

LAUGHING AT ABORTION

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](#).

Can abortion be funny? Some think so. While most liberals would not agree that it is, it remains true that the only ones who do are secular liberals. Some are prominent Americans. If they are not mocking pro-lifers, they are joking about abortion.

On October 17, Vice President Kamala Harris mocked Christian students, much to the applause of her fans. When Harris began to defend abortion at a Wisconsin rally, two young people shouted, "Christ is King." She could have let it go. Instead, she berated them.

"You guys are at the wrong rally." As is her wont, she laughed heartily, and the crowd loved it. Yet when pro-Hamas protesters shout her down, she simply insists on her free speech rights. But on this occasion, that was obviously deemed inadequate. These were Christians—they deserved to be belittled.

Recently, Michigan Gov. Gretchen Whitmer insulted Catholics by going for the jugular—she ridiculed the Eucharist. We made sure everyone found out about it. Then she lied about what she did. What was not generally reported was how she reacted when the subject of abortion came up.

Liz Plank, the podcaster with whom Whitmer mocked Holy Communion, said to the governor, "Okay, and you have two daughters. When they come back home and they leave their Stanley Cups lying around, do you ever think about getting a post-birth abortion?" Whitmer broke out into uncontrollable laughter, saying, "Thank you for raising that because there is

no such thing.”

In fact, there is. Babies are born alive as a result of a botched abortion. Some not only live to tell their story, they have organized to inform Americans about it. Yet Whitmer thinks it’s funny. If she had any guts she would confront these survivors face-to-face, and then share her sense of humor with them.

Less well known pro-abortion advocates think the same way. About a decade ago, some male students at Hunter College in New York City decided to play a game mocking abortion. They stuffed balloons under their shirts, pretending to be pregnant, and then used plastic forks and knives on each other to pop the balloons. Students yelled, “Kill that baby! Kill it!”

Four years ago a girl went on TikTok bragging about her second abortion. Two years ago she was outdone by Alison Leiby. She performed a comedy show, “Oh God, a Show About Abortion.” It was a celebration of her recent abortion. Why did she do it? “I wrote the show to help people understand and laugh about abortion.” That way more women will find it easier to make the decision to abort their child, and may even get a good chuckle out of it.

Almost as bad as these people are those with whom they live and work and refuse to confront them. Many of them know it is sick to laugh about abortion, but they don’t want to appear “judgmental.” But that in itself is a judgment.

Our society has become increasingly debased. When abortion is treated as legitimate comedic fare, the most vulnerable among us are next in line. History shows that desensitizing the population yields ugly results.

KAMALA'S ABORTION CONCESSION

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](#).

In October, in a Town Hall event, Kamala Harris said, "I'll tell you, there are probably many here and watching who, rightly, have made a decision that they do not believe in abortion. The point that I am making is not about changing their mind about what's right for them or their family."

It's quite a concession to say that those who are pro-life have "rightly" made their decision. No one, including her, would say that those who believe in racial discrimination have "rightly" made that decision. That's because there is no moral justification for it. But to concede that there is a moral justification to oppose abortion begs the question: What is it that pro-life Americans are objecting to?

Harris knows what's going on, and so does everyone else. The reason pro-life Americans find they cannot stomach abortion is because it kills the innocent. The real issue is why everyone does not admit the obvious.

WASHINGTON POST NEEDS A

REALITY CHECK

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](#).

Jeff Bezos, the owner of the *Washington Post*, lives in the real world, but many of his readers and writers do not. He knows the media have lost their credibility but the others do not. They need a reality check.

Bezos put the squash on an editorial to endorse Kamala Harris. Now the sky is falling in Washington.

He took to the editorial page to defend his decision. Here's what he said about newspapers. "We must be accurate, and we must be believed to be accurate. It's a bitter pill to swallow, but we are failing on the second requirement. Most people believe the media is [sic] biased. Anyone who doesn't see this is paying scant attention to reality, and those who fight reality lose."

He's right. The data prove it. In the 1970s, when Gallup first started asking about the media's credibility, trust ranged from 68 percent to 72 percent. Today it is at 31 percent. That's a record low. And it may be worse than that. Another national survey, released in September by Populace, found that 24 percent *publicly* agree the media tell the truth, but only 7 percent *privately* believe they do.

Just recently, a Rasmussen survey found that 50 percent of likely voters believe the media are biased in favor of the Democrats. In fact, 49 percent agree that the media are "truly the enemy of the people." The *Washington Post* has contributed mightily to this perception.

Here's an example about the Post that shows its blatant bias against the Catholic Church (many more could be provided).

In a November 13, 2022 editorial, it was claimed that “high-level sexual misconduct and cover-up in France shattered illusions of progress by the church toward establishing a culture of transparency and accountability in its hierarchy.”

The evidence? A retired cardinal and archbishop in France admitted to sexual misconduct with a teenage girl 35 years earlier.

At the time Bill Donohue wrote, “There are over 5,000 bishops in the world and the *Washington Post* found two of them who were involved in sexual misconduct decades ago. The paper argues that this shatters ‘illusions of progress.’” Donohue couldn’t help but say, “What is really shattered is the credibility of its editorial board.”

Those who write for the newspaper do not see themselves as biased. They see themselves as being right. Those who think otherwise are simply wrong. That is the liberal mentality, whether found in the media, education, or anywhere else.

The paper’s readers feel the same way. In retaliation against Bezos’ decision not to endorse Harris, more than 200,000 of them have canceled their digital subscription. Editorial board members and reporters are also quitting.

Journalist David Hoffman has had it, saying, “I stand against silence in the face of dictatorship.” He didn’t call him Hitler, at least not in public, but he did say, “I believe we face a very real threat of autocracy in the candidacy of Donald Trump.” His colleague, Mary Roberts, said she is quitting “because the imperative to endorse Kamala Harris over Donald Trump is as morally clear as it gets.”

As Jonathan Turley and others have documented, the Biden-Harris years represent the most anti-free speech administration in the history of the United States, yet according to the *Washington Post* they do not pose a threat to democracy—Trump does. Is there any air in their bubble?

Even richer is former Washington Post executive director Marty Baron. “To declare a moment of high principle, only 11 days before the election that is just highly suspect that is just not to be believed that this was a matter of principle at this point.”

It takes gall for Baron to accuse Bezos of not being principled.

In 2018, *60 Minutes* fired its executive producer, Jeff Fager, because he was a sexual predator. He would have been fired earlier had Baron not killed a story about his behavior. [See Donohue’s book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse*, for more information on this story.]

Amy Brittain, the *Washington Post*’s investigative reporter, and Irin Carmon spent four months doing a story on Fager; it was a follow-up to an earlier piece on Charlie Rose, who was fired from CBS after sexual harassment claims were made. They spoke to several women who said Fager had sexually abused them. Baron, they said, kept delaying the story and refused to speak with them. When the story finally ran, all the allegations against Fager were deleted; only additional allegations against Rose made it into the print.

Why did Baron kill the story on Fager? According to Carmon, “The close relationship between the paper and 60 Minutes” had something to do with it.

Bezos needs to clean house, and he is not alone. As the Gallup poll showed, the media are “the least trusted group among 10 U.S. civic and political institutions involved in the democratic process.” Small wonder why.

HARRIS AND “Dr.” JILL COMPETE FOR HONORS

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 literary credentials of Kamala Harris and Jill Biden are quite a spectacle. Not sure who is more impressive.

Harris claims to be the author of a 2010 book, *Smart On Crime*. Jill Biden claims to have a doctoral degree. But there's more there than meets the eye.

It's a sure bet Harris didn't write *Smart On Crime*. On the book's cover it identifies Kamala Harris “with” Joan O.C. Hamilton. Real authors know what that means—“with” wrote the book. This is acceptable if the “author” is a celebrity or an athlete, but when politicians, or TV personalities for that matter, sell themselves as real authors—when “with” wrote the book—it is simply dishonest.

But this doesn't excuse Harris from the charge of plagiarism. It has now been revealed that several passages in the book were lifted, word for word, from the Associated Press and Wikileaks. Harris put her name on it so she has to be held accountable. Bill Donohue begged off from buying it because it is selling on Amazon for \$395.

Her oral skills are no better. Known as the “Word Salad Queen,” Harris has a penchant for scrambling her thoughts. Much of what she says is so incoherent, or just plain dumb, as to make heads spin. For example, when she says, “I grew up understanding the children of the community are the children of the community,” it suggests that others grew up understanding the children of the community are *not* the

children of the community. Would love to meet them.

Harris' understanding of what culture means is equally profound.

"Culture is—it is a reflection of our moment and our time. Right? And present culture is the way we express how we're feeling about the moment and we should always find times to express how we feel about the moment. That is a reflection of joy. Because, you know...it comes in the morning." For some reason, we thought it was after lunch.

An Ed.D. is not like a Ph.D. The former is a degree in administration; the latter is a research degree. Most Ph.D.s, Donohue included, don't identify themselves as Dr., though they have every right to do so. To be awarded the degree, they have to write a dissertation, or what is regarded as an original contribution to research. This is not a requirement for an Ed.D. Therefore, when someone with an Ed.D. identifies as Dr., it makes those with a Ph.D. wince.

Jill Biden, armed with her Ed.D., insists on being called Dr. Jill, and the media dutifully comply (some people actually think she's a physician). After perusing what the University of Delaware calls her "dissertation/executive position paper" (never heard of an "executive position paper"—must be unique to Ed.D. candidates), it is clear that her "Dr." status is an embarrassment.

News reports say that her paper, which was on student retention in community colleges, is 137-pages long. Actually, the text is only 79 pages (the rest are introductory notes and the bibliography). It reads more like an encyclopedia than serious scholarship.

Readers can't get by the first two pages without wondering how any educator would sign off on it. Yet seven did, including the Provost. Then again, the Bidens are god in Delaware.

"Dr." Jill got off to a bad start. She writes, "The needs of

the student population are often *undeserved*, resulting in a student drop-out rate of almost one third (our italics)." She obviously meant "underserved." This was the second sentence on p. 1.

On p. 2, she proves her mathematical illiteracy. Commenting on the demographic characteristics of the students at Delaware Tech, she writes, "Three quarters of the class will be Caucasian; one quarter of the class will be African American." She should have stopped there. But evidently she can't count. She added, "one seat will hold a Latino; and the remaining seats will be filled with students of Asian descent or non-resident aliens."

Sometimes she simply makes no sense. "Although students make friends through their classes and their technologies...." What's that? Students make friends through "their technologies"?

Even better are her childlike constructions. She makes such pedestrian points that it makes the typical pub conversation sound Shakespearian.

"A faculty mentoring program can go hand-in-hand with the advisement process." Isn't that what mentoring programs are all about? Then we learn that "The best mentors are the faculty or staff with whom a student seems to connect." Very insightful.

Furthermore, she says, "The mentor should be genuinely interested in helping the students succeed or meet their goals." Extraordinary observation. Also, "The student retention committee should formulate a plan to increase retention." Great idea.

On the conclusion page, we learn that "Because community colleges are education institutions, the most important focus must center on the academic success of the students." Go to the head of the class, Dr. Jill.

Kamala and Dr. Jill are proof positive that anyone can make it in the USA.

KAMALA'S SLAVEMASTER PEDIGREE

This is the article that appeared in the November 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 Left is good at lying, especially when it comes to the poor and their upbringing.

The first question asked of Kamala Harris by David Muir in the debate between her and Donald Trump was, "When it comes to the economy, do you believe Americans are better off than they were four years ago?" She responded, "So, I was raised as a middle-class kid." Not only was that a dodge—her answer had nothing to do with the question—it was a lie.

In a lengthy piece on Breitbart about her biography, it was said that "a close look at her childhood shows that Harris and her younger sister grew up with many opportunities that many 'middle class' children do not have, such as living abroad, private school education, and growing up in some of the wealthiest locales in the world."

Today, Harris and her husband, Doug Emhoff, have an estimated net worth of \$8 million and they live in a house in Brentwood, California worth over \$5 million (double what they paid in 2012). The 3,500-square-foot estate has four bedrooms, five bathrooms, and a private pool. Her neighbors include Gisele Bündchen, Dr. Dre, LeBron James and Gwyneth Paltrow.

None of this would matter much if it weren't for Harris

portraying herself as an average American, and as someone whose background allows her to be the champion of the dispossessed. In actual fact, she has a slavemaster pedigree.

Her father, Stanford professor Donald Harris, is a descendant of Hamilton Brown, a slaveowner in Jamaica. He owned over 120 slaves in the early nineteenth century. He not only was a big sugar plantation slavemaster, he was an outspoken foe of the abolitionists. Moreover, he hated William Wilberforce, the most prominent public opponent of slavery.

Harris does not like to talk about her father's slavemaster roots, and neither does she like to talk about her mother's slavemaster roots. Indeed, her mother's side of the family is a classic case of privilege and an exemplar of oppression.

"In Indian society, we go by birth. We are Brahmins, that is the top caste." That is how her mother, Shyamala, described her roots.

A caste system is a type of social stratification that differs from a class system in that it does not permit mobility, either upward or downward. It's a closed system.

At the top are the Brahmins, mostly priests and academics. The second of four castes are known as the Kshatriyas; they are the warriors, administrators and rulers. Vaishyas are the third layer, consisting of artisans, merchants, tradesmen and farmers. Then come the commoners, the Shudras, mostly peasants and servants. Last are the Dalits; they are the ones who scrub the toilets, etc.

The Brahmins received some of their bounty from selling slaves. In the case of Harris' mother, Shyamala Gopalan, her roots are that of the Tamil Brahmins, also known as Tambrans.

Tambrans are from the southern tip of India, Tamil Nadu. They were the most advantaged group residing in the Tamil-speaking region of the country. As hereditary Hindu priests, they took

over many of the elite positions in the colonial government, something which today is a source of embarrassment. This explains why Harris never mentions the words Tamil and Brahmin in her 2019 book about her life, *The Truths We Hold*. She doesn't want the world to know about her elitist roots.

Slavery was not outlawed in India until 1843, yet it still exists today in parts of the country. Ironically, it still exists in the spinning mills of Tamil Nadu, Harris' mother's hometown area. According to a young scholar in India, "the history of Brahmins is underwritten by centuries of enslaving many millions of others." This is the privileged basis of Harris' mother's ancestors.

The caste system extends back 1,500 years. The Brahmins not only held all the major positions of power in India, but unlike everyone else, they lived in rent free villages. They maintained their grip on power by practicing endogamy, marrying only their own kind; the marriages were arranged.

At the bottom of the caste system are the Dalits, also known as the Untouchables. As one contemporary Indian writer puts it, "India's history is smeared with brutalities against lower-caste people by those higher up on the caste ladder." The Untouchables are the most oppressed in the Hindu caste system, a function of their being considered impure.

Harris says we need reparations in the U.S. because of slavery and discrimination. But she never addresses the oppressive conditions of the Dalits and Shudras, nor does she call for the abolition of slavery in India where it still exists.

Perversely, Harris demands that to facilitate discussions on reparations for African Americans we need to do a study of slavery and the effects of discrimination. Fine. Let us also do a study of her slavemaster pedigree. Then she can begin writing checks to those who survived the oppression visited upon their forefathers by her ancestors.

Harris likes to mouth the wonders of inclusion, yet she is the beneficiary of centuries of exclusion. Time for her to fess up.

WHY KAMALA STIFFED AL SMITH DINNER

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

When Kamala Harris decided to stiff New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan and skip the Al Smith Dinner on Oct. 17, she became the first presidential candidate to do so since Walter Mondale in 1984. As Cardinal Dolan pointed out, he lost every state but one. (New York Archbishop John Cardinal O'Connor did not extend an invitation to either candidate in 1996 and that is because he could not bring himself to invite Bill Clinton; he had just vetoed a ban on partial-birth abortion.)

The Al Smith Dinner, named after the first Catholic to run for president in 1928, is well attended by elites from government, the media, business and the entertainment industry. It is an opportunity to showcase one's policies and persona. This may explain why Harris took a pass.

Neither Harris nor Trump is Catholic, but that doesn't matter as much as their policies. They differ tremendously on abortion, school choice and religious liberty, and many other issues of importance to Catholics.

Harris is a rabid proponent of abortion-on-demand, and even

agrees that babies born alive as a result of a botched abortion need not be attended to by medical personnel.

When it comes to religious liberty, Harris is a co-sponsor of the Equality Act and the sponsor of the Do No Harm Act. Both would exempt the bill's provisions from the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the most consequential religious-liberty legislation ever adopted.

It would have been uncomfortable for Harris, and, quite frankly, for many others, had she attended. She has a lot in common with dissident Catholics (to the extent they can realistically be called Catholic), but not with practicing Catholics.

There is another reason why it would have been awkward for Harris to attend the dinner. The event is known for allowing the candidates to "roast" each other. This is right up Trump's alley—he is lightning fast and loves to roast his foes on a regular basis. But for Harris, this kind of setting would have been a disaster.

Harris was raised in a confused religious household. Her father was a Christian and her mother was Hindu. She attended a Baptist church but she says very little about her religious upbringing. Nor does she say much about her faith today.

The Religion News Service, a secular-leaning media outlet, says two things about her religious status. She likes to talk about the Good Samaritan and she likes to invoke liberation theology.

What does the Good Samaritan New Testament verse mean to Harris? It means helping our neighbor. Fine. But her comments are so pedestrian as to be childlike in their innocence. "Neighbor is not about having the same ZIP code. What we learn from that parable is that neighbor is someone you are walking by on the street." That is certainly a novel interpretation.

Religion News Service tried to help her by offering a sanitized understanding of liberation theology, saying it is a “strain of Christian thought that emphasizes social concern for the poor and political liberation of oppressed peoples.” Not really. It is a Marxist-driven ideology with a Christian veneer, just the kind of “theology” that secularists are okay with.

To be sure, Harris is not that different from the man she serves. While the media call Joe Biden a “devout Catholic,” a survey by Pew Research Center found that only 13 percent of Americans think he is “very religious.”

Her running mate, Tim Walz, is no better. His parents were nominally Catholic and he bolted the Catholic Church long ago to join the most liberal mainline Lutheran denomination, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. He wanted nothing to do with the more orthodox Lutheran Church–Missouri Synod. During the debate with JD Vance, he admitted, “I don’t talk about my faith a lot,” which is certifiably true. He then quoted a passage from the Bible.

The religion problem is deeper than the candidates. The Democratic Party has been thoroughly secularized for some time.

In 2012, the Democrats deleted the word “God” from their Platform (they had to restore it after a pushback). Four years later, the 2016 Democratic Party Platform had 14 sentences on specific rights for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People, and two vague sentences on “respecting faith” at home.

The only time the 2024 Platform mentions God is in a throwaway reference speaking about the need for all of us to “live up to their God-given potential.” That’s it. Though it does make mention of Jews and Muslims, it makes no mention of Christians or Catholics. It’s as though we don’t exist.

People of faith don’t even merit their own section on

religious liberty.

Instead, there is a small section on “Combating Hate & Protecting Freedom of Religion.” It condemns anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, but says not a word about all the violence directed at Christian churches and crisis pregnancy centers. Nor does it comment on attempts to stifle Christian speech or punishing Christian foster parents.

Harris had a chance to reach out to Catholics at the Al Smith Dinner. She chose not to.

SECULARISTS PUZZLED BY TRUMP SUPPORT

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

Every survey shows that most Americans do not consider Donald Trump to be a particularly devout Christian. Indeed, only 14 percent of U.S. adults say the word “Christian” describes the former president. Even among evangelical Protestants who think favorably of Trump, only one in five strongly associates the term “Christian” with him.

This obviously does not bother his supporters, but it sure bothers others. The others are those who are unhappy with the faithful for standing by Trump, a man they say is characterologically flawed. They are basically saying that religious Americans who are in Trump’s corner are hypocrites.

R. Marie Griffith is a religion and politics professor at

Washington University in St. Louis. Speaking of the faithful who support Trump, she says, “They really don’t care about, is he religious or not.” According to Newsweek, this signifies a “disconnect” between personal faith and political support, one that “prioritizes political goals over traditional religious values.”

Not really. What it suggests is that Christians who like Trump are mature voters: They are not choosing the most pious candidate—they are choosing the person who is the most likely to promote their values. Whether the candidate is religion-friendly matters gravely, not his personal relationship with God.

In June, we published a report, “Biden and Trump on Religious Liberty,” that compared the Trump-Pence administration’s record on this subject to that of Biden-Harris (we recently updated it). In his four years as president, Trump addressed religious liberty issues 117 times. From the beginning of his presidency in January 2021 to October 1, 2024, Biden-Harris addressed these matters 33 times.

While quantitative data are important, qualitative analysis are also critical. On this score, Trump wins easily: he expanded religious liberty while Biden-Harris often contracted it.

Our report looked at the following issues: Faith-based initiatives; Conscience rights; Abortion; HHS Mandate; Foster Care; Gays; Transgenderism; and International Issues.

“No one seriously believes that Trump is a man of deep faith,” Bill Donohue said. “But his policies on religious liberty are a model of excellence. Biden, on the other hand, tries hard to convince the public that he is a ‘devout Catholic’ yet his religious-liberty rulings are unimpressive, and in some cases are subversive of this First Amendment right.”

Harris’ views on religious liberty are inextricably linked to

the administration she serves. This explains why Sen. Mike Lee recently said that “Kamala Harris doesn’t believe that religious institutions should be able to live according to their faith. Rather, they must bend the knee to the popular social justice movement of the day.”

Lee does not exaggerate. Harris is a co-sponsor of the Equality Act and she introduced the Do No Harm Act. Both would gut religious liberty protections by sidelining the 1993 Religious Freedom Restoration Act. And unlike Trump, who gave us Supreme Court Justices who respect the First Amendment guarantee of religious liberty, Harris would go the other way.

There is no disconnect between people of faith who are unimpressed with Trump’s personal Christian credentials and his phenomenal record of promoting religious liberty for all Americans. After all, they know what the choices are.

Harris, who is a religious hybrid (she was raised Baptist and Hindu), is not exactly known as Ms. Devout. But she is known as someone who entertains a militant secularist mindset. It is the latter that counts. Persona matters but policies matter more. That’s the mature way of sizing up candidates for public office.

CATHOLICS FOR KAMALA LEAVES US NUMB

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

There is a group called Catholics for Kamala but it is short

on her accomplishments. We would expect a detailed analysis of her public policy positions that are important to the Catholic community. But there is none.

On the home page of catholics4kamala there is a picture of her with the inscription, "Elect Kamala Harris for President." Below it reads, "The positions of the Biden/Harris Administration and the Democratic Party are easily the most consistent with Catholic Social Teaching." For some reason, not a single position is listed.

The next page reads, "We Need a President Who is Compassionate." Not competent, but "compassionate." It says below, "Catholics need to vote for a Presidential candidate that exhibits the character our country needs now."

Back to the home page. Clicking on "Learn More" takes the reader to a page that reads, "The Catholic Case for Kamala Harris and Tim Walz."

In the course of a couple of paragraphs, the first specific issue mentioned that is supposed to be of special interest to Catholics is "global warming." The last issue mentioned is the "scourge of White Christian Nationalism," which, as we have pointed out many times, is a bogeyman invented by Christian bashers.

The most specific catholics4kamala gets about issues is in the "Harris v. Trump" page. This is what passes as specific about Harris: "Youthful and joyful"; "Looks forward to the future"; "Advocates for the well-being of all"; "Focused on the Common Good"; "Inclusive and affirming"; and "Hopeful." That about sums it up.

BEWARE POLLSTERS

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

There is a 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. In early October, a Pew Research Center poll had Trump beating Harris among Catholics 52-47.

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. (It was revealed this fall that for the first time in decades there are now more registered Republicans than Democrats.)

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

THE REAL THREAT TO DEMOCRACY

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

There are constant cries from the Left warning that democracy is under assault. They are right about that, but they are wrong about the enemy: it's not Christians we should fear—it's people like them who are imperiling democracy. Here are a few examples of how they operate.

Christians are busy in the courts these days pursuing religious liberty claims. For defending their rights, they are being castigated by CNN. "Religious interest groups are queuing up a series of high-profile appeals at the Supreme Court this fall that could further tear down the wall separating church and state, seeking to take advantage of a friendly 6-3 conservative majority that has rapidly pushed the law in their favor in recent years."

In other words, because religious liberty is under assault by militant secularists, allies of religious liberty have had to go to the courts seeking justice from these bullies. For this, they are accused of subverting the First Amendment. This is what white racists said in the 1960s when blacks were seeking justice in the courts—they blamed the plaintiffs. Fair-minded people know who the real threat to democracy is in both instances.

Similarly, because Republicans are filing a record number of lawsuits in the states ensuring election fairness, they are being blamed for undermining democracy, not those engaged in voter fraud. Reuters reports that the reason for the court challenges is “to sow doubts about election integrity,” and the *New York Times* says that “experts” believe that many of the suits “are based on unfounded, or outright false, claims.”

These stories are appearing at the same time that the Biden-Harris administration is suing Alabama for removing more than 3,000 noncitizens from the voter rolls. Why would they want to do that?

Why is it that this administration’s Department of Justice refuses to make public a plan it adopted in March 2021, two months after the election, to increase voter turnout? Who were they looking to register? Milkmen or migrants? Given that they sought the advice of left-wing advocacy groups (they are currently working with the Southern Poverty Law Center in the Alabama case), we know it wasn’t the milkman.

Hillary Clinton recently said that those who engage in speech that sounds like Russian propaganda should be “criminally charged” for exercising their freedom of speech. But apparently she is not a threat to democracy anymore than John Kerry is. He is now complaining that the First Amendment right to free speech “stands as a major block to the ability to be able to hammer [disinformation] out of existence.”

Meanwhile, religious left-wing activists recently held a conference at Georgetown University decrying attempts to destroy democracy. It is not Muslim extremists who bother them, or Iran interfering in our elections, it’s “the tenets of Christian Nationalism” that we need to guard against.

The meeting was led by Jim Wallis, the self-described “radical” who was removed from his post as editor-in-chief of *Sojourners*, the far-left Protestant publication which he

founded and headed, for making a lousy editorial judgment. A year after he was dumped from the magazine, Georgetown rewarded him with a new post—one that he founded—as the head of the Center on Faith and Justice.

Psychologists call this phenomenon “projection,” that is, the tendency to project onto others one’s own foibles. It might also be called “gaslighting,” the manipulation of others designed to cause them to doubt their own thoughts and perception of reality. The Left is very good at that.

This is more than hypocrisy—this is propaganda at its worst.