions legal, at any time

during pregnancy.

Moreover, Harris voted against the “Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act” that would protect unborn children by prohibiting abortion at 20 weeks, a point where the child is able to feel great pain.

Then there is the matter of governors allowing babies to die after a botched abortion.

Trump addressed this issue by initially misidentifying the culpable governor as being from West Virginia—he later corrected his mistake saying the governor was from Virginia (he was referring to Ralph Northam). Substantively, what Trump said was basically right. He accused the governor of contending that “the baby will be born and we will decide what to do with the baby. In other words, we’ll execute the baby.”

Here is what Virginia Gov. Northam opined in 2019. If a baby survived an abortion, he said, “The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that’s what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.” So while the baby would not be “executed,” per se, he could be put down, or left to die, after he was “kept comfortable.” That’s infanticide. There is no other word for it.

Northam is not alone among Democrats on this issue. Just prior to his stunning admission, New York State Gov. Andrew Cuomo signed legislation that allowed premature babies who survive a chemical abortion to be denied treatment.

At the federal level in 2019, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act was blocked by Senate Democrats. It would require that a baby born alive during an abortion must be afforded the same care that would apply to all babies delivered at the same gestational age. Harris was one of the senators who voted to kill the bill. On January 11, 2023, all but two congressional Democrats voted against this same bill.

It is one thing for Harris to be wrong—candidates for public office frequently misrepresent their record—but it is quite another when the media misrepresent the truth. And it is infuriating when they set themselves up as “fact checkers” during a presidential debate and are later proven wrong. ABC disgraced itself.

Moderators should moderate. They are not paid to be commentators.

---

# THE MYTH OF CHRISTIAN NATIONALIST VIOLENCE

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

**Bill Donohue**

As a sociologist and a Catholic advocate, I am quite interested in the left-wing accusation that Christian nationalists are a violent-ridden threat to America. Those who make this charge are mostly academics and activists. I was skeptical about their claim, so I decided to fact check their work.

I am no longer skeptical: I am convinced these people are not only frauds—their goal is to demonize conservative Christian activists.

Christian nationalists are defined by their critics as those who seek to integrate Christianity and American civic life.

Perhaps the most prominent person floating this charge is Amanda Tyler, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee for Religious Liberty (BJC) and lead organizer of Christians Against Christian Nationalism. A while ago I read the testimony she gave in October, 2023 before the U.S. House Oversight Committee's Subcommittee on National Security, the Border, and Foreign Affairs.

This prompted me to email Christians Against Christian Nationalism, asking them to provide me with the evidence that Christian nationalism "inspires acts of violence and intimidation."

They wrote back referencing Tyler's October 25, 2023 testimony and her written testimony on December 13, 2022 before the House Oversight Committee's Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Civil Liberties.

The following analysis is based on the two testimonials.

In Tyler's testimony in 2023, she says, "The greatest threat to religious liberty in the United States today...is Christian nationalism." Such a sweeping statement would ordinarily be peppered with one example after another. She provides none. She simply makes an assertion, providing no evidence.

Her testimony in 2022 offers some examples to support her thesis about the violence of Christian nationalists.

The first example she mentions occurred in Charleston, South Carolina in 2015. Dylann Storm Roof shot and killed 9 people at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church. By all accounts, he was a seriously disturbed neo-Nazi who wanted to start a race war. But there is no evidence that he was a Christian nationalist.

Roof came from a troubled home. When he was born, his divorced parents got back together for a while, but it didn't last. His father remarried and allegedly beat his new wife, before

getting divorced once again.

Roof dropped out of school, spending most of his time taking drugs, getting drunk and playing video games. He was busted twice for narcotics. He was also known for burning the American flag.

No one doubts he was a racist. But no one ever accused him of being a Christian nationalist.

The second example cited by Tyler was the tragic Tree of Life Synagogue mass shooting in Pittsburgh in 2018. Robert Gregory Bowers killed 11 people and wounded six. It was the deadliest attack on any Jewish community in the nation's history.

His parents divorced when he was a year old. His father committed suicide while awaiting trial on a rape charge. Like Roof, Bowers was a disturbed racist and a right-wing nut. But no one who knew him ever said he was a Christian nationalist.

The third and fourth incidents mentioned by Tyler took place at Christchurch mosque in New Zealand on March 15, 2019. Brenton Harrison Tarrant was charged with 51 counts of murder, 40 counts of attempted murder, and one count of committing a terrorist act.

His parents separated when he was a young boy and his home was destroyed by a fire. When his mother remarried, he went to live with her and her husband. The new husband beat her (Brenton's mom), Brenton, and his sister.

Brenton left home and went to live with his father. That didn't work out: Brenton found his father dead by suicide. Those who knew him, which were only a few, said he was disturbed but none ever described him as a Christian nationalist.

The fifth example cited was a shooting that took place in 2019 at Chabad of Poway synagogue in Poway, California. John

Timothy Earnest shot and killed one woman and injured three other persons. In an open letter that he wrote prior to the shooting, he said Jews were plotting to kill the European race.

Earnest was an evangelical. Church members were split on whether his religious beliefs had anything to do with his shooting rampage. There is no evidence that he identified as a Christian nationalist, nor is there evidence that he was branded as such by those who knew him.

The sixth killing spree took place at Tops Supermarket in Buffalo, New York in 2022; it is located in a predominantly black neighborhood. Payton S. Gendron shot and killed 10 black people.

He was a classic loner. His father was an alcoholic and a drug addict for 40 years, resulting in the demise of two marriages. Gendron had no friends and was known to wear a hazmet suit in the classroom.

He was fascinated by violence, even to the point of bragging how he stabbed his own cat and then smashed the animal's head on concrete. He finished the cat with a hatchet.

Not only was he not a Christian nationalist, he wasn't even a Christian. Tyler concedes this point but nonetheless lists him as a Christian nationalist. This proves how desperate she is to make her case.

The seventh and last incident—the January 6, 2021 Capitol debacle—is labeled by Tyler as “an insurrection.” It was not. Insurrections involve the overthrow of the government. This was a rally that turned into a riot. The only person killed that day was an unarmed female veteran, shot by a cop. Security were shown on camera opening the doors of the Capitol to the protesters. Not exactly standard insurrectionist fare.

Most of Tyler's claims were just that—assertions. They were



not evidentiary. Her central thesis is that “The greatest threat to religious liberty in the United States today...is Christian nationalism.”

“Christian Nationalism and the January 6, 2021 Insurrection” is a report sponsored by BJC and the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF), a notorious anti-Christian atheist organization. It was published in 2022.

There are seven chapters in the Report, all supposedly chock full of evidence that the riot was a Christian nationalist event. Yet the first three chapters are merely a commentary on Christian nationalism, and don’t even attempt to tie the violence at the Capitol to it. Of the other four chapters, two were written by Andrew Seidel, an attorney who works for FFRF.

Katherine Stewart is an author and investigative journalist. Here is the first sentence in her chapter: “By now, most Americans understand that Christian nationalism played a role in last year’s violent attack on the Capitol.” She cites not a single source. It is simply an unsupported assertion. This is the extent of her “evidence.”

Seidel wrote chapters five and six. Chapter five covers events leading up to January 6, and chapter 6 claims to provide evidence that the riot was of Christian nationalist origin.

Chapter five says there were two violent Christian nationalist episodes leading up to January 6: one occurred on November 14, 2020; the other occurred on December 12, 2020.

Seidel argues that after supporters of President Trump rallied on November 14, “violence erupted in D.C.” It did. But the source he cites from the *Washington Post* simply says that Trump supporters clashed with counterdemonstrators. So what? The news story says not a word about Christian anything.

The December 12 incident saw another nighttime clash between the two factions. The source he cites notes that the Proud

Boys, a right-wing group that supports Trump, was involved. They were. What Seidel doesn't mention is that four of them were stabbed.

Chapter six begins by saying that Paula White, one of Trump's spiritual advisors, delivered "an explicitly Christian nationalist and openly militant prayer." What was it? "Blessed is the nation whose God is Lord" (Psalm 33:12). That was it.

Other "evidence" that the riot was a Christian nationalist event include statements by Katrina Pierson, a Trump campaign spokesperson. She said, Trump "loves the United States of America. He loves God." Ergo, this is an invitation to Christian nationalist violence.

Seidel also says that some people carried a cross and a Christian flag, and some were even spotted singing "God Bless America." More evidence that this was a Christian nationalist event was the sighting of men blowing shofars. A shofar is a Jewish musical instrument—not exactly a prop used by violent Christian nationalists.

Tyler wraps up the Report with similar "evidence." Signs such as "In God We Trust" are considered proof that Christian nationalists were on a tear. She says that as the violence took place, something curious happened: Christian leaders who condemned it "for the most part did not name Christian nationalism as a contributing or driving factor." I wonder why.

There are some positive signs that the false alarms about Christian nationalism are taking a toll on those responsible for sounding them.

In July, Missouri Sen. Josh Hawley gave a speech before a friendly audience noting that "some will now say that I'm calling America a Christian nation." With confidence, he said, "So I am."

This was encouraging because Hawley sent a message to militant secular zealots that he will not be put on the defensive. Indeed, he is proud to defend the idea that America is rooted in the Christian faith, and that our society is best served by following its tenets.

We can have a nation based on secular values or Christian values. The former celebrates the perverse notion that everyone is entitled to his own sense of morality. The latter maintains that without a moral consensus, ideally anchored in our Judeo-Christian heritage, we are ensuring that moral destitution rules the day.

At bottom critics of Christian nationalism have a problem with America. The Founding Fathers were adamant in their conviction that a free society was dependent on the kinds of values that inhere in Christianity. In 1892, the Supreme Court even acknowledged that “We are a Christian nation.” In 1952, Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, a liberal, wrote that “We are a religious people whose constitution presupposes a Supreme Being.”

Were all these famous Americans out to shove Christian teachings down the throats of the masses? Only those who want to upend Christianity think this way.

No doubt there are crazies who fit the label “Christian nationalist.” But if those who make a living off of selling the idea that Christian nationalists are a violent-ridden threat to America, and they can’t provide convincing evidence, then they are frauds. Worse, accusing Christians of bomb threats and arson—absent any proof—makes *them* a bona fide threat to America.

---

# DANGEROUS BALLOT INITIATIVE IN NEW YORK

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

There is a ballot initiative in New York State this November that is downright dangerous. Bill Donohue wrote a lengthy rebuttal and had it published in booklet form; a Spanish version is also available. We did a mass mailing to our allies across the state.

It is being widely distributed in the state not only to Catholics, but to non-Catholics as well. Thanks to the support of New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan it has been placed in the hands of all New York bishops and many others.

A longer version is available on our website. This should be of interest to non-New Yorkers as well. If these activists succeed with their stealth campaign in New York, they will bring their proposal to other states.

Here is the shortened version.

On Election Day, November 5, voters in New York State will cast their ballot for Proposition One. It would amend section 11 of article 1 of the New York State Constitution in two ways: Paragraph A would offer equal protection before the law to eleven new demographic categories; Paragraph B would revise the legal meaning of discrimination.

Those who champion Prop One are telling the public that it is needed because abortion rights are under attack. They manifestly are not under attack in New York State, but abortion-rights activists know that this is a hot button issue in many parts of the country—abortion is on the ballot in ten

states—therefore they reason that if it is on the ballot, it will galvanize supporters to turn out on Election Day.

This is only one aspect of what is in reality a huge stealth campaign. Those behind Prop One have a very different agenda. *Their real goal is to undermine parental rights, eviscerate religious liberty and legalize selective discrimination.*

Currently, the New York State Constitution says that no one can be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed or religion.

Paragraph A of Prop One would add the following demographic categories: age, sex, gender identity, gender expression, and reproductive healthcare and autonomy. The implications are dramatic.

### **Age**

To most people, age discrimination refers exclusively to older adults. To be sure, the rights of the elderly figure prominently in this discussion, but to children's rights advocates, those at the opposite end of the spectrum, namely minors, can also lay claim to being victims of discrimination. This is where Prop One can create enormous problems.

According to Beatrice and Ronald Gross, two of the leading children's rights advocates, the movement to liberate children was launched "to rectify the shameful conditions that lead to the damage and death of so many children." They claim that "young people are the most oppressed of all minorities."

The idea that children are oppressed begs the question: Who are the oppressors? Adults, of course, especially parents. Those who champion the rights of minors do so at the direct expense of parental rights. That is not unintentional.

If Prop One becomes law, minors will be able to checkmate their parents whenever they claim that their rights are being

encroached upon. Ditto for teachers who are accused of infringing on the rights of students (e.g., disciplinary measures). The kids will no doubt find public defense lawyers ready to come to their aid.

## **Sex**

There are many laws on the books that already protect women from discrimination, which explains why there is no major push for more such laws. Still, some will say there's no harm in including sex as a protected category in Prop One. But the fact is women have already said "No" to this proposal.

In 1975, voters in New York and New Jersey were given the opportunity to vote on the Equal Rights Amendment. The representatives in these two states, mostly men, had already voted to support this amendment, but when the vote was taken, it was defeated. As Linda Greenhouse of the *New York Times* noted, it was women, not men, who were responsible for the defeat. In short, New York women did not want to jeopardize their current status in law by living under a statute that could potentially work against their best interests.

## **Gender Identity and Gender Expression**

Adding gender identity and gender expression to the list of protected categories would seriously impact on parental rights and religious liberty.

The medical literature continues to grow concerning the long-term consequences of sex transitioning. Minors who transition, mostly girls who seek to be boys, are suffering from serious mental health problems and need to be treated accordingly.

Prop One would enable young people to skirt the scrutiny of their parents by accessing therapists and medical professionals behind their back in their quest to transition. They could claim they are being discriminated against on the basis of age.

In the state of Washington, a young girl wanted to get sex-reassignment surgery behind the back of her parents, but the parents found out anyway. They learned that if their daughter wanted to flee and move to a home with a family that agreed to take her in, she could do so. Moreover, the host family was under no legal obligation to inform her parents that she was about to have her genitals amputated.

This is exactly the kind of thing that could happen under Prop One.

It gets worse. States are effectively kidnapping children in service to the pernicious ideology of transgenderism. And if it can happen in Montana, it can happen in New York.

Krista and Todd Kolstad have a sexually confused daughter, Jennifer, who mistakenly thinks she is a boy. Jen had suicidal thoughts and when her family found out about it, Child and Family Services (CFS) were called to deal with her condition. Bullied at school, her parents moved her to another school district, doing everything they could to stabilize the situation. But CFS was unimpressed. They took Jen from them because they refused to affirm her delusional state.

Look for more such cases if Prop One wins.

If Prop One succeeds, there would be no stopping biological males from competing in women's sports, effectively destroying them. The guys could also use the locker rooms and shower facilities with the girls, and no one could stop them. If a coach complained, he could be fired.

In the name of gender expression, teachers could be required to address gender confused students by their choice of pronouns. In other words, a boy who thinks he is a girl could assert his gender expression rights by demanding that his teacher refer to him as "she" or "her." For that matter, he may want to be called "they" or "them," and his teacher would have to oblige.

This is not an exaggeration. Some schools, like one in Colorado, already have policies that assure this outcome. "Transgender and non-binary students have the right to discuss and express their gender identity and expression openly and to decide which, with whom, and how much to share their private information."

### **Reproductive Healthcare and Autonomy**

Reproductive healthcare, as interpreted by activists, means abortion-on-demand, without any restrictions. Parental rights would be non-existent—their daughters could get an abortion without their consent and at any time during pregnancy.

Establishing a right to healthcare autonomy clearly means that assisted suicide will become a reality. Even in cases where the patient is not suffering from a terminal disease, or where death does not appear to be imminent, the right to autonomy would give those who are merely despondent a right to die.

### **Religious Liberty Issues**

The impact of Prop One on religious individuals and institutions would be disastrous.

It cannot be denied that the new category of rights mentioned in Paragraph A are on a collision course with the state's interest in religious liberty, thus putting religious rights in jeopardy. It must also be said that the amendment does not say a word about religious exemptions, and that is telling.

Those who are supporting the LGBTQ agenda have made it plain that religious liberty should take a back seat to their interests.

There is no shortage of organizations that take direct aim at religious exemptions, in general. They would definitely be mobilized if Prop One prevails. Prominent among them is the Rights, Faith, and Democracy Collaborative, the parent company



of which is the Proteus Fund.

There are several issues affecting religious liberty where Prop One advocates will be very busy. One of them is adoption.

Advocates of Prop One say this is a bogus issue, citing the 9-0 victory in the Supreme Court in 2021. In that ruling it was decided that Catholic foster care agencies can reject gay couples from adopting children.

This ruling was significant, but so was the ruling in Massachusetts two years later. Mike and Kelly Burke were denied the right to be foster parents because they hold to Catholic views on sexual orientation and gender dysphoria. They said they would love any child, no matter what the sexual orientation or gender identity problems the child may have. But that was not enough to satisfy the militant secularists at the Department of Children and Families. This matter is still before the courts.

It's a sure bet that if this issue were to arise in New York, it won't be enough to satisfy government agents under Prop One. Religious liberty will be challenged, if not defeated.

Also last year, a Christian mother of five in Oregon wanted to adopt two children but was denied when she admitted that her religious beliefs would not allow her to take a minor to receive cross-hormone injections. This case is also tied up in the courts. Prop One would ensure a similar outcome.

Catholic schools across the nation have been hit with a wave of lawsuits by homosexual teachers who claim to be married. Though eventually they do not succeed, Prop One would inspire more attacks on the right of Catholic schools to hold teachers accountable; they voluntarily sign a contract respecting the teachings of the Catholic Church.

Similarly, there have been several attempts to force Catholic doctors and hospitals to perform sex-reassignment surgery, in

direct violation of Catholic teachings. This right not to cooperate is under attack by the Biden-Harris administration, which has directed the Department of Health and Human Services to go after Catholic individuals and institutions. Prop One would egg them on.

Consequently, Prop One would trigger an avalanche of lawsuits directed at Catholics and Catholic entities.

### **Paragraph B**

This section of the amendment would make it easy to discriminate against white people. It says that the discriminations banned in Paragraph A are permitted if the discrimination is done to “prevent or dismantle discrimination.” To put it differently, it could be okay to discriminate against white applicants for a job if by doing so it would enhance the chances of people of color landing the position.

Once the principle is established that not all forms of discrimination are objectionable, the door is open to widespread abuse.

### **Conclusion**

Prop One is the most deceitful and dangerous initiative ever introduced. It needs to be defeated.

---

# **NASHVILLE MANIFESTO PROVES REVEALING**

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day*

*that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

On March 27, 2023, Audrey Elizabeth Hale, murdered three adults and three 9-year-old children at Covenant School in Nashville, Tennessee. A transgender person, who mistakenly thought she was a boy, Hale had been treated at the time for “emotional disorder.” She kept a log of her problems, detailing how she was planning a mass shooting. Thanks to a lawsuit brought by the *Tennessee Star*, her manifesto has been made public.

*[The quotes are as written by Hale. No corrections were made.]*

Hale, who sometimes referred to herself as Aiden, was a terribly despondent person who saw little reason to live. “Nothing on Earth can save me,” she wrote in her diary. Other times she would say things like, “Everything Hurts” and “I hurt bad enough & long enough that I Need to DIE.” She confessed, “Everything makes me sad. I’m sad about everything.” “Being Me Sucks.”

If there was one person she said she loved, it was Paige Patton, whom she referred to as P.A.P., or the “brown girl.” She was a radio host. They played basketball together in the eighth grade and remained in occasional contact thereafter. Hale referenced Paige in her diary, saying, “If I cry all day, it’s cause I need your love.”

She was also fond of Nikki Tidwell, whom she met at the Nossi College of Art. On January 16, 2023, just over two months before Hale went on her shooting spree, she let her know of her plans. “I’m so sorry, Nikki. I didn’t plan my massacre on the 17th, I’m going to be in terrible s\*\*\* for leaving you. How bad my heart hurts. Tomorrow is my last day on Earth. I love you, I am so sorry. Audrey (Aiden).”

Then she had second thoughts: “(P.S. Not leaving yet. I couldn’t do it. I don’t want to ruin your day. I’ll wait as

planned. Audrey.” It was even more bizarre to learn that literally two days before the shooting began, Hale showed up at a birthday party for Nikki.

If there was one factor that accounted for Hale’s profound unhappiness it was her adamant rejection of her nature. She hated the fact that she was not a male. “Why does my brain not work right?? Cause I was Born Wrong!!!” She opined, “A terrible feeling to know I am nothing of the gender I was born of. I am the most unhappy boy alive. I wish to be dead.”

She took out her internal problems on society. “Everything hurts. And I hate society b/c society ignores to see me. I’m a queer; I am meant to die.” She even wrote a statement titled, My Imaginary Penis wherein she said, “My penis exists in my head. I swear to god I’m a male.”

Hale was angry that she somehow let girls down. “Major blow to girls; I am a boy that has no penis.” She was also angry at God. “If God won’t give me a boy body in heaven, then Jesus is a faggot.”

She hated her father. In a post titled, “Dad problems,” she wrote, “He never once loved me for years, maybe like ever.” She declared, “You’re a loser. I hate you...I don’t care if you die. I want to kill you.” She even condemned him on the day of the mass murder.

Days before she went on her rampage, Hale spoke of her darkness. “Soon I will leave this world...I will regret nothing...No regrets by the gun!!!”

She was mentally ready. “For 5 years I planned to die. Now I am finally ready to go.”

Then, in a clear reference to Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, the high school seniors who killed 12 students and one teacher in the 1999 Columbine High School massacre, she wrote, “I want my massacre to end in a way that Eric & Dylan would be proud

of.”

On the day of the killing, Hale boasted, “Nature needs enigmas...I am one, Thank God.” More ominously, she scribbled, “DEATH. Today is the day. The day has finally come!”

She gave a shout-out to Paige, saying she was ready to roll. “Please don’t be mad...” She added, “P.S. I think God will enter me in heaven. If I do go there, I’ll be waiting for you. All our pain will leave us.”

She really did believe in God. Much earlier she had written, “God is love, so are you.” But on that fateful day, she begged forgiveness. “Forgive me God, This act will be inglorious.”

Hale gave Paige a heads up just before she pulled the trigger. She contacted her and said, “I’m planning to die today. This is not a joke. You will probably hear about me on the news after I die.” Thirteen minutes later the shooting began.

Transgender persons are not normal and it is cruel to pretend otherwise. They need help. That does not mean affirming their sick status—it means getting to the source of their troubles. If that means anything, it means not treating conditions like Hale’s as if they were merely an “emotional disorder.” What she suffered from was much more serious.

---

## TIM WALZ’S IDEA OF EDUCATION

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Minnesota Gov. and vice presidential candidate Tim Walz has

some very bizarre, even repugnant, ideas about education. He has been reluctant to talk about them, and the media have shown no interest in pressing him on this issue.

Walz has had little to say about the rigors of the curriculum, but he has addressed a variety of side issues. One of them involves equity, diversity and inclusion, code words for combating racism by promoting more of it. He is responsible for launching a center at the Minnesota Department of Education to further this cause.

The education gurus who are the key contributors to this radical agenda include Boston University professor Ibram X. Kendi—he believes all white people are inveterate racists—and Robin DiAngelo, the disgraced author accused of plagiarizing her University of Washington 2004 Ph.D. dissertation. Both have made millions hawking their ideology.

Walz is also responsible for making Ethnic Studies a requirement for graduation.

When Bill Donohue taught a college course on Ethnic Studies, he had the students learn about the Irish (the European example), Puerto Ricans (the Latino example), African Americans (the African example), the Japanese (the Asian example) and Jews (the Middle Eastern example).

This is not Walz's idea of Ethnic Studies. His notion involves introducing students to lectures on oppression and "cisheteropatriarchy," which roughly means the study of successful heterosexual males, though in the courses Walz favors it means these guys are responsible for oppressing the world.

Walz is also interested in advancing the LGBTQ agenda, which has no intrinsic bearing on education. He earned the tag "Tampon Tim" when he ordered tampons be made available in every men's bathroom in the state. Men cannot menstruate, which explains why tampons have never been placed in men's

bathrooms. But this doesn't matter to Walz.

His anti-science view is shared by Hillary Clinton; she commended him for his "compassionate and common-sense policy." Also, Minnesota State Rep. Sandra Feist defended Walz by saying, "Not all students who menstruate are female." She did not identify one person who has a penis, scrotum and testicles who menstruates. He doesn't exist, except in their heads.

Walz is so passionate about the LGBTQ agenda that effective in July 2025 he is going to mandate that all teachers affirm the sex of a student who falsely maintains that he is of the opposite sex. In other words, if Johnny thinks he is Jane and wants to be called she/her, or even they/them, then the teachers must oblige.

As Joy Pullman, the executive editor of The Federalist, notes, this would effectively "ban practicing Christians, Jews, and Muslims from teaching in public schools." They do not accept the anti-science view that one's sex is a subjective determination.

What makes Walz so dangerous is that he refuses to promote school choice, thus ensuring that most students are indoctrinated with his left-wing ideas about race and sex.

Every poll taken in Minnesota on school choice shows that more than 70 percent favor it, and this includes a majority of Democrats. Moreover, 26 states have some form of school choice program—21 run by Republicans and 5 by Democrats—but Walz refuses to offer minorities (whom he claims to champion) the same opportunity to select the school of their choice that those who are more affluent already enjoy.

The media are delinquent in not telling the truth about Walz's education record. It's a disaster, and so is the cover up.

---

# SURGEON GENERAL SOUNDS ALARM

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

U.S. Surgeon General Vivek H. Murthy recently said that from his own experience, parenting has been “more stressful than any job I’ve had.” He notes that his view is shared by parents across the nation.

After painting a dour picture of parenting, he explains, “That’s why I am issuing a surgeon general’s advisory to call attention to the stress and mental health concerns facing parents and caregivers, and to lay out what we can do to address them.” He further says that we must identify “policies” and “programs” to improve matters.

What he said is not backed up by the data. For example, married men in America are about twice as likely to be very happy, compared to their unmarried peers. Also, men and women who have the benefit of a spouse and children are the most likely to report being “very happy” with their lives. Finally, a combination of marriage and parenthood is linked to the biggest happiness dividends for women.

Now if these same people were asked if it is stressful to raise children, no doubt they would agree. So what? Experiencing stress does not negate the possibility of being happy.

Winning the World Series or the Super Bowl is stressful for the players. It is also a source of tremendous happiness. The two emotions are not necessarily contradictory.



This is a familiar pattern. Government officials announce they are going to fix a problem that is largely of their own making. They are good at contriving issues that demand an expansion of the government.

---

## PHIL DONAHUE PASSES

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

TV talk-show icon Phil Donahue died on August 18. He did not ascribe to Catholic teachings on sexuality but he was a very generous supporter of St. Jude's Children's Research Hospital. He was married to Marlo Thomas, daughter of entertainer and founder of St. Jude, Danny Thomas. St. Jude is known for treating children with severe health issues, and not charging anyone a dime.

Bill Donohue was a guest on Phil's shows for many years. He told the *National Catholic Register* that he "thoroughly enjoyed mixing it up with him. He [Phil] told his producers on several occasions the he loved having me on even though we usually clashed. That made him unusual—he was not afraid of confronting a conservative. He was a real man. And I always appreciated his kindness. May he rest in peace."

---

# SCHOOL CHOICE MARCHES ON

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Those who scream the loudest about helping minorities are almost always the same ones who are doing everything they can to keep them in their place.

Proof: It is mostly Democrats who champion minority rights, and it is mostly Democrats who want to force minorities to attend schools they wouldn't send their own children to (the Democratic Platform explicitly rejects school choice). That's because Democrats are owned by the National Education Association (NEA), the largest labor union in the nation. Almost all their funding goes to the Democrats.

In short, no advocate of the poor should be taken seriously if he is opposed to school choice. They are the enemy of the poor.

The good news is that the march for school choice cannot be stopped. In fact, there are some 80 education choice programs available in at least 30 states, and the push for more is relentless. Here are some examples.

- In 2011, Arizona was the first state to offer an ESA, education savings account. It provides a fund for students to pay for various forms of education.
- No state has pioneered school choice more than Florida. We are talking about tens of thousands more children enrolling in private or charter schools or homeschooling.
- In March, Alabama joined 10 other states in enacting universal or near universal education freedom legislation.

- In November, Colorado voters will decide whether to encode school choice in its state constitution.
- Georgia offers a variety of school choice programs, including two private school choice ones, charter schools, magnet schools, homeschooling and inter and intra-district public school choice.
- Iowa has essentially what Georgia has.
- Indiana has four private school choice programs: ESA, school voucher, tax-credit scholarship and individual tax deduction.
- Voters in Kentucky will decide in November whether they want school choice. One school district, Pulaski County, has been accused of violating the law by using social media to tell voters to vote “no” on the ballot initiative.
- School choice advocates are lobbying lawmakers in North Carolina to clear the waitlist for families seeking scholarships under the state’s school voucher program. Roughly 55,000 are on the list.
- Texans are strongly in favor of school choice, and so is Gov. Greg Abbott, but lawmakers are mostly opposed. In the spring, Abbott succeeded in persuading voters to dump six incumbent Republican opponents of school choice.
- In March, Utah expanded its ESA program, essentially doubling the number of students who qualify.
- Also in March, Wyoming adopted its first school choice program, though Gov. Mark Gordon used his line-item veto to narrow the eligibility of the ESA initiative.

Those opposed to school choice allege that funds for these alternative schools effectively siphons money away from traditional public schools. This is inaccurate.

First, it is a fundamental right of parents to decide which school their children should attend, not school unions. Second, it is a myth that public schools suffer a financial

hit when school choice programs are instituted.

A few decades ago, economist Milton Friedman surveyed this argument by discussing the situation in the District of Columbia. At that time D.C. was spending more than \$11,000 per year per student in public schools (today the figure is more than double that). The D.C. voucher plan at that time called for a maximum of \$7,500.

Therefore, Friedman argued, "For every voucher student who leaves the public school for a private school, the system would gain more than \$3,500. Far from taking money away from public schools, vouchers increase the funds available per remaining student."

On this issue, the Democrats are on the wrong side of history. Beholden to their benefactors at the NEA, they are willing to put their heel in the face of black Americans who simply want the same right to select the school of their choice as afforded most Americans. They should not be denied.

---

## MARK LEVIN WAS RIPPED OFF

*This is the article that appeared in the October 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Bill Donohue has long admired the erudition and courage of Mark Levin, the influential author and Fox News host. But his recent show featuring a so-called victims' advocate was a disaster. Quite frankly, he was ripped off.

On his August 24 show, Mark had as his guest Joey Piscitelli. He was identified as a leader for 20 years with Survivors

Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP). He alleges that when Kamala Harris was the San Francisco district attorney she did not prosecute priests who were accused of sexually abusing minors (he claims to have been a victim).

He further contends that the district attorney whom she beat “in early 2004,” Terence Hallinan (he is wrong—she beat him in 2003 and took over in 2004), was hot on the trail of the Archdiocese of San Francisco but Harris never followed up. He attributes her inaction to Archbishop William Levada, “the most powerful bishop in the United States.”

Having closely followed this issue for decades, and having assisted in effectively busting SNAP (it is a shell of its former self, and even then it was not an organization), and having authored a book on this subject, [\*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes\*](#), Bill Donohue is in a position to checkmate Piscitelli’s account.

If Harris showed favoritism to the Catholic Church, we would need to know if she prosecuted other professionals who interact with minors. For example, did she prosecute public school teachers, or members of the clergy from other religions? This is important because most of the offenses committed by priests occurred in the last century (mostly between 1965 and 1985). In education, the problem is ongoing. If Harris did not pursue teachers, why should she have pursued priests?

From Donohue’s own research on this issue, subsequent to the publication of his book, he learned that Hallinan was able to secure Church documents on 40 former or current priests. It is important to note that in June 2003, approximately six months before Harris took over as D.A., the U.S. Supreme Court overturned a California law from 1994 that retroactively eliminated the statute of limitations for crimes involving the sexual abuse of minors.

Instead of asking why Harris did not pursue criminal cases against molesting priests—when the high court said such offenses were time barred—perhaps we should ask why Hallinan was so aggressive in singling out priests for prosecution, even using a grand jury to bring indictments. He was on a tear, seeking 75 years of Church documents.

Why would a D.A. want to spend his resources seeking to obtain the files on priests extending back to the 1920s? The *San Francisco Chronicle*, not exactly a Catholic-friendly source, labeled Hallinan's pursuit "a fishing expedition."

Where did Hallinan get the documents on the 40 priests? The archdiocese *voluntarily* turned them over in May 2002. By the way, lay employees were among the 40, and most of the priests were no doubt dead or out of ministry.

There is no question that San Francisco Archbishop Levada was seeking to protect the anonymity of accused priests. In doing so, he was doing what the leaders of every religious and secular institution do in these situations. Do the media open their books to the authorities on sexual abuse allegations? Do school administrators? Does Hollywood? In short, Levada was not an outlier, as Piscitelli suggests.

While serving as San Francisco District Attorney, Harris was asked why she would not make public those documents she possessed on priests. Linda Klee, her chief of administration and spokeswoman, told a reporter, "If we did it for you, we would have to do it for everybody. Where do you stop, and where do you start?"

Elliot Beckelman is a former prosecutor in the San Francisco District Attorney's Office who dealt with clergy sexual abuse cases.

He defends Harris' decision not to release Church documents. "I don't think a district attorney should float that out there if a person can't defend themselves. It's a very serious

charge, a sex crime. The Catholics, like other minorities, feel picked upon, and I thought for the integrity of the investigation that we don't have running press conferences to make out that the Catholics are worse than the Jews—which I am—or worse than the Hindus. There's always a balance that comes to sexual assault investigations."

Beckelman does not exaggerate. SNAP has smeared the Catholic Church for decades. Its longtime leader, David Clohessy, was deposed in 2012 and shown to be a fraud. Five years later, after he was sued by an employee for accepting financial kickbacks and funneling money to SNAP via dummy organizations, he resigned. He was also shown to have more interest in sticking it to the Catholic Church than in doing anything constructive to help victims.

Clohessy admitted that there never was a SNAP office—he "worked" from home. It still has no office: its "staff" consists of persons with emails and a cell number.

Those who victimize minors are despicable. Ditto for those who exploit this issue for ideological and financial profit.