

WHY DID WALZ, BIDEN, SANDERS AND De BLASIO HONEYMOON IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES?

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

In the 1930s, if a Republican politician chose to go to Hitler's Germany for his honeymoon, he would have been hounded from office. But in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s three Democrats and one independent (with close ties to the Democrats) chose to go to communist countries for their honeymoon. One of them is Tim Walz, the newly minted Democratic vice presidential candidate. We need to know why.

In 1989, Walz moved to Communist China to teach at a high school for a year. He later said it was "one of the best things I've ever done." Five years later he got married and chose to honeymoon there. He has been to China at least 30 times.

When Walz was chosen to join Vice President Kamala Harris on the presidential ticket, the Chinese state media noted his frequent trips there and praised him for "fostering cultural exchanges."

Under Mao Zedong, who ruled China from 1949 to 1976, 77 million people were killed, far outdoing the body count under Hitler and Stalin. While Walz has criticized human rights abuses in China in recent years, he has never explained why he would honeymoon in a nation with a history of mass murder. Nor has he explained why he is reticent about condemning Communist China for threatening the security of Taiwan.

Walz has much in common with Joe Biden. In 1977, then-Senator

Biden spent his honeymoon with his second wife, Jill, in a Communist-run country, Hungary. But he did more than celebrate his marriage. According to Daily News Hungary, he met with Communist officials and “had some secret meetings during his stay.”

It was a weird place to go to at the time. In 1956, Hungarian young people staged a revolt protesting Soviet domination. Tens of thousands took to the streets for six days before they were crushed by the communists. Mass arrests and executions followed and some 200,000 Hungarians fled to Austria and Yugoslavia before the borders were closed.

Why would Biden choose to honeymoon behind the Iron Curtain? That’s a long way from Rehoboth Beach.

Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, an independent who frequently caucuses with the Democrats, spent his honeymoon in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). The communists killed 66 million, mostly under Stalin.

Like Walz, Sanders has never explained why he would honeymoon in such a blood-stained country. He did so in 1988. While he was there he condemned U.S. foreign policy, but said nothing about egregious human rights abuses in the USSR.

In 1972, Sanders said that U.S. policy in Vietnam was “almost as bad as what Hitler did.” In 1985, he had a friendly sit-down with Daniel Ortega, the communist dictator of Nicaragua. In 1989, he visited Castro’s Cuba, praising the communists for their healthcare system, schools and housing, but saying nothing about the political prisoners being held. Today he refuses to condemn the oppressive Marxist regime of Maduro in Venezuela.

In 1994, former New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio went on his honeymoon to Cuba. What he did was illegal, but that didn’t matter. He never told his children about this—they found out after he admitted it on TV; they were told their parents

honeymooned in Canada.

In 1988, de Blasio went to Nicaragua to support the communist Sandinista regime. In 1990, he said he supported “democratic socialism” (which is an oxymoron), but when he was asked about this by the New York Times in 2013, he denied it. When the reporter said he has the evidence, de Blasio said, “It doesn’t matter.”

It does matter to the American people that left-wing political leaders cozy up to communist totalitarian dictators. Biden has already been erased by Harris, De Blasio is out of office and Sanders is going nowhere, but for Walz, that is a different story. He needs to come clean. It is one thing to teach in Communist China, quite another to celebrate a wedding there. And why all the back and forth trips?

VANCE’S CATHOLICISM UNDER FIRE

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

It didn’t take long. J.D. Vance, Donald Trump’s pick to be his vice president, is a convert to Catholicism, and already that is a source of anger among the haters. He is being dubbed an “integralist” and a “Christian nationalist.” Our interest has less to do with Vance than it does the nature of attacks on Catholics of a traditional stripe.

Anthea Butler teaches at the University of Pennsylvania and is a regular guest on MSNBC. The religion professor contends that

God is “a white racist.” She claims Vance is “aligned with what is called Catholic integralism, the belief that Christians can use a ‘soft power’ approach to exert influence over society.” She cites his opposition to killing babies in the womb as one such example of what she means.

Jack Jenkins is the national reporter for the Religion News Service. He also believes Vance is guilty of Catholic “integralism.” He is unhappy with Vance for not answering questions about “his own thoughts regarding Catholic integralism.”

What is Catholic integralism? That was the title of an article by Steven P. Millies in 2019. It’s an old idea, he says, one that seeks “the integration of religious authority and political power.”

So who are these “integralists” who want a theocracy? To prove his point he says “Pope Francis remains a head of state today.” He is also upset with Catholic writer Sohrab Ahmari for saying we need to “fight the culture war with the aim of defeating the enemy.” That makes him an “integralist.”

Kevin Augustyn authored an article on this subject for Discourse magazine that is even better. “This ideology is growing, vibrant and influential, but it is inherently illiberal and dangerous to American democracy.” He says the believers maintain that it is wrong to separate church and state. So who are they? He does not say. He quotes none of them.

He also claims that “some integralists” are committed to a “totalitarian vision that justifies such things as the disenfranchisement of women, Jews, atheists and indeed all non-Catholics; the persecution of heretics and sexual minorities; the kidnapping of secretly baptized children; and the abolition of religious toleration even for other Christians.”

These “integralists” sound like maniacs. So who are they? He does not say. He quotes none of them.

Justin Dyer is executive director of the Civitas Institute and a professor of government at the University of Texas at Austin. He wrote a piece for the *Washington Post* last year on “the logic of integralism” that is precious.

He says Catholic integralists believe in lots of weird things. “Nothing is truly private” and “there is no private life or private conscience.” So who are they? He does not say. He quotes none of them.

These writers would have us believe that this is the way Vance thinks. But no one seems to be able to come up with anything he has said that sustains this charge. In fact, what Vance has said is true and admirable.

“My views on public policy and what the optimal state should look like are pretty aligned with Catholic social teaching. That was one of the things that drew me to the Catholic Church. I saw a real overlap between what I would like to see and what the Catholic Church would like to see.”

If that makes him an “integralist,” we need more of them. We hasten to add that some of the books Bill Donohue has authored were specifically written to give sustenance to what Vance believes. Guess that makes Donohue an “integralist” as well, though he didn’t know it until now.

Christian nationalism is the big bogeyman for Christian bashers. So we knew someone would charge Vance as being a devotee. The first to do so is a U.S. Senator, Chris Murphy from Connecticut. He says Vance was picked “to help shape this transition away from democratic norms, this transition to a white, patriarchal, Christian-dominated nation.”

So what did Vance say to merit this accusation? He does not say. He quotes nothing he ever said.

So who is Sen. Murphy? He grew up in a congregational church and now admits he rarely goes to church. He blames his children and his schedule. He says he is “not a regular churchgoer these days, in part because of kids. In part because of a busy schedule.”

His “busy schedule” has earned him an “F” lifetime rating on life issues from Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America. His lust for abortion extends to infanticide: he has consistently voted against efforts to protect children who are born alive after failed abortions. Planned Parenthood consistently gives him a rating of 100%. He also earned a 100% rating from the Human Rights Campaign, the big anti-science and anti-women LGBT group.

As we said at the beginning, these attacks are not merely aimed at Vance—they are aimed at all traditional Catholics. These haters want to demonize us and drive us out of the public square. But they are in over their heads—our side is growing and getting bolder. We will make sure of that.

WALZ’S POLICIES ON RELIGION AND SEXUALITY

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

Democratic candidate for president, Vice President Kamala Harris, has chosen Minnesota Governor Tim Walz to be her vice presidential pick. His policies on religious liberty and sexual issues mirror hers.

In 2024, Walz approved legislation that would protect religious liberty in Minnesota's Human Rights Law. However, this was done after a 2023 bill that he signed into law that stripped them of their protections. The 2023 law caused an uproar across the state and forced Walz and the Democrats to retreat. The Catholic Conference of Minnesota was heavily invested in passing the 2024 law.

In 2023, Walz signed a bill into law that specifically excluded Christian universities with statements of faith from Minnesota's Postsecondary Enrollment Options (PSEO) program. This program allows high school students to enroll at local colleges at no cost to them; they can receive both high school and college credits. This law was struck down in the courts after a Christian family sued Walz. The case was *Loe v. Walz*. No friend of religious liberty would ever have banned Christians from this program.

During the Covid-19 lockdowns, Walz banned houses of worship from having gatherings of larger than 10 people. After the heads of Minnesota's Catholic and Lutheran churches said they would reopen May 26, 2020, Walz quickly changed his position and allowed the churches to reopen. He had previously allowed retail stores, casinos, bars and restaurants to open at 50 percent capacity, and he okayed the opening of the Mall of America. The hard line he took for houses of worship smacked of an anti-religious bias.

Walz's position on abortion is consistent with that of Harris'. He not only has no record of opposing an abortion for any reason—or at any time during pregnancy—he is so radical that in May 2023 he signed a funding bill that repealed Minnesota's protection for babies born following a botched abortion. In other words, he legalized selective infanticide.

On January 31, 2023, Walz enshrined the "right" to abortion and other reproductive health care measures into Minnesota statutes. This law was designed to protect abortion in the

state from future Supreme Court decisions.

When it comes to transgenderism—the anti-science movement that promotes the right of males and females (including minors) to switch their sex—the Biden-Harris team is the most radical administration in American history. Walz is on board, 100 percent.

On April 27, 2023, he signed a law that banned “conversion therapy.” House File 16 “prohibits mental health practitioners or mental health professionals from providing conversion therapy to vulnerable adults and clients under age 18.”

In other words, Walz wants to stop teenage girls (80 percent of those who “transition” to the other sex are females) from having the right to correct the mistake they made—often aided and abetted by corrupt therapists and medical professionals—in attempting to change their sex. These exploited young people want to “detransition” back to their father-determined sex, but Walz wants to take this right away from them.

On April 27, 2023, Walz signed a law that turned Minnesota into a transgender sanctuary state. House File 146 “prevents state courts or officials from complying with child removal requests, extraditions, arrests, or subpoenas related to gender-affirming health care that a person receives in Minnesota.”

In other words, this law gives state courts temporary emergency jurisdiction over any child in Minnesota who has “been unable to obtain gender-affirming health care.” If a child runs away, and moves to a state to receive “gender-affirming care,” Minnesota would not return the child to his parents under this law. Similarly, in a custody battle, a parent could take the child to Minnesota for “gender-affirming care” and the out-of-state parent would have no recourse in Minnesota’s courts.

Tim Walz is no friend of religious liberty, the rights of the

unborn, and the welfare of young people. There will be no tension between him and Harris on any of these issues.

HARVARD TURNS THE PAGE

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

Harvard University's decision to officially refrain from taking public policy positions is not only commendable, it is a model for virtually every institution of higher learning.

Indeed, it should be adopted by every entity not specifically founded as an advocacy organization. This would include corporations as well as umbrella groups representing such professionals as actors, athletes, doctors, nurses, teachers, and all those whose line of work has nothing to do with advocating for one cause or another.

In short, if a company sells shoes, it should sell shoes and refrain from making partisan public statements.

The Harvard report rightly notes that "if the university and its leaders become accustomed to issuing official statements about matters beyond the core function of the university, they will inevitably come under pressure to do so from multiple, competing sides on nearly every imaginable issue of the day." When this happens, it notes, it "runs the risk of alienating some members of the community by expressing implicit solidarity with others."

Well said.

IS HARRIS SUFFERING FROM BLACK GUILT?

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

Utopians throughout the ages have dreamed of an egalitarian society where everyone is equal. Add Kamala Harris to the list. But given her entitled background, it makes us doubt her sincerity.

When she was running for president in 2020, Harris said in a video that “There’s a big difference between ‘equality’ and ‘equity.’” She is right about that, but her interpretation of what these terms mean is deeply flawed. She thinks, as do all those on the Left these days, that equity means equal outcomes. It does not. It means fairness. Equality means sameness.

No matter, the most important thing Harris said in her video was, “Equitable treatment means we all end up at the same place.” In the real world, her idea explodes.

Let’s say everyone is given the same salary. Now we achieved the “equitable” society Harris wants—we all end up at the same place. No one has any more than anyone else. But for how long?

What if Jones sees a portrait that Smith has drawn and wants to buy it. What if others observe what is happening and want to compete with Jones to buy the portrait? After the bidding war is over and Jones wins, Smith is richer than everyone else. Bingo—inequality rears its ugly head again.

The only way to ensure this doesn't happen is to deny all the Joneses the freedom to spend their money the way they want, thus making sure everyone remains at the same place. In other words, the quest for an egalitarian society *can never succeed and always winds up oppressing the masses*.

In a track meet, all runners start at the same spot. But they don't finish at the same spot. We can, and should, do what we can to ensure that everyone who wants to compete should have an equal opportunity to do so, but we should never jimmy the race to force all runners to cross the finish line at the same time.

It is strange that Harris would even want such a society. She is the product of black privilege. Her late mother, Shyamala, was raised in a caste society in India where upward mobility does not exist. She occupied the top tier—she was a member of the Brahmins. Critical race theorists label them oppressors.

She boasted about it. "In Indian society, we go by birth. We are Brahmins, that is the top caste. Please do not confuse this with class, which is only about money. For Brahmins, the bloodline is the most important. My family, named Gopalan, goes back more than 1,000 years."

It would be hard to find a more full-throated celebration of inequality than this.

What about Kamala's dad, Donald Harris? He traces his ancestry to slavemasters. The Stanford University professor of economics, who has accused his daughter of smearing his Jamaican ancestors by saying they are a bunch of potheads, admitted in 2018 that his grandmother was a descendant of Hamilton Brown. He was a plantation and slave owner in northern Jamaica. He owned scores of slaves, most of whom were brought from Africa, which has a long history of slavery.

Given her pedigree, this raises the question: Is Kamala suffering from black guilt? More important, however, is why

anyone running for president of the United States would want to craft a society where everyone ends up in the same place. Not only is that impossible, attempts to do so yield totalitarian results.

CATHOLIC COLLEGES RECEIVING CATALYST

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

We have chosen more than a dozen Catholic colleges and universities to receive boxes of *Catalyst*, starting with the September issue; they will continue to receive our journal through the end of the year. We hope to entice these young people to join the Catholic League.

The schools selected for the mailing are the following:

Ave Maria University (Ave Maria, Florida)
Belmont Abbey College (Belmont, North Carolina)
Benedictine College (Atchison, Kansas)
The Catholic University of America (Washington, D.C.)
Christendom College (Front Royal, Virginia)
Franciscan University of Steubenville (Steubenville, Ohio)
John Paul the Great Catholic University (Escondido, California)
Thomas Aquinas College (Santa Paula, California and Northfield, MA)
The Thomas More College of Liberal Arts (Merrimack, New Hampshire)

University of Dallas (Irving, Texas)
University of Mary (Bismarck, North Dakota)
University of St. Thomas Houston (Houston, Texas)
Walsh University, (North Canton, Ohio)
Wyoming Catholic College (Lander, Wyoming)

DISNEY FILM WINS ANOTHER “BEST DOCUMENTARY”

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

Over the summer, the Catholic League’s documentary, “Walt’s Disenchanted Kingdom,” won “Best Documentary” at the International Film Market. This brings to nine the number of awards we won. We had four wins, four nominations, and one honorable mention.

In addition to winning “Best Documentary” at the International Film Market, we won that award at the L.A. International Short Film Festival. We were nominated for “Best Documentary” at the Perth Christian Film Festival (Australia), the Prisma Film Festival (Rome, Italy), and the Arizona Faith and Family Film Festival.

The film has been seen by millions of people, at home and abroad. It is available on Amazon and several other platforms.

Disney has been rocked by criticism coming from many quarters about some of its fare, and we sure had something to do with that outcome. We were the only organization to make a documentary detailing its departure from the days of Walt

Disney. He never authorized films and events that tried to sexualize children.

If you haven't seen the film, please see our website and click on "Videos" for information.

BUTTIGIEG SAYS ABORTION MAKES MEN FREE

This is the article that appeared in the September 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](#).

Vice President aspirant and Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg said recently that not only does abortion liberate women, "men are also more free in a country where we have a president who stands up for things like access to abortion care. Men are more free."

Buttigieg, who contends that he is married to a man, is right about that. Abortion does in fact make men free. They are free from their fatherly duties, thus allowing them to prey on women—in the name of liberating them—while appearing to be on their side. It's a dream come true.

In an article by Judith Blake in *Science*, published in 1971, two years before abortion was legalized in *Roe v. Wade*, she found that college-educated men were the strongest supporters of legal abortion. Indeed, little has changed since then.

When Bill Donohue taught a course on Family Relations at La Roche College in Pittsburgh, he asked his students, most of whom were nursing students, to explain why single men have

always been the greatest champions of a woman's "right to choose"? Is it because they have long been closet feminists? Or is there something else going on? The women knew exactly what was going on. Reckless men love abortion.

In a 2022 article published by Business Insider, it found that the majority of young men (and young women) were supportive of abortion rights but that older men (those over 50) were the least supportive. This makes sense. Reckless older men have less of a vested interest in abortion, but reckless younger men see it as freeing them from their responsibilities. It allows them to tell their pregnant girlfriend to find an abortion clinic and liberate themselves of their baby; ever obliging, she can even charge it to his credit card. It's a win-win. For him.

Survey after survey shows that public support for abortion declines markedly the later into pregnancy a woman is; there is very little support for late-term abortions and partial-birth abortions. Buttigieg disagrees. His enthusiasm for abortion rights knows no limits.

On "The View," Meghan McCain asked Buttigieg in 2020 "exactly [what] your line is" about when to draw the line on abortion. He said "it shouldn't be up to a government official to draw the line. It should be up to the woman who's confronted."

McCain pressed him, asking if he was okay with infanticide. His answer was disingenuous. "Does anybody seriously think that's what these cases are about?" She responded, "I think that people care about that, yes."

Similarly, the year before, Chris Wallace on "Fox News," said to Buttigieg, "So just to be clear. You're saying that you would be okay with a woman well into her third trimester deciding to abort her pregnancy?" To which he said, "Look, these hypotheticals are usually set up in order to provoke a strong emotional..." Wallace retorted, "It's not hypothetical. There are 6,000 women a year who get abortions in the third trimester." He answered, "That's right, representing less than

one percent of cases.”

In other words, Buttigieg disagrees with almost everyone. He is in the tiny minority who believe abortion should be legal in virtually every instance, regardless of how late into pregnancy it is. He can't even condemn infanticide. This explains why he is opposed to legislation that makes it illegal to provide medical care to an infant who survives an abortion. It doesn't get more radical than this.

Notice, too, that when Wallace said that 6,000 women a year get an abortion in the third trimester that Buttigieg erased their humanity by citing a statistic. That's the way extremists think: they don't see the faces of women or their unborn babies—they dissolve them to a stat.

Buttigieg does not want to make abortion “safe, legal and rare.” His idea of male and female liberation is to make it as frequent as can be. He is way out there.

BEWARE PSEPHOLOGISTS DURING AN ELECTION SEASON

[Bill Donohue](#)

As a political sociologist, I have been studying electoral politics for decades. There is a fancy name for what is called “the scientific study of elections.” It is called psephology, or what is more commonly known as survey research. To what extent we can seriously say it qualifies as a science is open to debate. Not open to debate is how influential surveys are. They matter, and that is because they shape public opinion.

It was during World War II that survey research surged. Columbia University conducted research on how best to sell war bonds, and it was determined that Kate Smith, the iconic American singer (best known for "God Bless America"), would be the most persuasive person to hire. It worked.

Survey research is the domain of sociology. Today there are many outstanding survey houses: the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, and the University of California at Berkeley are as well known today as Columbia. Then there are survey companies outside the academy, such as Gallup, Pew Research Center, McLaughlin & Associates, Rasmussen, and all the ones sponsored by the media, mostly newspapers and TV outlets.

The quality of the work varies intensely. During an election season, they carry significant weight, perhaps too much.

The size of the sample, the filtering characteristics employed (registered v. non-registered voters), the wording of the questions, the inclusion of cell phone users, the diversity of the respondents, etc. There is also the factor that some citizens don't trust pollsters and refuse to offer an honest answer. As important as anything, some surveys are methodologically more trustworthy than others, but even in the best of hands, problems are legion.

In 2016, when Hillary Clinton faced Donald Trump, virtually every pollster in the nation got the outcome wrong; the overall average put Clinton ahead by 4.3 percent. A few weeks before the election, the *New York Times* said Clinton had a 91 percent chance of winning; Trump had a 9 percent chance.

It is not true that all electoral constituents are equally consequential. Protestants and Jews, for example, are reliably Republican and Democrat, respectively. Catholics matter the most because they are the most in flux.

Up until the late 1960s and early 1970s, Catholics laid anchor

with the Democrats. But when George McGovern was the Democratic nominee in 1972, his radical politics stunned Catholics. Internal changes in the Party—the ascent of feminists—pushed Catholics from leadership positions in the Party.

Abortion was another factor. Of the three major religions, Catholics were the only ones to be pro-life; Protestants, including evangelicals, and Jews celebrated *Roe v. Wade* (evangelicals switched sides by the end of the 1970s).

The two political parties also flipped during the 1970s. Before that time, Republicans, led by a WASP Rockefeller elite, were seen as the voice of abortion rights; Democrats, reflecting the views of Catholics, were mostly anti-abortion. By the time Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980, the Republicans were the party of pro-lifers and the Democrats were the pro-abortion party. Nothing has changed since.

In 2016, Trump won the Catholic vote, 52-45. In 2020, he narrowly won 50-49 over Joe Biden. Going into the 2024 election, it looks very close again.

When Catholics are asked by pollsters whom they will vote for, what matters is whether they are practicing or not. Catholics who attend church with some regularity are more likely to vote for Trump, but those who seldom attend are more likely to go for Harris. Hispanics vote Democrat, though more are now moving towards the Republicans.

Now more than ever before, Republicans have become the party of religious Americans; secularists dominate the Democratic Party. They also don't like Catholics. In 2023, a survey by the Pew Research Center found that more Democrats had an unfavorable view of Catholics (25 percent) than had a favorable view of them (22 percent). Interestingly, Democrats look more favorably on Muslims and atheists.

Demographically, single women—never married, separated,

divorced or widowed—are the biggest supporters of the Democrats. It accounts, in large part, why Democrats do better with women overall.

The working class used to be solidly Democrat, but no more. They feel abandoned and alienated and much prefer the Republicans, especially Trump Republicans.

Blacks have always been a one-party people. Following the lead of Lincoln, they voted overwhelmingly Republican, but when FDR made overtures to them, they became overwhelmingly Democrat. They became even more solidly Democrat in the 1960s: it was the federal government that gave blacks rights long denied in the states, and Democrats are much more likely to prefer federal approaches to social and economic problems than are Republicans, who favor a states-rights approach.

Besides Catholics, the segment of the population that matters most are the Independents; there are more of them than there are Republicans and Democrats.

In short, Catholics and Independents are likely to decide the election. In the meantime, keep your eye on the psephologists. Some are better than others.

POPE OPINES ON HARRIS AND TRUMP

[Bill Donohue](#)

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 gave by way of example issues such as war and capital punishment. He said it was acceptable for a Catholic to disagree with the pope on these matters, 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 United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has also addressed what qualifies as "intrinsically evil." They, too, single out abortion and euthanasia as being among the most non-negotiable issues. "Other direct assaults on innocent human life and violations of human dignity, such as genocide, torture, racism, and the targeting of noncombatants in acts of terror or war, can never be justified."

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

Kamala Harris justifies abortion in every instance, allowing no exceptions. Her position is identical to that of President Joe 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." Many bishops said the president's rabid support for abortion disqualified him from receiving the Eucharist.

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