

INSIDE THE MIND OF LEFT-WING HATERS

This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 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](#).

Michael P. McDonald
Director of Communications

Most Americans were shocked to learn that an innocent man, Brian Thompson, was murdered simply because he was an insurance man; he was the United Healthcare CEO. They were also shocked to learn that a former Marine, Daniel Penny, was being tried for manslaughter: he put his life at risk trying to subdue a crazed man on a New York subway who threatened to kill passengers; it ended with the death of the offender.

But in the mind of left-wing haters, Thompson deserved to be killed and Penny was probably guilty.

The author Joyce Carol Oates took to social media to claim that the outpouring of negative sentiments toward slain United Healthcare CEO Brian Thompson “is better described as cries from the heart of a deeply wounded & betrayed country; hundreds of thousands of Americans shamelessly exploited by health-care insurers reacting to a single act of violence against just one of their multimillionaire executives.”

Oates, however, took a different approach to Daniel Penny. She questioned if the decision to dismiss the manslaughter charge was “based on law.” Oates accused Penny of homicide and wondered if there were “mitigating circumstances” that would have led to the dismissal.

Beau Forte, a former Green Party candidate for Congress in New Jersey, said, “Currently, over 1,000 people go bankrupt daily,

solely due to personal medical bills. Anyone who can make millions of dollars overseeing a system like this, and sleep well at night doesn't deserve my sympathy." Forte additionally opined on social media "that the world is a better place because of" Thompson's murder.

Forte posted on social media that he did not know enough about the Daniel Penny case to make an informed statement if Penny "was guilty or not." Forte, however, went on to push the racist lie "that If [sic] you swapped the races in this case, the jury would not be deadlocked."

Anthony Zenkus, a senior lecturer at Columbia, is more of an activist than an academic. According to his profile on Columbia's website, he is involved with racial justice, income inequality, and climate justice. He has served as an organizer for Occupy Wall Street, the fight for a \$15 minimum wage, Al Gore's climate initiative, and supports Black Lives Matter.

Zenkus posted online, "Today, we mourn the death of United Healthcare CEO Brian Thompson, gunned down...wait, I'm sorry—today we mourn the deaths of the 68,000 Americans who needlessly die each year so that insurance company execs like Brian Thompson can become multimillionaires." His X account is littered with sympathy for the shooter and scornful of anyone showing remorse for Thompson.

Zenkus did not make any statements on the Daniel Penny verdict, but when the incident first happened he posted on social media, "Daniel Penny was trained. Daniel Penny knew exactly what he was doing to Jordan Neely [sic]. Daniel Penny murdered Jordan Neely. Arrest Daniel Penny."

The ladies on ABC's "The View" were quick to defend Jordan Neely and cast aspersions on Daniel Penny. Whoopi Goldberg sympathized with Neely stating that "he was an ill man" and argued that the death of his mother "set him off on his mental path." Co-host Sunny Hostin referred to Neely as "a former

Michael Jackson impersonator” and suggested he was “hungry and thirsty” and less of a threat. Both Goldberg and Hostin asked several times “where is our compassion as a society” for Neely.

As for the murder of Thompson, co-hosts of “The View” took a different tone. Sara Haines took point accusing health insurance companies of acting “like a criminal racket.” Meanwhile, Hostin referred to the gunman as “young” and “promising.”

Senator Elizabeth Warren (MA-D) commented on the murder of Thompson noting, “Violence is never the answer, but people can only be pushed so far.” She went on to say, “This is a warning that if you push people hard enough, they...start to take matters into their own hands in ways that will ultimately be a threat to everyone.”

Senator Bernie Sanders (VT-I) commented on the Thompson murder by arguing that the “anger at healthcare industry tells us...you cannot have people in the insurance industry rejecting needed healthcare for people while they make billions of dollars in profit.”

Yolanda Wilson, Ph.D., an associate professor of health care ethics at St. Louis University, wrote on social media “While I’m not rejoicing about UHC CEO being shot dead in the street, I’m not sad about it, either. People deserve better than the US health insurance industry, and chickens come home to roost.”

Following Penny’s acquittal, Hawk Newsome, a cofounder of Black Lives Matter, stated, “We need some black vigilantes.” It is worth restating the George Floyd riots that Black Lives Matter participated in contributed to the death or injuries of dozens of people and caused between \$1 and \$2 billion dollars worth of damage.

What happened to Thompson was inexcusable. What Penny did was

honorable. Unfortunately, 41 percent of those under the age of 30 found Thompson's killing acceptable. This tells us more about what they are learning in school and from social media than anything else.

LEFTISTS ATTACK RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN EUROPE

This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 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](#).

The Observatory on Intolerance and Discrimination against Christians in Europe (OIDAC Europe) annually collects data on the state of religious liberty. Its latest report garnered media coverage on both sides of the Atlantic, but most of it was simply a tally of offenses committed against Christians; the motives of the perpetrators were given scant coverage. Had they probed more deeply, they would have reported on the oversized role played by militant secularists.

Given that most of the major media outlets in North America and Europe are left-of-center, this outcome is not surprising. It seems clear that this was less an oversight than a calculated decision.

In the nearly 15 years that OIDAC Europe has been documenting anti-Christian hate crimes, there has been a steady increase in the number of incidents; they range from vandalism to murder. The researchers found there were 2,444 anti-Christian hate crimes in 35 European countries last year, including 232 personal attacks on Christians. France, the United Kingdom and

Germany posted the worst records.

Who's mostly responsible? The 2024 Report says most of the attacks were done by (a) radical Islamists (b) those who were anti-religious and (c) those who identify with the radical left. The latter two categories combine for the large share of the offenses, and although the Report does not say so explicitly, those two demographic groups are representative of militant secularists.

A review of the types of offenses detailed by the Report validates this conclusion. Radical Muslims are not the biggest threat to religious liberty in Europe; it is left-wing radicals who harbor an animus against Christianity. It should be mentioned that much the same kind of persecution is taking place in Canada and in the United States.

For example, those who follow traditional Christian teachings were discriminated against by losing their jobs, being subjected to unfounded investigations, the closing of bank accounts, humiliation and bullying.

"Expressing religious convictions such as 'marriage is a union between one man and one woman,' or 'human life begins at conception,'" were among the reasons Christians lost their jobs. Those are the kinds of beliefs that trigger militant secularists on the left to act, not radical Islamists (they are more prone to strike out against converts to Christianity).

The Report also found that "In the context of employment, Christians who expressed traditional views, were often reported by activists, subjected to disciplinary hearings—which some described as interrogations about their personal beliefs—and subsequently dismissed." Left-wing activists fit the bill completely.

Here's how discrimination on the basis of traditional moral beliefs works. "Any mention of faith in a CV precludes one

from an interview. My yearly assessment was lowered because I spoke of Christ.” That is precisely the type of bullying that secular activists are very good at.

Besides the workplace, traditional Christians are being targeted in the universities. “This perception seems to stem mainly from a hostile attitude towards Christianity among students from the political left and from negative preconceptions about Christians that are attributed to anyone who professes the Christian faith.” That says it all.

Some Christian haters in Europe have gone so far as to punish praying in public. They even attack those who pray silently. Christians are being interrogated by the police, fined and prosecuted if they pray outside an abortion clinic.

Adam Smith-Connor is an army veteran and father. He was found guilty in October 2024 by a British court after “praying silently in his own mind in a public area in a so-called ‘buffer zone,’ because at one point his head was seen slightly bowed and his hands were clasped.” That was it. In Northern Ireland a woman who was caught peacefully praying by the roadside now faces up to six months in prison if found guilty.

In May, another person who was simply standing on a public street corner in a “buffer zone” in Birmingham was asked by the police, “Are you here to pray for the lives of unborn children?” By the way, these “buffer zones” include private homes: it is against the law in Scotland for private home owners to display pro-life signs if they can be seen within 200 meters of the premises.

This is the kind of thing we would expect from the dictators in North Korea, not democratically elected officials in Europe.

Transgenderism is all the rage in Europe. They are now banning teachers in the U.K. for “misgendering” a transgender pupil, meaning they are punishing teachers for calling a boy a boy

and a girl a girl even when the boys and girls falsely claim that they are of the opposite sex.

In Switzerland, the government took a couple's 16-year-old daughter from her parents and placed her in a state home because the parents objected to her "gender transition."

This is the mark of totalitarians, and it is not radical Islamists who are doing it. It is the work of militant left-wing secularists who hate Christianity.

They are locking up the wrong people in Europe.

THE PROBLEM WITH ROBERT F. KENNEDY Jr.

This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 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](#).

Robert F. Kennedy Jr. has been chosen by president-elect Donald Trump to be Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS). From a Catholic perspective, there are serious problems with that choice.

First and foremost is Kennedy's position on abortion. It might be more accurate to say his positions on abortion. For most of his career he has been a staunch supporter of abortion-on-demand, but now he says he favors some restrictions.

Kennedy didn't evolve over the years on this issue. He did so recently when it became apparent that if Trump were to win the election he may land some post in the administration. Being

pro-abortion, he obviously reasoned, could be a real problem, especially if he were up for the HHS job.

When Kennedy was asked by former ESPN commentator, Sage Steele, whether there should be any limits on abortion, he said no. "Even if it is full term...I don't think it's ever OK...I think we have to leave it with the woman rather than the state." He didn't say that ten years ago. He said it in May of last year.

It gets worse. Literally *three days* after the Steele interview, Kennedy said abortion should be permitted only before viability.

There are other issues that should give Catholics pause. In December 2023 he told political commentator Patrick Bet-David that he did not support a ban on "gender affirming" care for minors. Why? Because he did not "know enough about it to say that it should be completely illegal," and he needed "to look at the data" before making a decision.

But guess what? In May he decided he supported a ban on minors receiving "gender affirming" care.

Kennedy not only wants to make marijuana legal nationwide, he wants to legalize some psychedelics. That would presumably include psilocybin (magic mushrooms), the most popular psychedelic in the nation. He believes that there are significant benefits to psychedelics that have not been uncovered because the medical establishment has gone out of its way to prevent that research.

Here's what we know about magic mushrooms. They can cause frightening hallucinations, distorted thinking, impaired concentration, unusual body sensations, nausea and vomiting, paranoia, confusion and emotions ranging from bliss to terror.

The fundamental problem with Kennedy is that he lacks a coherent understanding of these issues.

He spent his entire life defending abortion-without-limits, and had no problem justifying puberty blockers, chemical castration and mutilating the genitals of disturbed minors—until he experienced his grand epiphany in May. And now he thinks we need to make it easier for Americans to hallucinate.

Following our news release on this subject, Kennedy told Trump and Sen. Tommy Tuberville that he will not pursue his pro-abortion policies and will instead follow what the president wants.

BAR FOR SCREENING NOMINEES DIPS LOWER

This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 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](#).

Donald Trump's nominees for various posts will soon be scrutinized, and some of them are bound to have their personal lives held under a microscope. Assuming something tawdry turns up, the question is whether it will matter. It's worth remembering some fairly recent events.

Think of all the politicians who have been accused of one sexual impropriety after another. We have the Kennedys: John, Robert and Ted—all of whom learned a thing or two from their philandering father, Joe. More recently we learned about the alleged sexual escapades of Dennis Hastert, Al Franken, Elliot Spitzer and Andrew Cuomo. Homosexual congressmen such as Gerry Studds and Barney Frank were accused of sexual misconduct.

Bill Clinton, of Monica fame, was accused of rape, as was Joe Biden and Donald Trump. Biden's daughter, in fact, wrote that her sexual troubles began early on. To wit: She wrote in her diary about "having sex with friends @ a young age; showering w/my dad (probably not appropriate)...."

When did it become acceptable to live a life of sexual recklessness?

In the 1970s, the libertine ideas that took root in the 1960s began to manifest themselves behaviorally (Plato's Retreat for straights and the bathhouses for gays). The sexual revolution gave us a spike in out-of-wedlock birth, babies being killed in the womb, broken lives, AIDS and premature deaths. It continues today though it is not as dramatic as it was then.

From the 1970s to today, Hollywood, TV talk shows, the media, women's magazines (e.g., *Cosmopolitan*), psychologists and sociologists have been bombarding us with the need to be tolerant of what previously was considered intolerant speech and behavior. When vulgar singers and dancers strut their stuff at presidential events, and drag queens get their jollies by sexualizing little kids at public libraries, is it any wonder why so many men and women have become inured to moral degradation?

Having polluted our culture with obscene toxins, it is a little late in the game to invoke Christian standards for government posts. So if there is a Trump appointee who has a record of moral turpitude, who among the Democrats is going to throw the first stone?

Our choice would be Dr. Richard Levine. He served as the Assistant Secretary for Health who goes by the name Rachel and falsely claims to be a woman.

LOOK WHO FUNDS CATHOLIC DISSIDENTS

This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 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 examined which foundations are funding Catholic dissident organizations and learned that the number-one contributor appears to be the Arcus Foundation.

Arcus funds We Are Church, DignityUSA, New Ways Ministry, Catholics for Choice and the Women's Alliance for Theology, Ethics and Ritual (WATER). All reject the Church's teachings on marriage, the family, sexuality and ordination, yet claim to be Catholic.

New Ways Ministry was founded in 1977 by Father Robert Nugent and Sister Jeannine Gramick. It has been roundly condemned by cardinals and bishops in Rome and the U.S., but Pope Francis spoke positively of Gramick in 2021.

Jon Stryker created the Arcus Foundation in 2000 to focus on LGBT causes and the preservation of the great apes. He is a homosexual billionaire, and his lavish funding of Catholic dissident groups is done to undermine Catholicism. In 2023, he gave a total of more than \$42 million in grants and operating expenses to various organizations.

Other groups that fund these anti-Catholic entities include the Ford Foundation, George Soros' Open Society Foundations, Susan Thompson Buffett Foundation, William & Flora Hewlett Foundation and the Huber Foundation.

This just goes to show how ideologically corrupt many members of the ruling class really are.

U.S. TRAILS U.K. ON PUBERTY BLOCKERS

This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 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's time the medical profession in the U.S. caught up with the U.K., and most European nations, by pulling back its support for gender ideology. It's madness and every sane person knows this to be true.

The American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Federation of Pediatric Organizations, the American Psychological Association and the American Psychiatric Association are still promoting transgenderism, the insane idea that the sexes are interchangeable. They are not—nature is not a social construct.

The Brits have figured it out. They decided on December 11 to make permanent an earlier decision by the country's National Health Service to ban the use of puberty blockers for young people suffering from gender dysphoria.

Wes Streeting, the health secretary, said, "We need to act with caution and care when it comes to this vulnerable group of young people, and follow the expert advice." One of the experts he listened to was Hilary Cass. She noted that puberty blockers "are powerful drugs with unproven benefits and significant risks."

Why is the U.S. on the wrong side of history on this issue? As Bill Donohue pointed out in *Cultural Meltdown: The Secular Roots of Our Moral Crisis*, what's driving transgenderism is money and ideology. That's a wicked stew.

The transgender industry is a multibillion dollar enterprise. Lots of medical professionals are making a quick buck exploiting sexually confused young people. They are prescribing puberty blockers and performing sex-reassignment surgery—including chemical castration and genital mutilation—on troubled youth.

Then there is the role of ideology. Transgenderism is based on the unscientific notion that the sexes are interchangeable. It holds that all it takes for a male to become a female, and vice versa, is to make public declarations of this sort. But we cannot change what nature has ordained. Nature is not like a piece of putty that can be twisted and reconfigured. God made sure of that.

Dr. Christiane Nüsslein-Volhard is a Nobel Prize-winning biologist. She calls the transgender movement's claims "unscientific" and "nonsense," and says that allowing teenagers to determine their own sex is "madness." Furthermore, she says, "All mammals have two sexes, and man is a mammal. There's the one sex that produces the eggs, has two X chromosomes. That's called female. And there's the other one that makes the sperm, has an X and a Y chromosome. That's called male."

This is Biology 101. But it needs to be relearned, and no segment of the population needs to relearn it more than the medical profession. They need to put the money and ideology aside and start acting responsibly again.

2024 ELECTION TRACKER

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

The 2024 election cycle revealed a seismic shift in the political landscape of this country. While most of the focus has been rightfully on the presidential election, there were also significant developments downballot that are indicative of the culture shifting in the direction of commonsense and traditional values.

Abortion

In the 2024 election, the pro-life side began to show some signs that it can win elections in the Post-Roe era. In Florida, Nebraska, and South Dakota, voters defeated efforts to repeal pro-life laws. Considering that pro-life initiatives lost every vote since 2022, these three wins prove there is a path forward on this critical issue.

Although there were positive signs, unfortunately abortion access was enshrined into the state constitutions of Arizona, Colorado, Maryland, Missouri, Montana, Nevada, and New York.

Drug Legalization

Drug legalization met serious setbacks this cycle. In Florida, North Dakota, and South Dakota, voters rejected efforts to legalize marijuana. Meanwhile, Massachusetts voters rejected an initiative to legalize natural psychedelics (i.e. mushrooms). However, voters in Nebraska legalized medical marijuana.

School Choice

Voters in Colorado, Kentucky, and Nebraska rejected school choice initiatives. There were marking similarities between all three states.

First, the supporters of school choice were vastly outspent in all three campaigns. For instance in Kentucky, the “no” campaign outspent the “yes” side by nearly three-to-one, with local school boards using official funds to oppose school choice. In Nebraska, the “no” campaign raised over \$7 million while the supporters of school choice only had a war chest of \$1 million.

Further, in all three states the initiatives were very limited in their scope and the wording of the initiatives was vague. This directly led to tempered support, even the Christian Home Educators of Colorado came out against the amendment over fears that the language of “quality education” could lead to intrusive regulations. Meanwhile, Kentucky voters were asked to amend the constitution to thwart efforts by the state’s supreme court to derail school choice proposals, but voters were never given a positive vision of what a school choice program might look like. In all three instances, there was an enthusiasm gap that allowed the opponents of school choice to defeat the initiatives.

However, there were some positive signs on school choice. Many candidates that supported school choice won their elections. For instance, Texas elected a school choice majority in the state legislature. Likewise in Indiana, the gubernatorial challenger, who ran on an anti school choice platform, lost resoundingly. In an election postmortem, NBC’s Chuck Todd linked the strong performance of Republicans with Hispanic voters in Florida and Texas to the aggressive school choice programs advanced by officials in both states.

Other Education Issues

Earlier this election cycle, San Francisco voters supported a ballot measure that bolstered the school district’s math curriculum. Moving in the opposite direction, voters in Massachusetts passed Question 2, which does away with the requirement for high school students to pass a standardized test in order to graduate.

Parental Rights

Voters in Washington State approved Initiative 2081, which establishes a “parents’ bill of rights.” This allows parents to review books in school libraries and remove books deemed sexually explicit. Further, parents can now opt their children out of sex education courses or class sessions or assignments related to gender ideology, politics, or religion. Most importantly, it pledges that students’ and their families’ religious beliefs will be respected.

Crime

California residents voted overwhelmingly to pass Proposition 36, a tough-on-crime ballot initiative that will enact harsher penalties for retail theft, property crimes and drug offenses.

Earlier in the election cycle, a slew of anti-crime measures were approved by voters across the country. Voters in San Francisco approved Ballot Measure E, which strengthens the city’s police force, minimizes the amount of paperwork cops have to do freeing them up to patrol the streets, and utilizes new technology to deter crime. Meanwhile up in Washington State, voters passed Initiative 2113, which reverses restrictions on police pursuits.

District Attorneys

The 2024 election also saw the culling of several radical District Attorneys, many of whom were supported by progressive billionaire George Soros. In Los Angeles, District Attorney George Gascón was blown out by law-and-order candidate Nathan Hochman. Further up the California coast, Alameda District Attorney Pamela Price was ousted by voters in a successful recall election. Price, who received significant support from Soros during her career and made “criminal justice reform” a hallmark of her tenure was deemed too lenient and ultimately failed to keep residents safe. Meanwhile in Georgia, District Attorney Deborah Gonzales lost her reelection bid after pursuing an “unapologetically” progressive agenda that contributed to spiking crime rates and the murder of Laken

Riley, a college student murdered by an illegal immigrant while out jogging.

Election Integrity

Voters in Idaho, Iowa, Kentucky, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Wisconsin all voted to enact measures to ensure that only citizens can vote.

Meanwhile, voters in Alaska, Colorado, Idaho, Missouri, Nevada, and Oregon all rejected efforts to install ranked choice voting. However, DC voters passed an initiative to allow for this voting system.

BELIEVING BALD-FACE LIES

This is the article that appeared in the December 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 just finished another presidential election year. Never have there been more lies told by so many candidates at the federal, state, and local levels. Not the usual lies—the ones that candidates tell about themselves and their opponent. There is nothing new about that. The bald-face lies, the kinds of falsehoods that every sentient person knows is an obvious lie.

The most disturbing aspect of this phenomenon is that it works; importantly, it is not confined to the political world. How is it possible to believe something that is manifestly false? Similarly, what motivates inveterate liars?

Recently, the Drudge Report, a once popular news aggregate website, ran a headline on the front page saying, “Tucker

Carlson Claims Abortion Causes Hurricanes?"

After checking the story, which was published by Mediaite, a left-wing outlet that seeks to discredit conservative voices, and reading what Carlson actually said, it was clear as a bell that he was mocking those who say hurricanes are caused by global warming. He said, sarcastically, "No, it's probably abortion." Any fair-minded person would conclude that what Carlson said was in jest, but that's not what was reported.

Throughout this past year, reporters, media commentators and politicians said over and over again that late-term abortions were not legal under *Roe v. Wade*, and that it was simply not true that in some states there is no legal requirement mandating that medical personnel attend to babies who survive a botched abortion. As we, and others, pointed out, this was utterly false. The pro-abortion side simply lied.

In October, we had a chance to fact check a "fact checker" at the *New York Times* and found that the reporter left out the second part of a sentence from a Minnesota bill that she quoted. She did so purposely so as to make her point. Had she included the entire sentence, her position would have been proven wrong.

After we took Michigan Gov. Gretchen Whitmer to the cleaners for mocking the Eucharist, her press secretary said that the woman who feigned taking Communion (a Dorito was placed on her tongue by Whitmer) was not kneeling. That was a lie. She was not sitting on a couch, as they contended—she was kneeling. The picture proves it.

After President Biden called Trump supporters "garbage," White House staff tried to alter his words. When the truth came out, the White House press secretary still said he never said such a thing, even though he was captured on tape saying exactly that.

Why do these people lie when it is 100 percent certain that

they have? Because they can get away with it.

To be sure, when presented with the evidence, most people are instantly persuaded. But not all. There are those who, upon hearing prominent persons deny that what they said is a lie, are puzzled. They are no longer sure. That plays to the advantage of the liar because doubt has been instilled in their mind. In short, liars count on uncertainty—it mitigates the damage done.

Why do people not trust their senses? Why are they unsure even when the facts are stacked against the liars?

There have been plenty of psychological studies done on groupthink. Solomon Asch learned in the 1950s that group size has a significant impact on our tendency to conform. His experiments showed that approximately a third of the people are inclined to doubt their own conclusions if surrounded mostly by people who have reached a different conclusion. Conformity triumphs over truth.

Daniel Kahneman found that groupthink occurs when people are presented with a perspective that is contrary to theirs and they buckle. Why don't they standfast? They want to avoid conflict. Their desire for harmony overrides their willingness to express an independent thought.

This is the psychological variant of the political reality found in Washington D.C. "If you want to get along, go along."

The price that people pay for suppressing their conscience is evidently worth it. They reason that when in doubt, go with the flow. Unfortunately, this plays into the hands of those who intentionally seek to distort the truth—their goal is to escape the consequences of their lies. Regrettably, having succeeded in blunting the worst outcome, they are inspired to continue lying. They can always count on the doubters.

The Communists in the last century liked to hold

elections—even though they meant nothing—because they wanted to forge a sense of unity. They believed that if the people went through the motions and voted, it would convince them that they have a say in government. For some, it worked.

Elite decision-makers in the democracies also want to get the masses onboard, so when their lies are challenged, they double-down with more lies. By planting the seeds of doubt, they can't be held accountable.

To lie is not to make a mistake. We mistakenly say something when we don't have all the facts. To lie presumes we know the truth and choose not to acknowledge it. It's even more diabolical when it is done to manipulate the public for self-serving purposes.

MEDIA COVER-UP FOR HARRIS

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

Our normally curious media are noticeably incurious regarding several serious matters involving Kamala Harris. Why the silence on issues that the voters have every right to know about?

Harris is rarely asked when she became aware of President Biden's mental decline. When she is, she pretends not to have noticed.

For example, when asked by the *New York Times* if she has any regrets about defending his mental state, she said he has the "intelligence, the commitment and the judgment and

disposition" to lead. Right after his disastrous debate performance in June—when everyone conceded he was mentally struggling—she said he is “so smart” and is “extraordinarily strong.”

Why, then, have so many of those who have been with Biden over the past few years found him to be mentally challenged?

In his new book, *War*, Bob Woodward recounts many stories about Biden's apparent mental collapse. He can't complete sentences, he repeats himself constantly, he rambles, he can't focus when speaking (even when given notecards), he is unable to remember basic facts, he wanders aimlessly around the room, etc.

So if others knew he was mentally shot, why didn't she? Didn't her staffers notice his declining cognitive abilities, and didn't they discuss this with her? Did she ever go to the president and ask him about it? Did she ever talk to his wife about it? Why are the media giving her a pass on this? After all, this is a matter of national security, among other things.

Harris' mother came from Tamil Brahmin stock—the most privileged caste in India. The Brahmin reputation for looking down at those below them is legendary. Here's why this matters.

The *New York Times* reported on October 30 that when her mother married a black man in the United States, her family was against it. But the news story doesn't say why. Her husband, Donald, was not some low-life: he was studying for his doctorate in 1962 when they met (he teaches economics today at Stanford University).

So if she didn't marry “down” economically, why would her Indian family oppose the marriage? Was it because they perceived her marrying “down” racially? In short, was it because he was black that they objected? If so, she would certainly want to keep this out of the media. She is the

champion of racial equality, isn't she? How would it look if the public learned that her Indian family wanted nothing to do with marrying a black man?

Harris' husband, Doug Emhoff, no longer denies knocking up his nanny while married to his first wife. The nanny, Najen Naylor, also taught his children at a rich private school. When Emhoff's wife found out about the affair, she filed for divorce.

The unanswered question is: Whatever happened to the baby? There are two stories about this that are worth probing.

One story has it that she miscarried after a disturbing encounter she had with him (the LAPD were called to intervene), causing her to miscarry. The other story, which is based on multiple friends of the nanny, says she never miscarried—she “kept” the baby.

If the nanny “kept” the baby, whatever happened to it? Did she have an abortion? We know that when she left her job as a teacher, she allegedly received a settlement from Emhoff. What was the settlement for? We also know she bought a house in the Hamptons in 2021 for \$885,000. Not many nannies can afford that. Some say there was a non-disclosure agreement (NDA). Was there?

Both Kamala and her husband are big fans of abortion rights, so if the baby that he fathered with the nanny were aborted, that wouldn't have mattered to them. But it matters to the public. Why haven't the media probed this story? Is this another cover-up?

Also, Emhoff likes to say how “toxic” masculinity is. What is really “toxic” is beating your date for flirting with a parking valet. Three women have accused him of doing just that after the Cannes Film Festival in 2012 (he denies it). He allegedly smacked his girlfriend so hard that he spun her around, simply because she put her hand on the shoulder of the

valet, leaving her in tears. He never apologized.

Emhoff is also accused by former female employees of being a “misogynist” who flirted with staff members, hired a “trophy secretary” on the basis of her youth and good looks, and held male-only cocktail parties on Friday evenings. Sounds like pretty toxic masculinity.

Why don't we know whether Emhoff had his child aborted? Why don't we know for sure whether he is a violent sexist? Why don't we know if Kamala's Indian family objected to her marrying Donald Harris because he is black? When did Kamala first know that Biden was mentally unfit to be president, and to whom did she speak, if anyone?

It is scandalous that the media are refusing to do their job. This is journalistic malfeasance.

MEET THE CATHOLICS WHO SUPPORTED HARRIS

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

As we have pointed out numerous times, Kamala Harris has not endeared herself to Catholics. Her policies on abortion, marriage, the family, sexuality, religious liberty and school choice are all contrary to Catholic teachings. Moreover, her decision to refuse an invitation to speak at the Al Smith Dinner, and to belittle Christian students at a rally, only add to her problems.

Despite all of this, there was a group called Catholics for Harris-Walz. Here's a quick look at the most prominent among them.

Sr. Simone Campbell

Campbell is the former executive director of Network, a dissident Catholic entity. She spoke at the 2012 Democratic National Convention (DNC) in support of Obama's Health and Human Services mandate: it required Catholic nonprofits to pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plans. Campbell believes that abortion should not be illegal, and more recently she has thrown her support behind the Equality Act. It would force Catholic doctors and hospitals to perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgery.

Anthea Butler

Butler teaches at the University of Pennsylvania and is a regular guest on MSNBC. She is widely known for her promotion of critical race theory, which holds that white people are irredeemably racist. She has even called God a "white racist." Moreover, she has accused the Church of operating "a pedophile ring."

Joe Donnelly

Donnelly started out as a Catholic official who was mostly in line with the teachings of the Catholic Church. But he ended his career in government as a foe of the Church's moral teachings. Donnelly abandoned the positions of the Catholic Church on abortion, LGBT issues, and religious liberty. He went on to serve as Biden's ambassador to the Holy See.

Rep. Rosa DeLauro

DeLauro is a co-sponsor of the Equality Act and has a lifetime rating of 100 percent from the pro-abortion behemoth NARAL.

In 2021, she issued a "Statement of Principles" criticizing the bishops for admonishing Catholic public figures who reject

core moral teachings. DeLauro has a long history of telling the bishops what to do. In 2006, she issued a similar statement arguing that one can be a Catholic in good standing and promote abortion. In 2007, she was one of 18 self-identified Catholic Democrats to criticize Pope Benedict XVI on the same topic. In 2015, she led a contingent of 93 self-identified Catholic Democrats to tell Pope Francis that he needed to focus on climate change rather than abortion.

Christopher Hale

Hale administers Catholics for Harris. It is really a one-man social media account with “no organizational structure” or budget to speak of. Hale claims he serves “as a pipeline to the official Harris-Walz campaign,” saying he is part of the Harris campaign’s “Catholic kitchen cabinet.”

Previously, Hale ran Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good. It was expressly founded to subvert the Catholic Church, provoking a “revolution within the Church.” Catholics in Alliance was funded by George Soros’ Open Society Institute and the Tides Foundation. However, both pulled their funding after it lost its IRS tax-exempt status.

Denise Murphy McGraw

McGraw is one of the national co-chairs of Catholics Vote Common Good; it is a spin-off of Vote Common Good, a Soros-funded progressive Christian organization. In 2020, it issued a letter signed by 1,600 far-left faith leaders calling on Biden to run for president. It also attacked New York Archbishop Cardinal Dolan when he spoke positively about Trump.

Patrick Carolan

Carolan is one of the national co-chairs of Catholics Vote Common Good. Prior to this, he ran the Franciscan Action Network, a left-wing social justice entity. He opposes Catholic schools that enforce the teachings of the Church on several issues; similarly, he encourages Catholic lay groups

to support gay marriage.

Rep. Madeleine Dean

Dean was part of a panel talk hosted by Catholics Vote Common Good at the 2024 DNC. She co-sponsored the Equality Act in 2023, and she has a 100 percent score from NARAL.

Rep. Mary Gay Scanlon

Scanlon was part of a panel talk hosted by Catholics Vote Common Good at the 2024 DNC. She co-sponsored the Equality Act in 2023, and has a 100 percent score from NARAL.

Miguel Diaz

Diaz was part of a panel talk hosted by Catholics Vote Common Good at the 2024 DNC.

Diaz previously served as the United States' Ambassador to the Holy See under Obama. He was a tireless champion of Kathleen Sebelius, the Secretary of Health and Human Services who tried to force Catholic nonprofits to pay for abortions.

Dr. Patrick Whelan

Whelan is the lead organizer of Catholics for Kamala. He is the founder of Catholic Democrats.

In 2010, Whelan authored a "study" claiming that pro-choice policies actually led to a decrease in abortions. Even the pro-abortion research giant, the Guttmacher Institute, contradicted his findings. His "study," it became clear, was intended to discredit the bishops. He tried this trick again in 2021.

In 2011, he blamed Philadelphia Archbishop Charles Chaput for not addressing social justice issues with the bishops. More recently, Whelan co-authored "The Catholic Case for Kamala," an 80-page booklet that explores the alleged "Opus Dei roots" of Project 2025.

These are the kinds of Catholics who are championing the cause

of Kamala Harris. Is anyone surprised?