

# BAR FOR SCREENING NOMINEES DIPS LOWER

[Bill Donohue](#)

Now that Donald Trump is announcing his choices for various posts, some of the nominees are bound to have their personal lives held under a microscope. Assuming something tawdry turns up, the question is whether it will matter. Probably not, even if it should.

This may anger Democrats, many of whom have already complained that Christians are phonies for supporting someone with such a checkered moral record as Trump, but their anger needs to be directed inward. After all, since the 1960s, liberals have been lecturing the public on the need to be non-judgmental, promoting the novelty of situation ethics, the result of which was to effectively lower the bar. They can't now demand that the bar be instantly raised.

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, TV talk shows, Hollywood, 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?

Our Judeo-Christian heritage was based on a sexual ethics of reticence. Restraint was seen as a virtue. Today it is seen as outdated, if not a problem.

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 is the Assistant Secretary for Health who goes by the name Rachel and falsely claims to be a woman.

---

# POLLSTERS      MISS      “SLEEPER ISSUES”

[Bill Donohue](#)

Pollsters seeking to tap what is on the mind of voters are right to focus on the big issues: the economy, illegal immigration, crime, abortion, education, healthcare, foreign policy, and the like. But there are other matters that affect voters, though they are not front and center in most people's minds. They are more like “sleeper issues.”

Lots of Americans these days, especially those in their middle years and older, are voicing a sense of uneasiness, even bewilderment, about the state of our society in general. Their apprehension is not necessarily rooted in something that Washington has done. It's more a realization that things have gotten out of whack. Extremes dominate.

In large part, the extremes are rooted in culture, not politics. We can tell from public opinion research that Americans are very concerned about the moral direction of the country.

Selfishness, self-absorption, rudeness, and a complete disregard for the rights and sensibilities of others is evident in school and the workplace. Inappropriate use of cell phones—on trains and buses and in bars and restaurants—is commonplace. Those who sport vulgar lyrics and videos take no responsibility for how they corrupt young people. Car drivers are increasingly distracted and unwilling to yield. Those on bicycles and scooters—the motorized ones are the worst—show no regard for public safety.

All of these things feed the perception that America is becoming unhinged. The fact that few are held accountable for their transgressions makes things worse.

There are also policy issues that matter in this regard. When school officials and politicians aid and abet mentally challenged young people who want to transition to the opposite sex—absent parental consent—they are contributing to our culture of opportunism. Ditto for hospitals that exploit these disturbed minors by fast-tracking the changes. It's all about ideological extremism and greed.

It could be argued that it would be illogical for voters to blame politicians for the cultural issues that are making people uneasy. Technically, that is true. But in the real world, we are all a blend of reason and emotion. In other words, those upset with extremism in the culture are likely to blame officials who harbor an extremist political agenda for cultural depravities.

For example, politicians who believe that tampons should be put in boys' bathrooms are clearly not responsible for those who talk loudly on their cell phones in public places, but because they promote extremist policies, voters may see them as emblematic of our overall condition. This is the kind of "sleeping issue" that is in the back of people's minds. Such issues are capable of exploding at election time—it's like a frustration time bomb—yet they are not likely to be discerned by pollsters.

In short, cultural issues are often treated as insignificant by pollsters during election season. This explains, in part, why they are so often wrong in their prognostications. What's in the back of people's minds has a way of leaping to the front, or at least becoming more important, when they cast their ballot. The price for extremism is costly in a democracy.

---

# BELIEVING BALD-FACE LIES

Bill Donohue

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.

---

# Veterans Day: War and Remembrance for Freedom Was Not Free

[Fr. Gordon J. MacRae](#)

*This article originally appeared on Fr. MacRae's website,  
These Stone Walls, on November 6.*

***Veterans Day and Remembrance Sunday first honored the great sacrifices of the First and Second World Wars, and freedom from a global tyranny too easily forgotten.***

**"What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly."**

**– Thomas Paine, 1776**

What we today honor as Veterans Day (November 11) in the United States, and Remembrance Sunday (the Sunday nearest November 11) in the United Kingdom, began in Europe as Armistice Day. This history is worthy of a reminder, for we forget the fine points of history to our own peril. The armistice that ended hostilities in World War I, culminating in the 1919 Treaty of Versailles, was signed on November 11, 1918. In 1954, Armistice Day was expanded to become Veterans Day in the United States and Remembrance Sunday in England to honor all who served in the two World Wars. Today this memorial is expanded to honor the veterans of all wars.

The quote from Thomas Paine above was a criticism of American colonists who became comfortable in their isolation and failed to heed the growing oppressions that would eventually end up



at their doors in the War for Independence. At a time when the American footprint is fading from the paths to tyranny throughout the world, it's perilous to forget the high price that was paid to win and preserve our freedoms. The freedom from tyranny that we sometimes take for granted in America was won at the price of our brothers' blood which today cries out to us from the Earth. We are free thanks to them. War is futile without remembrance.

World War I engulfed all of Western Europe, pitting the Central Powers of Germany and the Austria-Hungarian Empire against the Allies: Great Britain and its Dominions, France, Russia, and then later Italy and the United States. All was not quiet on the Western Front of that war which extended all the way from the Vosges Mountains in Eastern France to Ostend, Belgium.

America entered World War I in 1917 in response to Germany's use of submarines to destroy commercial vessels crossing the Atlantic. This tipped the balance of the war which ended a year later. The First World War cost the lives of ten million people by the time an armistice was signed on November 11, 1918. World War II, which began with Germany's invasion of Poland in 1939 and ended with the surrender of Germany and Japan in 1945, took the lives of fifty-five million people. Freedom was never free.

## **Dates with Destiny**

We citizens of a civilized society remember significant dates for a reason. But the Internet generation is causing us to lose some of our collective cultural memory. Today, we rely too much on a Google search to provide meaning to our existence. There's something to be said for having at least a basic framework of meaning for dates we observe and why they are of some cultural importance to us. Anniversaries that lend

themselves to our social or cultural identity are in danger of being lost for subsequent generations.

Perhaps the most modern example of a date with cultural meaning in Western Civilization is September 11, 2001 a date that today lives in infamy on a global scale. At *Beyond These Stone Walls*, I marked its twentieth anniversary with "[The Despair of Towers Falling, the Courage of Men Rising](#)." That post was a vivid description of how that day unfolded from a very unusual perspective, that of a prison cell, and of its far reaching impact even here.

But most people in the Western world are not conscious of the whole story behind the significance of that date. Knowing why America became a target of al Qaeda on that date gives the event a whole new meaning, and human beings engage in an innate search for meaning in the events of our lives. That is the very purpose of religion. It seeks and finds meaning in our individual and collective existence. In human history, no culture has survived for long without religion, or a substitute for religion.

And it's the substitute for religion – for real religious meaning – that we should most fear. Those who set the infamous day of September 11 in motion were themselves marking the anniversary of events they retained in collective consciousness for over 300 years, events that much of the rest of the world had forgotten. What happened in New York and Washington on September 11, 2001 began in Europe more than three centuries earlier during the Siege of Vienna on the night of September 11, 1683.

The story was described by the late Christopher Hitchens in "[Why the suicide killers chose September 11](#)" (*The Guardian*, October 3, 2001). Then it was expanded upon by Father Michael Gaitley in a great book entitled, [The Second Greatest Story Ever Told](#)." In the book, Father Gaitley wrote of the historic significance of September 11:

***“For some 300 years, an epic struggle raged between the Ottoman (Muslim) Empire and the Holy Roman (Catholic) Empire. The Battle of Vienna marked the turning point in this struggle as it stopped the Muslim advance into Europe... On the night of September 11, [1683], the Muslims launched a preemptive attack on Austrian forces...”– The Second Greatest Story Ever Told, p.45***

By the next night, September 12, 1683, after a night of fierce battle, the Islamic forces were repelled and routed by the Polish cavalry led into battle by King Jan Sobieski himself. But victory also brought the knowledge that 30,000 hostages, mostly women and children, were executed before the Islamic retreat on orders from the Moslem commander. The Polish king wrote in a letter of his horror at the savagery of the fleeing invaders. Then, writing his post-victory letter to his nation, King Sobieski paraphrased in Latin Caesar’s famous words of victory: “Veni, Vidi, Deus Vincit” – “I Came, I Saw, God Conquered.”

King Sobieski had entrusted that battle to the intercession of Mary, Mother of God, and it was in honor of this victory that the Pope established the date of September 12 as the Feast of the Holy Name of Mary. What had thus been the date that began an event of glory and great sacrifice for Christendom was a date of infamy for fundamentalist Islam, a date remembered for over 300 years. It was for this reason that September 11 was chosen for an attack on the West by al Qaeda terrorists in 2001.

## **Swords into Plowshares**

Lord Jonathan Sacks, former Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth, described the West’s lack of awareness of that significance as being “among the worst failures of political intelligence in modern times.” In “[Swords Into Plowshares](#),” an essay in *The Wall Street Journal* (October 3-4, 2015), Lord Sacks wrote that our lack of

awareness was not accidental, but “happened because of a blind spot in the secular mind: the inability to see the elemental, world-shaking power of religion when hijacked by politics.”

That story of the significance of September 11 told above is not war in the name of religion as some would today have you believe. It is what takes the place of religion when it is suppressed in the human heart and soul, and overshadowed in the public square until man’s search for meaning is hijacked by politics.

One of the great victories of the First and Second World Wars – great victories won at great price – was freedom of religion. In our era of forgetfulness, this has been twisted into a guarantee of freedom FROM religion, and the result has been an agenda to park religious voices somewhere outside the American public square. By America, I mean all of the Americas. What happens in the U.S. does not stay in the U.S. Lord Jonathan Sacks has composed a wise and well informed caution for America:

***“The liberal democratic state gives us freedom to live as we choose, but refuses, on principle, to guide us as to how we choose... Religion has returned because it is hard to live without meaning in our lives... [but] the religion that has returned is not the gentle, quietist and ecumenical form that we in the West have increasingly come to expect. Instead it is religion at its most adversarial and aggressive. It is the greatest threat to freedom in the post-modern world.”– Jonathan Sacks, “[Swords Into Plowshares](#),” WSJ.com, October 3-4, 2015***

It is only when religion is denied a voice in the public square that such a hijacking happens. Humanity will seek meaning then only in what is left. There is a broad assault on religion in Western Culture today with the goal of just that – of removing voices of religion from the public square by the process of selective memory, of blaming war on faith. The

reality is very different. An analysis of 1,800 conflicts for the “Encyclopedia of Wars,” by Charles Phillips and Alan Axelrod determined that fewer than ten percent had any real religious motivations.

It’s very interesting that today Lord Jonathan Sacks cites the Western intellectuals’ belief that the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the fall of European Communism in 1989 was “the final act of an extended drama in which first religion, then political ideology, died after a prolonged period in intensive care...”

***“The age of the true believer, religious or secular, was over. In its place had come the market economy and the liberal democratic state in which individuals, and the right to live as they chose took priority over all creeds and codes.”***

The fall of the Berlin Wall and European Communism was, therefore, “the last chapter of a story that began in the 17th Century, the last great age of wars of religion.” What makes this theory so interesting is that it blatantly overlooks the fact that one of the greatest religious figures of the 20th Century – Saint John Paul II – is also the person most responsible for setting in motion the collapse of the Soviet Union and the fall of the Berlin Wall. That is what Father Michael Gaitley unveils as an essential element in [\*The Second Greatest Story Ever Told\*](#), but first it has to look back upon Armistice Day.

Religious faith was never a cause for war, nor was it ever an excuse. But for those who survived the Great Wars of the Twentieth Century – and for 65 million lives lost in the face of Godless tyranny, faith was all that gave it meaning, and without meaning, what’s left?

Don’t let your religious freedoms and your voices of faith be so easily parked along the wayside of America and the rest of

the free world, for thus it will not remain free for long. People died to give us that voice, and today is a good day to remember that, and to honor their sacrifice. To distance ourselves from war and remembrance – from the price of freedom – is to give witness to Thomas Paine’s dismal foreboding on the eve of war:

***“What we obtain too cheap, we esteem too lightly.”***

+++

**Note from Father Gordon MacRae:** Thank you for reading and sharing this post. Please join us in prayerful remembrance for those who served and especially those who gave their lives to secure and preserve our freedom. None of those who speak today about political threats to democracy have any real idea of what freedom cost.

---

## **REFLECTIONS ON THE ELECTION**

**Bill Donohue**

Not surprisingly, the mainstream media are in disbelief over the results of the presidential election. That’s because they live in an intellectual ghetto. Instead of just talking to each other, it would be so nice if they actually spent time talking to those who work in housekeeping, the cafeteria, maintenance and security.

Will they change now that they have been proven wrong? Not at all. They are hopelessly incapable of changing, though they love to say that the public has a hard time accepting change. Not so. They do.

Does money count in elections? Not as much as many think. Harris raised over \$1 billion and wound up \$20 million in debt in the final week. Trump spent half as much, over \$400 million. In the few weeks before the election, Bill Gates gave Harris \$50 million, and Michael Bloomberg followed with another \$50 million. George Soros topped them both.

Do celebrities matter? They may if they occasionally show up for a rally or fundraiser. But Harris went overboard, bringing in Oprah, Bruce Springsteen, Beyonce, Taylor Swift, Katy Perry, Jennifer Lopez et al. She also went on Saturday Night Live before the election. This actually hurt her. Why? She was already seen as a lightweight, the word-salad queen, so being surrounded by celebrities only fed the perception that she was not a serious person.

Why were so many of the polls wrong? Because most of them never corrected for the Trump supporters who simply won't speak to them. They don't trust them, and, importantly, they know it is not popular in many circles to admit being for Trump.

The pollster that was the most accurate was J.L. Partners. Based in the U.S., it was founded by pollsters for the British Prime Minister; it published its results with the *Daily Mail*, a conservative U.K. publication. It was one of the few that got it right: it said in the run-up to the election that Trump had a 54 percent chance of winning. McLaughlin & Associates also did a good job.

Pollsters often ask the wrong questions, or they don't dig deep enough. For example, the media kept reporting that Trump's unfavorability rating was significantly higher than Harris'. On election day, Nate Silver, who runs an influential survey site, reported that Trump's unfavorability score was 8.6 points higher than his favorability score. For Harris, her unfavorable rating was 2.0 points higher than her favorable rating.

A more important question is how the public views the candidates on their leadership abilities and their ability to get things done. A month before the election, Gallup found that when it comes to who is a strong and decisive leader, Trump outscored Harris 59 percent to 48 percent. On their ability to get things done, Trump won 61-49. Exit polls on election day found that his numbers increased significantly on related measures.

In other words, an election is not a popularity contest. It is about issues and who is the most likely to govern effectively.

Billy Martin, who coached the New York Yankees, was hard to deal with. Bobby Knight, who coached the University of Indiana basketball team, could be obnoxious. Bill Belichick, who coached the New England Patriots, was surly. Unlikeable though they were, they were also great leaders who knew how to win.

Ergo, while Trump's persona may strike many as offensive, few question his ability to get things done, and that is what counts in the end.

Democratic strategist James Carville warned Democrats in October that Harris was not getting her message out. This misses the point. She had no message. That was her problem. Being against Trump is not a message—it's a feeling: it doesn't tell voters what policies you want to implement.

Admittedly, she was put in a delicate position. Joe Biden dropped out after the debate in June because the media could no longer pretend that he wasn't mentally challenged. They covered up for him for years, but could do so no longer. Harris never faced a challenger—she was anointed—and proved incapable of separating herself from his policies.

More than anything else, it was the politics of extremism that did her in.

- Flooding the economy with funny money drove prices sky



high

- Allowing millions of migrants to crash our borders and then be rewarded with better services from the government than are afforded homeless veterans angered millions
- Playing catch and release with violent criminals was indefensible
- Forgiving student loans for the middle and upper classes while making the working class pay for them was infuriating
- Promoting policies that allow children to change their sex behind their parents' back was mindboggling
- Allowing boys to compete against girls in sports and shower with them was morally bankrupt
- Allowing the FBI to spy on Catholics was malicious
- Inviting foreign aggression was irresponsible

These policies did Harris in. For the most part, the American people do not want extremists on the right or the left in office. Thank God for that.

---

## NEXT UP—NEW SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

**Bill Donohue**

According to the *Washington Post*, Donald Trump won the Catholic vote 56 percent to 41 percent. That's a great triumph for religious liberty. As we previously [documented](#), there were far more victories for religious liberty under the Trump administration than under Biden-Harris. He is poised to enhance his record. To do that he needs to lock in a religious-friendly Supreme Court for decades to come.

Trump appointed Brett Kavanaugh, Amy Coney Barrett and Neil Gorsuch; the first two are Catholic and Gorsuch, who was raised Catholic, is Protestant. All are good on religious liberty. Chief Justice John Roberts, another Catholic, is mostly reliable on this issue. Clarence Thomas and Samuel Alito, both staunch Catholics, are rock solid on this First Amendment right.

Thomas is 76. Alito is 74. Both have served with distinction. They are bright and courageous and have been subjected to incredible vitriol. Indeed, they have survived attempts to destroy them by the masters of personal destruction: those who work in the media, left-wing advocacy organizations, the entertainment industry, and education have worked overtime to smear them.

The Left failed to bring them down. Halleluiah. But early next year it will be time for them to step down. If Trump can appoint two more just like them—he can't do any better—he will secure a religious-friendly court for decades. There is nothing the Catholic bashers would like less.

---

## HARRIS HAS A PROBLEM WITH CHRISTIANS

*This article appeared in [The American Spectator](#) on Oct. 25*

[Bill Donohue](#)

Vice President Kamala Harris occasionally attends a Baptist church, but she still has a problem with Christians. So does her boss. Biden attends Mass regularly, but his rejection of Catholic moral teachings—on abortion, marriage, the family and

sexuality—makes practicing Catholics wonder about his bona fides.

When Harris was California's attorney general, she bludgeoned pro-life activist [David Daleiden](#). He used undercover videos to expose how abortion operatives harvest and sell aborted fetal organs. She authorized her office to raid his home: they seized his camera equipment and copies of revealing videos that implicated many of those who work in the abortion industry.

In her role as California AG she also sought to cripple crisis pregnancy centers with draconian regulations. Specifically, she supported a [bill](#) that would force these centers to inform clients where they could obtain an abortion. She was sued and lost in the Supreme Court three years later.

On February 25, 2020, Sen. Harris voted against the [Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act](#), a bill that would “prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.” That's called infanticide.

When she was in the senate, Harris [co-sponsored](#) the “Do No Harm Act,” as well as the “Equality Act.” Both bills would weaken, or nullify, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, thus mandating that Catholic doctors and hospitals perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgery.

Harris' passion for abortion rights—she has never found one she couldn't justify—impels her to attack Catholic candidates for the federal bench. She did so most famously in late 2018 when she questioned [Brian C. Buescher](#) about his suitability to be a federal district judge. His membership in the Knights of Columbus raised a red flag for her.

“Were you aware that the Knights of Columbus opposed a woman's right to choose when you joined the organization?” Her real target, of course, was the Catholic Church. Should someone who

accepts the Catholic Church's teaching on abortion—child abuse begins in the womb—be allowed to sit on the federal bench? She knows the Constitution bars a religious test for holding public office, so this was her end-run around it.

Harris was also upset that the Knights ban women. But several Jewish women's groups (e.g. Hadassah) ban men. So do the Catholic Daughters of the Americas. For that matter, so does the League of Women Voters. But it seems that for Harris, none of those organizations are a problem. Just Catholic fraternal ones.

Harris refused to attend the Al Smith Dinner, letting Catholics know what she thinks about them. But she never misses a Hollywood dinner. Those are her ideological next of kin, not Catholics.

When a couple of Christian young people shouted, "Christ is King" at a recent Wisconsin rally, Harris could have ignored them. After all, when left-wing pro-Hamas protesters shout her down, she simply says that she has the right to speak. But she couldn't help berate the Christians, saying, "[You guys are at the wrong rally.](#)" She was right about that—Christians are not welcome at her events.

Harris is losing to Trump [52-47](#) among Catholics. And this was before she stiffed New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan by blowing off the Al Smith Dinner, and before she mocked Christian students.

No one truly believes that Trump is personally a deeply religious man. He admits as much. But his policies are clearly religion friendly. The same is not true for Harris. She is wedded to the Biden-Harris record, and it pales in significance to what Trump accomplished. [It's not even a close call.](#)

---

# ROGAN'S COMMENTS ON ABORTION DISSECTED

Bill Donohue

When J.D. Vance sat down with Joe Rogan for a three-hour interview, the subject of abortion came up.

Rogan expressed concern about the different state laws on abortion, saying the issue “is essentially based on a religious idea.” He brought up religion again when discussing the Justices who overturned *Roe v. Wade*.

Abortion is fundamentally an issue of biology, not religion. To be sure, many religious organizations have teachings on this subject. They also have teachings on what constitutes a proper diet. But that doesn't make dietary issues inherently religious. The heart of the abortion issue is when life begins. That is not a uniquely religious issue. Indeed, it is primarily a scientific one.

Biology 101 teaches that the DNA that makes us unique individuals is present at conception, and not a moment later. That's when life begins. Rogan can disbelieve it, but he cannot disprove the scientific evidence.

Commenting on overturning *Roe v. Wade*, Rogan said, “you have these religious men who are trying to dictate what women can or cannot do with their bodies.” Before commenting on this remark, it is true that of the six Supreme Court Justices who overturned *Roe v. Wade*, all are Christian; five are Catholic and one is Protestant (one of the Catholics is a woman, and one of the dissenting Justices is also a Catholic woman).

What Rogan said would be disturbing—indeed it would be bigoted—if it were clear that what he said was his opinion. But the transcript suggests otherwise.

Rogan was discussing the decision to overturn *Roe* when he said, “the zeitgeist is that abortion had always been you know *Roe v. Wade* has always been the law of the land and then all of a sudden that was taken away and you have these religious men who are trying to dictate what women can and can’t do with their bodies.”

It is obvious to any fair-minded person that Rogan was simply noting what was commonly understood at the time—he did not commit himself one way or the other as to whether he shared this view. This is important because left-wing media outlets such as *The New Republic* made it appear that these were his views. In short, they took his comment out of context, thus turning what was a sociological observation into his personal opinion.

Still, it would have been helpful if Rogan challenged the view that “these religious men” were shoving their religion down everyone’s throat.

Not too long ago, Stephen Breyer, Ruth Bader Ginsburg and Elena Kagan served on the Supreme Court. All are Jewish. They often took a secular view on cultural issues. Were they imposing their secular ideological preferences on the rest of us? Or were they simply making decisions based on their interpretation of the law?

Ginsburg, in fact, said *Roe* was wrongly decided. She was personally in favor of legalized abortion, but she said it should never have been decided by the courts—it was an issue for the legislature. *This is exactly what the “religious” Justices decided.*

The Constitution prohibits a religious test for public office. Unfortunately, too many Americans seem to have a problem with

that, especially when Catholics are overrepresented.

It is important to note that the way *The New Republic* framed Rogan's comment is remarkably similar to the way Kamala Harris' website framed it—making it appear that he personally objects to “these religious men” dictating to women.

This is not a gaffe. They know exactly what they are doing.

---

## MEDIA COVER-UP FOR HARRIS

[Bill Donohue](#)

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, say 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?

Whether she wins or loses, it is scandalous that the media are refusing to do their job. This is journalistic malfeasance.

---

## MEET THE CATHOLICS WHO SUPPORT HARRIS

[Bill Donohue](#)

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 recent 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 is 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?*