

# BARRETT FACED BIASED SENATORS

Amy Coney Barrett had the deck stacked against her. Five senators should have recused themselves given their past bigoted comments. Their remarks were made as members of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

## 1) Sen. Dick Durbin

On September 7, 2017, Bill Donohue wrote to him regarding his remarks of September 6 on the suitability of University of Notre Dame Law School professor Amy Coney Barrett to be seated on the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. Donohue accused him of crossing the line when he drilled down on her Catholicity.

“Do you consider yourself an orthodox Catholic?” This was a remarkable question posed by Durbin. After all, he attended Catholic schools for 19 years. He said he had “never seen [that term] before.” He then asked, “What’s an orthodox Catholic?” This was disingenuous. Durbin was trying to get Barrett to opine on her Catholic values and how they may affect her judicial decisions. He would never do this to any nominee who was Jewish or Muslim.

Barrett was not perturbed. “It is never appropriate for a judge to apply their personal convictions, whether it derives from faith or personal conviction.”

This was not the first time Durbin showed his true colors. In 2005, when considering the qualifications of John Roberts, a Catholic, for the Supreme Court, he told a CNN correspondent that senators need to “look at everything, including the nominee’s faith.” Yet there is no record of Durbin looking into the faith of non-Catholic nominees for the federal bench.

## 2) Sen. Dianne Feinstein

On September 7, 2017, Donohue wrote to her about comments she made while questioning Barrett on September 6. “When you read your speeches, the conclusion one draws is that the dogma

lives loudly within you.”

Donohue wrote the following to Feinstein. “No one was fooled by your question. Why didn’t you come right out and ask her if she takes her judicial cues from the Vatican? That would be more honest.” Donohue also asked her, “Do you, as a matter of course, probe the propriety of having a person of deep faith on the court who is not Catholic? If so, please share that information with me. If not, try treating Catholics as equals.”

In 2005, when questioning John Roberts, Feinstein asked him if he agreed with President John F. Kennedy when he pledged to respect separation of church and state. Thus did she dig up the old canard about “dual loyalties.” Apparently, she was unaware that Kennedy made his Houston remarks in 1960 following an outburst of anti-Catholicism by leading Protestants.

### 3) Sen. Kamala Harris

In 2018, Harris questioned the suitability of Brian C. Buescher to be seated as a federal district judge. On December 26, 2018, Donohue issued a news release condemning Harris for attacking the nominee because he was a member of the Knights of Columbus, a pro-life Catholic organization.

Harris asked Buescher, “Were you aware that the Knights of Columbus opposed a woman’s right to choose when you joined the organization?” Her real target was the Catholic Church’s teachings on abortion and sexuality. Harris has also declared war on pro-life activists who expose the ugly practices of abortion mills.

### 4) Sen. Mazie Hirono

Hirono took the same position against Buescher as Harris did, which is why Donohue included her in his statement of December 26, 2018. Here is what she said to the Catholic nominee. “The Knights of Columbus has taken a number of extreme positions. If confirmed, do you intend to end your membership with this

organization to avoid any appearance of that?" She cited the Knights' opposition to gay marriage as an example.

If the Knights are "extreme," then millions of Americans, most of whom are not Catholic, are on the fringes. Those who believe that marriage should be reserved for one man and one woman are hardly extremists. They are simply stating the obvious (only a man and a woman can make a family). No matter, Hirono wants those who believe this verity to be excluded from the judiciary.

#### 5) Sen. Chuck Schumer

On August 13, 2003, Donohue issued a news release criticizing Schumer's remarks opposing Alabama Attorney General Bill Pryor's nomination to the 11th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. Pryor oversaw the removal of the Ten Commandments monument from the state Supreme Court building.

"His beliefs are so well known," Schumer said of Pryor, "so deeply held, that it's very hard to believe—very hard to believe—that they're not going to deeply influence" him if he gets confirmed.

In effect, Schumer was subjecting Pryor to a "*de facto*" religious test. Charles Krauthammer said "the net effect of Schumer's 'deeply held views' litmus test...is to disqualify from the bench anyone whose personal views of abortion coincide with those of traditional Christianity, Judaism and Islam."

These five senators should never been allowed to vote on Barrett. Their bias is palpable.

---

# BARRETT'S FAITH TRASHED BY MEDIA AND ACTIVISTS

Judge Amy Coney Barrett may have escaped bigoted attacks by senate Democrats, but she did not get a pass from the media and activists.

Organizations that are either expressly atheistic or are wholly secular, of course, ripped Barrett's Catholicism. American Atheists and Americans United for Separation of Church and State issued news releases arguing that Barrett's commitment to religious liberty means she will discriminate against LGBTQ people.

Freedom From Religion Foundation contends that Barrett would "complete the Christian Nationalist takeover of the high court for more than a generation." Similarly, the American Humanist Association maintains that Barrett would be the sixth Catholic on the Supreme Court, a red flag; her reported membership in a charismatic Christian group was deemed "particularly concerning."

The Daily Kos ran two articles hammering Barrett. One called her a "religious extremist," and the other said she is "primed and ready to substitute the Church's particular teaching [on abortion] as the only true religious position on the matter." (Notice abortion was not framed as a biological issue.)

Left-wing activist Katie Hill, who runs a political action committee, said questions about Barrett's religion are fair game: we need to know if she "will impose her faith on the American people." (The way secularists impose their beliefs in education?)

Elizabeth Bruenig used her *New York Times* column to state that Barrett's nomination has "renewed attention to a fundamental conflict, centuries underway, between Catholicism and the

American ethos.” (This is a polite way of wondering if practicing Catholics—in the 21st century—can be good Americans.)

Mother Jones ran a piece that was long on innuendo and short on facts calling attention to Barrett’s alleged membership in a Christian charismatic group. Bill Maher sounded the alarms saying Barrett was “really, really Catholic.” Imagine someone saying Ruth Bader Ginsburg was “really, really Jewish”—everyone would know what that means.

MSNBC’s Joy Reid was more forthright on this issue, leading Megyn Kelly to condemn her “bigoted attacks on Catholics.” Ron Charles of the *Washington Post*, and Lindy Ki, a Biden delegate, raised questions about Barrett’s respect for separation of church and state (they have it backwards—respect for the autonomy of religious organizations is the pressing issue).

First prize goes to David Atkins of the Washington Monthly. “In reality, there is no anti-Catholic bias against Barrett from the left.” Looks like the secular dogma lives loudly within him.

The Trump campaign was doing more than blowing political smoke when it said that Biden should end his silence about the anti-Catholic attacks on Barrett. He should. If a Muslim Supreme Court nominee were the target of bigotry stemming from Republicans or conservatives, he would surely condemn it.

Bill Donohue is happy to say that he has been contacted by New York City Councilman and Pentecostal minister Ruben Diaz Sr., and Rabbi Aryeh Spero, both of whom have pledged to condemn anti-Catholics. Too bad Biden, a professed Catholic, can’t do the same. However, if he did, he would have to start by condemning his running mate.

---

# TRUMP BLASTED FOR OPPOSING INFANTICIDE

President Trump recently signed an executive order mandating that doctors attend to babies born alive, “no matter what the circumstances.” What prompted his order was the practice of denying medical care to babies born alive as a result of a botched abortion.

The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to late-term abortions. What Trump did goes beyond partial-birth abortion: His executive order is targeted at prohibiting infanticide. Astonishingly, he was criticized in some quarters for doing so. Some maintain that infanticide is not a problem.

Dr. Kristyn Brandi is a board member of Physicians for Reproductive Health. She opposed a legislative effort earlier this year that would provide sanctions for doctors who refused to provide medical care for babies born alive following a botched abortion. “The bill maligns and vilifies providers and patients to push a false narrative about abortion later in pregnancy.”

“States can and do punish people for killing children who are born alive,” opined Florida State University law professor Mary Ziegler. Journalist Danielle Campoamor said it is a “lie” to say babies born alive after a failed abortion need protection, saying such a scenario is “incredibly unlikely.” Yet the Associated Press, which quoted critics of Trump’s proposed order, said there were “143 deaths between 2003 and 2014 involving infants born alive during attempted abortions.”

Lying about infanticide is the natural progression of a mindset that justifies partial-birth abortion. In the 1990s

Ron Fitzsimmons, executive director of the National Coalition of Abortion Providers, admitted on national TV that he “lied through [his] teeth” when he “just went out there and spouted the party line” about how rare partial-birth abortion is.

All the health professionals, journalists, activists, and politicians who deny the reality of babies being born alive after a failed abortion need to tell that to Gianna Jessen. She survived an abortion. And so have many others. They should look at her in the face and say she has no business being alive.

---

## **IN DEFENSE OF PEOPLE OF PRAISE**

Prior to the battle over Amy Coney Barrett’s nomination to the Supreme Court, many reporters focused on a charismatic Christian organization, People of Praise, to which Barrett reportedly belongs.

Much of the coverage was negative. The media and left-wing activists tried to present this group as a fringe cult. Those claims were bogus. People of Praise is comprised of many well-educated Christians. Indeed, they are a vibrant community that makes the Church stronger. Consider what those who know the organization have said about it.

- Sean Connelly, communications director for People of Praise, said, “[C]harges of the mistreatment of women, insularity, lack of privacy and shunning are contradictory to our beliefs and our practices as a community.”
- Connelly also said, “Contrary to what has been alleged, women take on a variety of critical leadership roles within

People of Praise, including serving as heads of several of our schools and directing ministries within our community.”

- Joannah Clark, who grew up in People of Praise and is now the head of the Trinity Academy in Portland, Oregon says, “This role of the husband as the head of the family is not a position of power or domination.... It’s a position of care and service and responsibility. Men are looking out for the good and well-being of their families.”

- Clark also said, “At any point, a community member can decide to leave and is free to do so.”

- Clark added, “There’s a high value on personal freedom,” and “I’ve never been asked to do anything against my own free will. I have never been dominated or controlled by a man.”

- Clark further added, “I consider myself a strong, well-educated, happy, intelligent, free, independent woman.” “We are normal people – there’s women who are nurses, doctors, teachers, scientists, stay-at-home moms.... We are in Christian community because we take our faith seriously. We are not weird and mysterious.... And we are not controlled by men.”

- The late Cardinal Francis George wrote, “In my acquaintance with the People of Praise, I have found men and women dedicated to God and eager to seek and do His divine will. They are shaped by love of Holy Scripture, prayer and community; and the Church’s mission is richer for their presence.”

- Bishop Peter Smith, an auxiliary bishop of the Diocese of Portland, Oregon and member of People of Praise, said, “We’re a lay movement in the Church.... We continue to try and live out life and our calling as Catholics, as baptized Christians, in this particular way, as other people do in other callings or ways that God may lead them into the Church.”

- Nathan W. O’Halloran, a Jesuit who grew up in a charismatic Catholic group, writes in *America Magazine* that “the charismatic movement...has been an answer to the prayer and the desire of many Catholics to live a more animated and evangelistic Christian life.”

- Dan Philpott, a Notre Dame political science professor whose



children attend Trinity School, run by People of Praise, said, "In my view, the phrases 'right' and 'conservative' aren't really helpful. Most Catholic lay organizations are there to help people live faithful Christian lives. It's hard to say that the causes it supports are really 'left' or 'right.' Its mission is really not political."

- Nicolas Rowan of the *Washington Examiner*, observes that "The group has enjoyed friendly relations with Pope Francis, contrary to many politically conservative Catholics."

- In the Associated Press, current members described People of Praise as, "a Christian fellowship, focused on building community. One member described it as a 'family of families,' who commit themselves to each other in mutual support to live together 'through thick and thin.'"

- The AP also notes that "People of Praise has a strong commitment to intellectualism, evidenced in part by the schools they have established, which have a reputation for intellectual rigor."

- The AP also reports that "Barrett's parents are both registered Democrats, according to Louisiana voter registration records."

- In a *Politico* article, Adam Wren says, "What's difficult to understand outside of South Bend, however, is just how deeply integrated this group is into the local community." (Anyone who has studied cults knows that cults try to cut their members off from the rest of society.)

- Peggy Noonan writes in the *Wall Street Journal*, "O. Carter Snead, a Notre Dame law professor and director of the de Nicola Center for Ethics and Culture, notes, Amy Barrett – herself a law professor as well as a judge – appears to be failing at being submissive and a total disaster at being subjugated."

Those senators opposed to Barrett had a hard time trying to nail her on her association with the People of Praise. That didn't stop some of them from unfairly attacking her on other issues.

---

# TRUMP AND BIDEN COURTED CATHOLICS

The Catholic vote is the religious swing vote, which is why the Trump and Biden camps pursued it. This explained their outreach via Catholics for Trump and Catholics for Biden.

More important than these campaign efforts was how the two candidates approached issues that are central to Catholicism. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops previously declared abortion to be the “preeminent” issue for Catholics. On this score, Trump’s pro-life position was consistent with the teachings of the Catholic Church.

Biden, who was once pro-life, turned out to be a champion of abortion-on-demand through term; he was therefore wildly out-of-step with his religion’s position.

Trump and the Catholic Church were in agreement that marriage should be the preserve of one man and one woman. Biden rejects the Church’s teaching and is a devotee of gay marriage. School choice is favored by the Catholic Church, and Trump is a rabid supporter of it. Biden is opposed to all school choice initiatives.

Religious liberty has emerged as one of the most important issues of our day, affecting domestic and foreign policy alike. We tallied nearly 50 instances where Trump embraced or advanced religious liberty in the past three-and-a-half years.

We examined Biden’s record over 47 years of public service and could find almost no instances of his support for religious liberty. He did vote for the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA) in 1993, but his recent endorsement of the “Equality

Act” and “Do No Harm” effectively vitiates his position: both would seriously undercut, if not neuter altogether, RFRA. Most glaringly, Biden’s support for the Health and Human Services mandate that would force the Little Sisters of the Poor to pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plan has led him to be denounced by Catholic leaders, lay and clergy alike.

The official Party Platforms offer a revealing look at the way the Trump and Biden campaigns address religious liberty. There are nine references to religious liberty in the Republican Party Platform, all of which are positive statements. The Democratic Party Platform cites religious liberty six times, four times positively and two times negatively.

Both Trump and Biden have been praised and criticized by some bishops. This matters less to Trump as he is not Catholic. But it matters greatly to Biden.

Cardinal Raymond Burke has said that Biden should not be given Holy Communion because of his pro-abortion record. Some priests have, in fact, denied him the Eucharist, or have warned him not to come to Communion, because of his stance.

Bishop Richard Stika called out Biden over the summer. “Don’t understand how Mr. Biden can claim to be a good and faithful Catholic as he denies so much of Church teaching especially on the absolute child abuse and human rights violations of the most innocent, the not yet born.” Bishop Thomas Tobin took an oblique shot at Biden when he observed that there was no Catholic on the Democratic ticket this time.

Some bishops have made more veiled-like comments. Bishop Joseph Strickland has spoken out strongly about the election and how the “Sanctity of Life, true marriage between a man & a woman, supporting the nuclear family and sexual morality based on biblical truth” must be paramount. Bishop Thomas Daly has advised those who “obstinately persevere in their public support for abortion, should not receive Communion without first being reconciled to Christ and the Church.”

What got Biden into deep trouble with the bishops was his decision not only to support gay marriage, but his willingness to officiate at a wedding between two men. Three leaders of the bishops' conference, Archbishop Joseph Kurtz, Bishop Richard Malone, and Archbishop Thomas Wenski issued a statement that was obviously aimed at Biden. They criticized him for being "a counter witness, instead of a faithful one founded in the truth."

The most recent bishop to call into question Biden's standing in the Catholic Church—without mentioning him specifically—is Archbishop Samuel Aquila. "It is not possible to be a Catholic in good standing and support abortion or assisted suicide, to promote unnatural sexuality, or to seek to push people of faith out of the public square."

Finally, there is the issue of anti-Catholicism. The Trump administration has never been tagged with anti-Catholicism, but the Biden campaign certainly has. In fact, his running mate, Kamala Harris, made a stunning contribution to this ancient strain of bigotry when she badgered a man being considered for a seat on a federal district court in Nebraska simply because he belonged to the Knights of Columbus.

Then we had Humanists for Biden, an off-shoot of Secular Democrats of America, also of recent vintage. The parent group was off to a fast start bashing Catholics. Biden also had in his employ Nikitha Rai, a data expert who believes that Catholics like Amy Coney Barrett, who espouse traditional moral values, should not be allowed to serve on the Supreme Court.

It is evident that Biden's policies on key issues are problematic from a Catholic perspective. Add to this his strained relationship with many priests and bishops, as well as the support he receives from anti-Catholics, and the difference between Trump and him is considerable.

---

# NYC ORTHODOX JEWS ARE RIGHT TO REBEL

New York State Gov. Andrew Cuomo and New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio may not get along, but they have one thing in common: an insatiable appetite for power. They love it when they can control people. But they hit a brick wall with Orthodox Jews.

The Catholic League understands the need for reasonable protocols to combat Covid-19, but we object to directives that are discriminatory in application, and this is especially true when religious institutions are subjected to a more burdensome standard than non-religious ones. This is why we support the objections raised by the Orthodox Jewish community in the New York City area. We only wish Catholics would be as aggressive in pushing back against edicts that are patently unjust.

On October 7, Cuomo ordered the shutdown of some neighborhoods, many in Brooklyn and Queens, because of a spike in coronavirus cases. While the target of his directive is the Orthodox Jewish community, he did not hold back in penalizing Catholic churches and schools, even though neither is exhibiting a health problem.

De Blasio issued a new directive that went into effect October 8. Those who do not wear a mask will be fined up to \$1,000, and mass gatherings will be subject to fines up to \$15,000. His order is hypocritical, discriminatory and wholly indefensible.

Why are so many Orthodox Jews mad? For the same reason why New Yorkers who are not part of their community are mad. Both the governor and the mayor have allowed, and indeed justified,

mass gatherings in the form of protests. And now they want us to respect what they say?

Why are non-violent mass gatherings at synagogues and churches subject to shutdowns when violent mobs can roam the streets with impunity? As one Jewish reporter said to New York City's health commissioner, Dr. Dave Chokshi, "What justification can we tell readers—why do they have to be careful when the mayor carves out exceptions based on his own personal politics?"

The reaction of Borough Park Community Board leader Barry Spitzer was similar. "People in the community have lost a lot of trust in the government, because people were told they can't pray but thousands of people can gather in the streets to protest, or because rules kept changing from minute to minute without rhyme or reason." Another Jewish leader opined, "They had no issue with the demonstrations, with the protests with thousands of people in the streets."

When the mob was taking over bridges, burning police cars, and breaking into stores all over New York, de Blasio never tried to stop them. When asked in June why people cannot go to church or synagogue because of fear of Covid-19 infections, but they can riot in the streets, de Blasio said, "We're in the middle of a national crisis, a deep-seated crisis. There is no comparison." He was referring to what he said was "400 years of American racism."

In other words, if de Blasio agrees with the purpose of a protest—no matter how violent—Covid-19 restrictions can be thrown to the wind. But religious funerals cannot be held.

Now de Blasio has outdone himself. On October 7, he proved once again what a rank hypocrite he is. "There's a place for peaceful protests," he said, "but the NYPD will not tolerate people doing harm to others. There will be no tolerance for assaults, for damage to property, for setting fires."

But when it came to Antifa and Black Lives Matter, de Blasio

not only told the cops to tolerate their violence, he told them to stand down and do nothing. He allowed them to harm others, assault others, damage property and set fires. They did it night after night. He had plenty of tolerance for that.

When the governor of New York tells rock stars scheduled to perform at the MTV Video Awards in New York City that they don't have to abide by his order to quarantine for 14 days, and when the mayor of the City of New York treats people of faith as the enemy—while supporting rioters—it is no surprise that New Yorkers have turned cynical.

De Blasio and Cuomo have shot whatever moral authority they once had. No one should pay them any heed.

---

## TEXAS A&M UPDATE

In the last issue of *Catalyst*, we noted how we went after Texas A&M professor Filipe Castro. He not only made a series of wholly bigoted and obscene comments about Catholicism, he threatened some Catholics. We contacted school officials, the university's accrediting agency, government officials, and the media.

The head of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission thanked us for alerting her to this situation. She said she would consider an investigation. We heard from many students and alumni, and the school newspaper interviewed our director of communications, Mike McDonald.

It was telling that the guilty professor refused to speak to the media about his situation. He most certainly has been put on notice and hopefully something more concrete will emerge.

---

# BIDEN'S EVOLVING VIEWS ON ABORTION

Joe Biden entered the senate in 1973, the same year the Supreme Court legalized abortion in its *Roe v. Wade* decision. He has evolved from being strongly pro-life to rabidly pro-abortion. Here is a list of his changing positions.

1974: A year after *Roe v. Wade* was decided, he said the ruling had gone "too far" and that a woman seeking an abortion should not have the "sole right to say what should happen to her body."

1976: He votes for the "Hyde Amendment" which bans federal funding of abortions.

1981: He introduces the "Biden Amendment" which prohibits foreign-aid funding of biomedical research involving abortion.

1982: He votes for a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

1983: He votes against a constitutional amendment allowing states to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

1984: He votes for the Mexico City Policy which bans federal funding for abortions.

1987: He becomes chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee and leads the fight against Supreme Court nominee Judge Robert Bork, whom he said was opposed to *Roe v. Wade*.

1994: He says, "Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them."

1995: He votes to ban partial-birth abortion.

1997: He votes to ban partial-birth abortion.

2003: He votes to ban partial-birth abortion

2007: He criticizes the Supreme Court decision upholding the ban on partial-birth abortion, calling it "paternalistic."

2008: He says he is opposed to overturning *Roe v. Wade*.



2012: He says the government does not have “a right to tell other people that women, they can’t control their body.”

2019: He says he is opposed to the “Hyde Amendment” which bans the federal funding of abortion.

2020: He says he supports abortion “under any circumstances.”

There is no one in public life who has undergone such a dramatic transformation. He did not change because of the Catholic Church: it did not change its position on abortion. He did not change because of science: it did not change its position on when life begins. It was Biden who changed, and he did so for totally political reasons.

---

## **BIDEN HIRED BIGOTED STAFFER**

Anti-Catholicism engulfed the Biden camp this presidential season. The latest guilty party is Nikitha Rai.

Rai was Deputy Data Director for the Biden campaign. She became incensed over the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett to the Supreme Court. She argued that Barrett’s Catholic beliefs should bar her from serving.

Rai took to Twitter for an exchange with Shadi Hamid, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute. At issue was Barrett’s alleged membership in a charismatic Christian organization that holds to traditional moral values. Biblical teachings on marriage and sexuality became the topic of discussion.

After someone else made reference to these teachings, citing Barrett’s previous service to a “South Bend private school” [she was a trustee at Trinity School], Hamid questioned why this was news. “Isn’t this the standard position for any orthodox Catholic?” Rai answered, “Unfortunately, yes.” Hamid

then said, “to be fair, it’s the standard position for any orthodox Muslim or Jew as well...”

Rai’s response was unequivocal. “True. I’d heavily prefer views like that not to be elevated to SCOTUS, but unfortunately our current culture is still relatively intolerant. It will be a while before those types of beliefs are so taboo that they’re disqualifiers.”

In other words, any person of faith who holds to biblical teachings on marriage and sexuality is intolerant and should be barred from serving on the Supreme Court. That would include all practicing Catholics, evangelical Christians, Mormons, Muslims, and Orthodox Jews. Nikitha Rai is the intolerant one.

We called for Biden to dump her but he refused.

---

## **BIDEN TEAM WELCOMES CHRISTIAN BASHERS**

Humanists for Biden is a newly formed organization, an offshoot of Secular Democrats of America, an entity that itself is of recent vintage. The pro-Biden group is headed by Greg Epstein, a humanist “chaplain” who splits his time between Harvard and MIT.

The quotation marks are intentional: Merriam-Webster defines chaplain as “a clergyman in charge of a chapel.” Epstein is a confessed atheist, and a chapel is a place of worship. Therefore, there is no basis in reality for his self-identity. Not only is Epstein delusional, those who access his services as a chaplain are equally delusional.

Humanists for Biden sought to attract all those who believe in nothing: agnostics, atheists, and the religiously confused. They are a growing part of the nation and are heavily populated by young people, and, of course, the learned ones in the professoriate.

A look at what Humanists for Biden believe yields a lot of pedestrian stuff. They are, of course, fashionably “diverse.” They claim to be fans of science and foes of bigotry, two attributes that distinguish themselves from no one. But are they really opposed to bigotry? The evidence is not persuasive.

Consider what we know of the parent organization, Secular Democrats of America (a redundancy if there ever was one).

Secular Democrats of America is opposed to school vouchers, a social justice cause that just happens to be championed by Catholics. If this is an oblique shot at Catholics, a more direct expression of its animus is the following: “In the United States, 1 in 6 hospital beds are in a Catholic institution, where care can be dictated by religious doctrine.” In other words, we as a nation have a serious problem on our hands: Catholic hospitals follow Catholic teachings. Worse, there are too many of them.

The humanists did not have the courage to say what needs to be done about this alleged problem, though we all know what their atheist agenda entails.

Not surprisingly, Secular Democrats of America is opposed to most religious exemptions; they want to secularize the churches. In fact, they explicitly argue that there should be no distinction in law between secular institutions and religious ones. This would gut the tax-exempt status of all religious institutions, and effectively neuter faith-based organizations.

They also say they are opposed to “religious tests” for public

office. For reasons that are not hard to understand, they have said nothing to condemn those Democrats—the secular ones—who have sought to subject Amy Coney Barrett to a religious test.

Naturally, Secular Democrats of America do not value innocent human life. Organized atheists rarely do. For example, they are pro-abortion and pro-euthanasia, goals shared by every totalitarian regime in history (all of which have been expressly atheistic).

What seals their animus against Christians is their charge that “Christian Nationalists” are a threat to democracy. This has become the new dog whistle of Christian bashers. They are always vague in defining who a “Christian Nationalist” is, but they are anything but ambiguous in attributing to evangelical Protestants and traditional Catholics all kinds of nefarious conspiratorial motives and practices.

If a conservative were to link secular Democrats with Antifa, he would be denounced. But somehow it is acceptable to link evangelicals and traditional Catholics with white supremacists. This is exactly what Secular Democrats of America does, warning its followers about the “intersection of Christian nationalism and white supremacy.”

Humanists for Biden say they are not an official part of the Biden campaign, but this is mere window dressing. Secular Democrats of America was welcomed at the Democratic National Convention; they were awarded three panels to promote their Christian-bashing cause.

Joe Biden is no stranger to welcoming these kinds of activists. On February 26, 2010, the Obama-Biden administration became the first presidential administration in history to formally meet with organized atheists. That was when officials from the Secular Coalition for America, home to some of the most rabid Christian haters in the nation, was invited to the White House for consultation.

What made Humanists for Biden so troubling was that this organization was being rolled out in the same week that one of Biden's staffers, Deputy Data Director Nikitha Rai, lashed out at Amy Coney Barrett for holding to biblical teachings on marriage and sexuality. Rai said such beliefs—which are held by practicing Catholics, evangelical Protestants, Orthodox Jews, Mormons and Muslims—should disqualify any nominee for public office.

Biden refused to fire Rai. He then doubled down by befriending a group of Christian-bashing atheists.