

KAMALA SMART TO SKIP AL SMITH DINNER

This article originally appeared in [The American Spectator](#) on September 26, 2024

[Bill Donohue](#)

Vice President Kamala Harris has turned down an invitation to speak at the Al Smith Dinner in New York City. Her staff says she will be busy campaigning, but that is a poor excuse: every presidential candidate, save for Walter Mondale in 1984, has accepted the invitation (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 President Bill Clinton; he had just vetoed a ban on partial-birth abortions).

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 is the real reason Harris is taking a pass: she fails on both counts.

Neither Harris nor Trump is Catholic, but that doesn't matter as much as their policies. Trump is pro-life, pro-school choice and pro-religious liberty. She is anti-life, anti-school choice and anti-religious liberty. Given this reality, a Catholic setting is not exactly the kind of venue that Harris would relish.

On abortion, Harris has never found one she couldn't justify. A proponent of abortion-on-demand, she claimed during the debate with Trump that he was wrong in saying that she would allow abortions "in the seventh month, the eighth month, the ninth month." She answered, "That's not true."

It is true and it is what *Roe v. Wade* allowed. To deny that late-term abortions exist is simply wrong. In 2019, the pro-abortion [Guttmacher](#) Institute admitted that at least 12,000 late-term abortions take place annually in the U.S. In 2023, a fact-checker at the [Washington Post](#) conceded that at least 10,000 late-term abortions take place each year.

Harris has consistently voted against every school choice measure ever proposed. Beholden to the teachers' unions, she will not allow indigent minorities the same right to send their children to the school of their choice that more affluent Americans enjoy.

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 (RFRA), the most consequential religious-liberty legislation ever adopted. This says it all.

Without RFRA, Catholic doctors and hospitals could be forced to perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgeries. This is what Harris wants. So radical is she on this issue that in 2019 she answered an [ACLU survey](#) saying she would have taxpayers fund sex-reassignment surgery for illegal aliens and federal prisoners.

Important as these policy reasons are, there is a bigger reason why Harris is not going to the Al Smith Dinner. Her persona is the problem.

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 be a disaster.

Let's face it—she talks like a pre-schooler. Gibberish. Hands waving, she has a hard time stringing two coherent sentences together. No matter what the question is, she begins by personalizing her response, all the while thinking of

something—anything—to say. This event demands that the participants be quick on their feet, and that is not exactly her strong suit. And she won't have her dancing sidekick, Tim, or her billionaire buddy, Oprah, there to bail her out.

Senator Chuck Schumer wants Harris to attend the Al Smith Dinner. It's time Trump sent him a MAGA hat.

TRUMP SUPPORT BY FAITHFUL PUZZLES SECULARISTS

[Bill Donohue](#)

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. “In his four years as president,” I noted, “Trump addressed religious liberty issues 117 times. From the beginning of his presidency in January 2021 to May 1, 2024, Biden addressed these matters 31 times.”

I added that while quantitative data were important, qualitative analysis was also critical. On this score, Trump wins easily: he expanded religious liberty while Biden 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,” I 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.

WHY NON-CATHOLICS GO TO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

[Bill Donohue](#)

At every level, non-Catholics are flocking to Catholic schools. The reasons vary, but no one argues with the numbers.

The rise of anti-Semitism on college campuses, many of them at elite institutions, has driven Jewish students to seek a more welcoming environment at Catholic colleges and universities. Earlier this year a Jewish student and her parents admitted they chose Saint Louis University because it is a place where she will be respected.

"We are an observant Jewish family who chose the Catholic, Jesuit Saint Louis University for our daughter, and she has been delighted," the girl's father said. A kosher kitchen was installed for her and it has inspired other Jewish students to transfer. Her father did not mince words. "In today's ominous campus atmosphere, a strong Catholic university may be a better option for Jews than an Ivy League school."

Franciscan University of Steubenville is also welcoming Jewish students. It has joined a coalition of 100 organizations, lead by Yeshiva University, to expedite the transfer of Jewish students to Catholic colleges. The coalition has condemned Hamas, pledging a receptive milieu for these students.

For different reasons, non-Catholics have long expressed an interest in elementary and secondary Catholic schools. Nationally, more than one in five students (22 percent) in Catholic schools are not Catholic. Indeed, some Catholic schools have quietly set a quota on the percentage of non-Catholic students they will accept, hoping to maintain its Catholic identity.

Many African Americans choose a Catholic school because it is a safer place for them to learn. That was certainly my experience teaching in a Catholic elementary school in Spanish Harlem in the 1970s. Critically important, of course, is the academic performance of these students: they do better than their public school cohorts. The Catholic graduation rate for high school students is typically close to 100 percent, and 85 percent attend a four-year college.

There is another factor that is often overlooked. Religious schools, not just Catholic ones, have proven to be outposts of civic engagement and tolerance.

In a recent review of over 13,000 studies, a meta-analysis published in the Educational Psychology Review by five scholars in the United States and the United Kingdom, found

that “Religious private schooling, particularly, is strongly associated with positive civic outcomes. The evidence is especially strong that private schooling is correlated with higher levels of political tolerance and political knowledge and skills.”

A teacher whom I know used to teach at St. Dominic High School in Oyster Bay, Long Island. She recalls not only having a fair number of Jewish students, she had quite a few gay students who transferred from a local public school.

At first she was a bit puzzled, but then realized that “these children had been bullied at their various public schools and labeled ‘queer’ and that St. Dom’s offered them a safe, loving home where respect, love and dignity was afforded every student.” As she pointed out, this is not what the media report.

Most Catholic schools do remarkable work, and it is too often underappreciated. They should be available to all parents, not simply those who can afford to pay tuition.

School choice programs are the greatest single lever of upward social mobility in the nation, something that African Americans, Asians and Hispanics know first-hand. Were it not for the teachers’ unions, and the money they throw at candidates for public office, more of them would be able to access quality private and parochial schools.

DANGEROUS BALLOT INITIATIVE

IN NEW YORK

[Bill Donohue](#)

There is a ballot initiative in New York State this November that is downright dangerous. I wrote a lengthy rebuttal and it is now available online in English and Spanish. It is also published in booklet form, in both languages. We are doing a mass mailing to our allies across the state. Most will get a digital copy; they can print it in booklet form if they have Adobe. Click [here](#) to read it. To read it in Spanish, click [here](#).

It is being widely distributed in the state not only to Catholics, but to non-Catholics as well. We will mail the booklet to approximately 1,200 Catholics, 120 Hispanic groups, 120 Jewish groups, 100 Muslim groups and 120 conservative groups.

Thanks to the support of New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan it is being placed in the hands of all New York bishops and many others.

This should be of interest to non-New Yorkers as well. If these activists succeed with their extremist agenda in New York, they will bring their proposal to other states.

On Election Day, November 5, voters in New York State will cast their ballot for Proposition One. It would amend section 11 of article 1 of the New York State Constitution in two ways: Paragraph A would offer equal protection before the law to eleven new demographic categories; Paragraph B would revise the legal meaning of discrimination.

Prop One is being promoted as a pro-equality initiative. In reality, it is a huge stealth campaign. Those behind Prop One have a very different agenda. *Their real goal is to undermine parental rights, eviscerate religious liberty and legalize*

selective discrimination.

Currently, the New York State Constitution says that no one can be subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed or religion. Paragraph A of Prop One would add the following demographic categories: age, sex, gender identity, gender expression, and reproductive healthcare and autonomy. Paragraph B justifies reverse discrimination. The implications are dramatic.

Please read our assessment of Prop One. And please alert your family and friends to it. It the most deceitful and dangerous initiative ever introduced. It needs to be defeated.

CATHOLICS FOR KAMALA IS PITIFUL

[Bill Donohue](#)

Depending on the survey, there are between 52 and 62 million Catholics in the United States; they make up roughly 20 percent of the population. That's a significant demographic, made all the more serious given the fact that whoever wins the Catholic vote generally wins the presidential election.

Therefore, one would think that a group called Catholics for Kamala would have a rich website, complete with a list of her accomplishments. We would expect a detailed analysis of her public policy positions that are important to the Catholic community. But there is none of this. Indeed, it is a pitiful website.

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." Really? Then why is there not a single position listed?

Clicking on the side arrow takes the reader to a page that says, "Support Harris/Walz in 2024." Below it reads, "Support Vice President Harris and Governor Tim Walz as a matter of devotion to the best interests of America and all Americans." Dropping the word "devotion" is about as Catholic as this team is about to get. Again, nothing specific—just another throwaway line. Oh, yes, there is a box that says, "Donate."

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." Another profundity.

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." Finally.

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." Yes, Catholics are really worked up about that. 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. Not a word about abortion or school choice.

Catholic Democrats and Catholics Vote Common Good are mentioned as sister organizations. The former falsely claims that in the last election Joe Biden won a majority of the Catholic vote (Trump won it 50-49), and the latter ends with a promise to end the "scourge of White Christian Nationalism."

The parent group of Catholics Vote Common Good is Vote Common

Good. Its latest financial report to the IRS lists the total amount of contributions it took in was \$0.00. That's right—zero dollars. It has barely over a million in total assets. In other words, it's a shell of an organization. So it is hardly surprising to learn that the national headquarters of Catholics for Kamala is a rented room in a strip mall in Westminster, California. Not sure they can afford a coffee machine.

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."

It doesn't get more vacuous than that.

BEWARE PSEPHOLOGISTS DURING AN ELECTION SEASON

[Bill Donohue](#)

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

It was during World War II that survey research surged. Columbia University conducted research on how best to sell war bonds, and it was determined that Kate Smith, the iconic

American singer (best known for “God Bless America”), would be the most persuasive person to hire. It worked.

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

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

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

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

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

Up until the late 1960s and early 1970s, Catholics laid anchor with the Democrats. But when George McGovern was the Democratic nominee in 1972, his radical politics stunned Catholics. Internal changes in the Party—the ascent of

feminists—pushed Catholics from leadership positions in the Party.

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

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

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

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

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

Demographically, single women—never married, separated, divorced or widowed—are the biggest supporters of the Democrats. It accounts, in large part, why Democrats do better with women overall.

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

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

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

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

POPE OPINES ON HARRIS AND TRUMP

[Bill Donohue](#)

Pope Francis recently ripped into Kamala Harris and Donald Trump, saying American voters were stuck with choosing “the lesser evil.”

He condemned Harris’ support for abortion rights as being an “assassination,” and he condemned Trump for his position on illegal immigration, saying “not welcoming the migrant is a

sin.”

The Catholic Church regards certain acts to be “intrinsically evil.” Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, before he became Pope Benedict XVI, wrote that “Not all moral issues have the same moral weight as abortion and euthanasia.”

He gave by way of example issues such as war and capital punishment. He said it was acceptable for a Catholic to disagree with the pope on these matters, adding that “he would not for that reason be considered unworthy to present himself to receive Holy Communion.” But that was not true of abortion or euthanasia.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has also addressed what qualifies as “intrinsically evil.” They, too, single out abortion and euthanasia as being among the most non-negotiable issues. “Other direct assaults on innocent human life and violations of human dignity, such as genocide, torture, racism, and the targeting of noncombatants in acts of terror or war, can never be justified.”

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

Kamala Harris justifies abortion in every instance, allowing no exceptions. Her position is identical to that of President Joe Biden. Yet after Biden met with the pope in 2021, he told the press, “We just talked about the fact he was happy I was a good Catholic and I should keep receiving communion.” Many bishops said the president’s rabid support for abortion disqualified him from receiving the Eucharist.

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

MEDIA DISTORT TRUMP ON ABORTION

[Bill Donohue](#)

On September 11, we [detailed](#) how Kamala Harris and the media were wrong, and former president Donald Trump was right, in assessing the exchange on abortion during the presidential debate. Their “fact-checking” is abysmal.

The media found fault with Trump for his claim that former Virginia Governor Ralph Northam, and vice presidential candidate Tim Walz, find “execution after birth” to be acceptable. CBS, Reuters, the *Washington Post* and Politifact say this is not true.

As I said in my defense of Trump, what he said was “basically true.” In discussing Northam, I pointed out that “while the baby would not be ‘executed,’ per se, he could be put down, or left to die, after he was ‘kept comfortable.’” That is true.

Intentionally allowing a baby to die—it does not matter if the physician and the mother want that to happen—is to effectively kill the child. As governor of Minnesota, Walz revoked legislation that requires lifesaving care for newborns. In practice, this is a backhanded way of permitting infanticide.

Similarly, NBC, CNN, the Associated Press, ABC, NPR, Newsweek and the *New York Times* claim that Trump cannot be right because infanticide is illegal in every state; the latter two argue that “there is no such thing as abortion after birth.”

Infanticide may be proscribed in law, but as just pointed out, Northam and Walz allowed it to happen. Moreover, former Gov. Andrew Cuomo allowed premature babies who survive a chemical abortion to be denied treatment.

If a baby is born, it is proof that the baby was not aborted. But this skirts the issue. If a baby who survives a botched abortion is allowed to die, unattended by medical staff, the decision-makers are permitting infanticide, however indirectly it may be.

Some in the media are playing games with this issue. Factcheck and ctinsider note that abortions in the ninth month are "exceedingly rare." But Trump never contested how frequent they are—he simply said that Harris and Walz defend late-term abortions. They do and it is dishonest to pretend otherwise.

USA Today tries to rescue Walz by saying Trump was wrong to say the vice presidential candidate "says abortion in the ninth month is absolutely fine." It claims that "There is no evidence that Walz said this, though he signed a bill that removed limits to abortion based on gestational duration." So who cares if Walz didn't say he was "absolutely fine" with his decision? He indisputably favors no limits on abortion through term.

Poynter, which prizes itself on being the premier fact-checker, contends that when Northam said it was okay for a physician and the mother to decide not to resuscitate a baby who survived a late-term abortion, "Northam declined to say what that discussion would entail." So what? It does not change the fact that they may decide not to treat the child, thus passively allowing infanticide to take place.

The media, in general, are so rabid in their defense of abortion rights that they are incapable of accurately reporting on this subject. Either that or they are lying in service to their cause.

TRUMP WAS RIGHT ABOUT ABORTION

[Bill Donohue](#)

Vice President Kamala Harris and ABC moderators made comments about abortion during the presidential debate that were factually incorrect. Former President Donald Trump was correct. Worse, the media, by and large, are siding with the false narrative.

Harris was asked by Linsey Davis if she supported any restrictions on a woman's right to an abortion. "I absolutely support reinstating the protections of *Roe v. Wade*," she said. She added that "nowhere in America is a woman carrying a pregnancy to term and asking for an abortion. That is not happening. It's insulting to women of America."

Trump responded saying, Harris "would allow abortion in the eighth month, ninth month, seventh month." She replied, "Come on." He followed up saying, "You could do abortions in the seventh month, the eighth month, the ninth month." She answered, "That's not true."

Trump won the argument.

Late-term abortions, contrary to what Harris said, are more common than what she contends. In 1995, Dr. George Tiller told his fans, "We have some experience with late terminations; about 10,000 patients between 24 and 36 weeks and something like 800 fetal anomalies between 26 and 36 weeks in the past 5 years."

Ron Fitzsimmons used to tell the media that partial-birth abortions—where the baby is 80 percent born—were extremely rare. Then in 1995 he went on national TV and admitted that he "lied through [his] teeth," saying he was just spouting "the

party line.”

In 2019, the pro-abortion [Guttmacher Institute](#) admitted that at least 12,000 late-term abortions take place annually in the U.S. In 2023, fact checkers at the [Washington Post](#) conceded that at least 10,000 late-term abortions take place each year.

Quite frankly, under *Roe v. Wade*, abortion-on-demand, while not a *de jure* right (it was not permitted after viability except in limited cases), was a *de facto* right. For proof, consider *Doe v. Bolton*, the companion case to *Roe*; it opened the door to abortion-on-demand.

In *Roe*, the high court said the states may outlaw abortion “except where it is necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother.” The ruling in *Doe* defined what an “appropriate medical judgment” was. It entailed the “physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the women’s age—relevant to the well-being of the patient.”

Not surprisingly, every state law that attempted to limit post-viability abortions to those necessary for the *physical* health of the women failed in court when challenged. In effect, the joint decisions in *Roe* and *Doe* legalized abortion up until birth. So when Harris says she accepts *Roe*, that means she wants to make all abortions legal, at any time during pregnancy.

Moreover, Harris voted against the “Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act” that would protect unborn children by prohibiting abortion at 20 weeks, a point where the child is able to feel great pain.

Then there is the matter of governors allowing babies to die after a botched abortion.

Trump addressed this issue by initially misidentifying the culpable governor as being from West Virginia—he later

corrected his mistake saying the governor was from Virginia (he was referring to Ralph Northam). Substantively, what Trump said was basically right. He accused the governor of contending that “the baby will be born and we will decide what to do with the baby. In other words, we’ll execute the baby.”

Here is what Virginia Gov. Northam opined in 2019. If a baby survived an abortion, he said, “The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that’s what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.” So while the baby would not be “executed,” per se, he could be put down, or left to die, after he was “kept comfortable.” That’s infanticide. There is no other word for it.

Northam is not alone among Democrats on this issue. Just prior to his stunning admission, New York State Gov. Andrew Cuomo signed legislation that allowed premature babies who survive a chemical abortion to be denied treatment.

At the federal level in 2019, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act was blocked by Senate Democrats. It would require that a baby born alive during an abortion must be afforded the same care that would apply to all babies delivered at the same gestational age. Harris was one of the senators who voted to kill the bill. On January 11, 2023, all but two congressional Democrats voted against this same bill.

It is one thing for Harris to be wrong—candidates for public office frequently misrepresent their record—but it is quite another when the media misrepresent the truth. And it is infuriating when they set themselves up as “fact checkers” during a presidential debate and are later proven wrong. ABC disgraced itself.

Moderators should moderate. They are not paid to be commentators.

SCHOOL CHOICE MARCHES ON

[Bill Donohue](#)

Those who scream the loudest about helping minorities are almost always the same ones who are doing everything they can to keep them in their place.

Proof: It is mostly Democrats who champion minority rights, and it is mostly Democrats who want to force minorities to attend schools they wouldn't send their own children to (the Democratic Platform explicitly rejects school choice). That's because Democrats are owned by the National Education Association (NEA), the largest labor union in the nation. Almost all their funding goes to the Democrats.

In short, no advocate of the poor should be taken seriously if he is opposed to school choice. They are the enemy of the poor.

The good news is that the march for school choice cannot be stopped. In fact, there are some 80 education choice programs available in at least 30 states, and the push for more is relentless. Here are some examples.

- In 2011, Arizona was the first state to offer an ESA, education savings account. It provides a fund for students to pay for various forms of education.
- No state has pioneered school choice more than Florida. We are talking about tens of thousands more children enrolling in private or charter schools or homeschooling.
- In March, Alabama joined 10 other states in enacting universal or near universal education freedom legislation.

- In November, Colorado voters will decide whether to encode school choice in its state constitution.
- Georgia offers a variety of school choice programs, including two private school choice ones, charter schools, magnet schools, homeschooling and inter and intra-district public school choice.
- Iowa has essentially what Georgia has.
- Indiana has four private school choice programs: ESA, school voucher, tax-credit scholarship and individual tax deduction.
- Voters in Kentucky will decide in November whether they want school choice. One school district, Pulaski County, has been accused of violating the law by using social media to tell voters to vote “no” on the ballot initiative.
- School choice advocates are lobbying lawmakers in North Carolina to clear the waitlist for families seeking scholarships under the state’s school voucher program. Roughly 55,000 are on the list.
- Texans are strongly in favor of school choice, and so is Gov. Greg Abbott, but lawmakers are mostly opposed. In the spring, Abbott succeeded in persuading voters to dump six incumbent Republican opponents of school choice.
- In March, Utah expanded its ESA program, essentially doubling the number of students who qualify.
- Also in March, Wyoming adopted its first school choice program, though Gov. Mark Gordon used his line-item veto to narrow the eligibility of the ESA initiative.

Those opposed to school choice allege that funds for these alternative schools effectively siphons money away from traditional public schools. This is inaccurate.

First, it is a fundamental right of parents to decide which school their children should attend, not school unions. Second, it is a myth that public schools suffer a financial

hit when school choice programs are instituted.

A few decades ago, economist Milton Friedman surveyed this argument by discussing the situation in the District of Columbia. At that time D.C. was spending more than \$11,000 per year per student in public schools (today the figure is more than double that). The D.C. voucher plan at that time called for a maximum of \$7,500.

Therefore, Friedman argued, "For every voucher student who leaves the public school for a private school, the system would gain more than \$3,500. Far from taking money away from public schools, vouchers increase the funds available per remaining student."

On this issue, the Democrats are on the wrong side of history. Beholden to their benefactors at the NEA, they are willing to put their heel in the face of black Americans who simply want the same right to select the school of their choice as afforded most Americans. They should not be denied.