

KILLED BECAUSE HE WAS CHRISTIAN; CHARLIE KIRK'S TRAGIC DEATH

Charlie Kirk was assassinated because he was an outspoken Christian. This is undeniable. Yet the media continue to bury this fact. Of course he was a conservative Christian—those are the only Christians targeted by Christian haters.

The suspected killer, Tyler Robinson, was also a sexually confused young man. It takes a very disturbed man to be “romantically involved” with a man who desperately wants to be a woman.

Apparently, Robinson’s roommate, Lance Twiggs, had a great effect on his ideological convictions, and they were not of the MAGA variety.

According to relatives of Twiggs, “He hates conservatives and Christians. He hated us. He was not raised that way, but he, over the years, has become really detached [and] been radicalized. He has obviously gotten progressively worse the last year or two,” saying he was “always very angry.”

Robinson made it plain to his family that he had a special hatred for Kirk’s Christian message. In an affidavit, a relative said that he “didn’t like Kirk” and was “full of hate and spreading hate.”

An important part of Kirk’s message was a strong defense of traditional Christian family values, something which is anathema to the LGBTQ crowd. Kirk deplored the entire transgender movement, and was therefore seen as the enemy. Liberal Christians tend to be on the transgender side, which is why they are safe.

As federal authorities, and Utah Gov. Spencer Cox, said, the evidence shows that he became “deeply indoctrinated with leftist ideology.” They concluded that he had only been “radicalized” in recent years. Those years coincide with his relationship with his trans boyfriend.

Robinson was not simply involved with a man who hated being a man, he himself exhibited ties—at least online—to the “furry” community. “Furries” are people who dress up as animals and consider themselves to be a mix of humans and animals. Many give themselves names, choose a species, and attend conventions with like-minded people. Most of the “furries” are homosexuals.

Now why aren't most of those in the media telling the truth to the American people?

What could be more different from Christian sexual ethics than the idea that it is natural for people to hate their sex and their humanness? Let's face it, it is not normal to rebel against one's nature, reconceptualizing oneself as a member of the opposite sex and another species.

The big media are in denial. They are not highlighting the virulent anti-Christian bigotry that bedevils Robinson and Twiggs, or their depraved orientations. They would rather lie than tell the truth. They have too much invested ideologically, financially and emotionally to change.

TRUMP TACKLES BIGOTRY

On September 8, President Trump addressed the Presidential Commission on Religious Liberty, underscoring his commitment to combating anti-Christian bigotry.

The task force he authorized to study this subject issued its initial report on anti-Christian bigotry on the same day (though it was dated June 6.) It covered many of the issues that the Catholic League has addressed. We previously gave a large batch of documents to the Department of Justice task force.

Among the issues that we addressed, and were cited in the report, were the Biden administration's war on pro-life Christians, particularly its treatment of crisis pregnancy centers. The corruption of the FBI—spying on faithful Catholics and labeling them “domestic terrorists”—engulfed the Catholic League for years; we made available all the documents detailing our efforts to stop it.

In this issue of *Catalyst*, we detail our latest response to the president's effort to stem attacks on Christians. We would like the president to broaden the scope of the panel to study instances of anti-Christian bigotry that emanate from outside the federal government. In his remarks, Trump referenced several such examples, though he was not explicit in charging the task force to address them.

Anti-Catholicism, which is at the heart of this problem, has a long and ugly history. Unfortunately, after many years of progress, the Biden team turned back the clock. Trump is off to a good start trying to rectify it. We stand ready to help.

TWO CHEERS FOR TRUMP'S FLAG BURNING STANCE

William A. Donohue

President Trump's criticism of the 1989 Supreme Court decision, *Texas v. Johnson*, that legalized burning the American flag, is deserving of great respect, notwithstanding some problems with it.

Trump was right to say, "The people in this country don't want to see our American flag burned and spit on." This alone is not sufficient reason to ban flag burning, but it is not irrelevant to the issue. More important, he was right to sneer at the high court when he said, "they called it freedom of speech." This needs to be expanded upon to understand why he is not off-base.

Two cheers for Trump. His reason for sneering, however, is not deserving of a third cheer.

"But there's another reason [besides free speech] which is perhaps much more important," he said, "it's called death. Because what happens when you burn a flag is the area goes crazy." He argued that flag burning "incites riots" and that those who are convicted would face a year in prison.

The problem with this formulation is that it is a recipe for stifling any speech deemed controversial. We've been down this road before.

In 1949, the Supreme Court exonerated a suspended Catholic priest, Father Arthur Terminiello, after he made an inflammatory speech in Chicago. He was arrested and prosecuted for breaking a Chicago ordinance prohibiting speech deemed to "stir the public to anger" or create a disturbance.

If his conviction had not been overturned, a mob could threaten to riot whenever they learned that someone whom they disagree with was scheduled to speak at a particular venue. This is what legal analyst Harry Kalven called the "heckler's veto." It puts the blame on those who want to express themselves.

Ergo, Trump's rationale for objecting to the Supreme Court's decision allowing flag burning is a non-starter. But is also wrong to say that he has no basis for objecting to that ruling. Conservative pundit Dana Loesch errs when she says, "the government has no right to control speech or expression." In fact, it does all the time, without controversy.

We have laws in this country against libel, perjury, obscenity, incitement to riot, infringement on copyright, treasonous speech, bribery, harassing phone calls, false advertising and the like. Someone who lies on his resume cannot seek relief by invoking free speech. Thus, her position holds no water.

Where the Supreme Court erred was in declaring flag burning to be speech. It is not—it is conduct.

Supreme Court Justice Hugo Black considered himself to be a First Amendment absolutist. In 1960, he wrote in a law journal, "It is my belief that there are 'absolutes' in our Bill of Rights, and that they were put there on purpose by those who knew what the words meant, and meant their prohibitions to be 'absolutes'...."

Not only was Black wrong about that, he later proved he was not the absolutist he claimed to be. His dissents in four "free speech" cases proves it. Here's one of them.

In 1969, twenty years before *Texas v. Johnson*, the Supreme Court took up a flag burning case that overturned the conviction of a man who burned the American flag while also making contemptuous speech about it. In *Street v. New York*, the court ruled that his speech was clearly protected, but it balked on whether flag burning should be considered "action."

Black, the "absolutist," dissented, arguing that "It passes my belief that anything in the Federal Constitution bars a State from making the deliberate burning of the American flag an offense. It is immaterial to me that words are spoken in

connection with the burning. It is the burning of the flag that the State has set its face against.”

Another liberal, Justice Abe Fortas, agreed with Black in his dissent. “One may not justify burning a house, even if it is his own, on the ground, however sincere, that he does so as a protest.” He also pointed out that the flag is not like any other property.

In the 1989 decision, the four dissenting judges, led by Chief Justice William Rehnquist, agreed with that position by emphasizing the cultural significance of the flag. Rehnquist also took Black’s position by saying flag burning was conduct, not speech.

Much of the confusion over this issue revolves around the difference between “speech” and “expression.” They are not identical, which is why attempts to conflate them are misguided. Speech, as the Founders understood it, was to be protected because it was foundational to freedom. It was political speech—the right to agree or disagree about the makings of the good society—that was their concern.

Expression is a very elastic term, covering conduct that has nothing to do with what the Founders envisioned. For example, the ACLU considers dwarf-tossing, mud wrestling, sleeping in parks, and the right of demonstrators to stop traffic on bridges, to be protected speech. This trivializes the First Amendment. Indeed, it is insane.

Trump has reintroduced a subject worthy of much discussion, even if his particular stance is problematic.

JAMES DOBSON, R.I.P.

Dr. James Dobson, founder of Focus on the Family, has died. He was a committed evangelical, a brilliant psychologist and an influential conservative activist. He also helped build good relations between Protestants and Catholics.

In 2005, Bill Donohue was honored when he shared a stage with many Protestant leaders at a “Justice Sunday” event in Louisville, Kentucky. Organized by Tony Perkins, president of the Family Research Council, noted speakers included James Dobson, Dr. Al Mohler and Chuck Colson.

Jim was a kind man who had the courage to go against the secular wave. A culture warrior, he never tired in his defense of traditional moral values, driving his critics mad. His books, articles, speeches and televised appearances showed how devoted he was to fighting the good fight. He also spoke in easy to understand terms, never trying to show off by speaking over people’s head.

God bless James Dobson.

FREE SPEECH ON CAMPUS BARELY EXISTS

Every year the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) releases its annual survey results assessing free speech on college and university campuses. The “2026 College Free Speech Rankings” was recently published, and the results are not sanguine. Indeed, they are disturbing.

The survey included 68,510 student respondents from 257 colleges and universities. The average overall score was 58.63, which was a failing grade. In fact, 166 of the 257 schools got an F for their speech climate; only 11 received a C or higher. Here's a sample of the state of free speech on campus.

"The percentage of students saying it is acceptable to shout down a speaker, block entry to a campus speech, or use violence to stop a campus speech all increased since last year and are at record highs."

The school which is number-one in the country allowing free speech to rein is Claremont McKenna College, followed by Purdue University and the University of Chicago. The worst is Barnard College, a women's school affiliated with Columbia University. Columbia is the second most intolerant of free speech, followed by Indiana University.

Catholic schools that were included in the survey are Georgetown, Duquesne, Fordham, DePaul, Dayton, Marquette, Villanova, Notre Dame, Loyola University, Chicago and Boston College. All received a grade of F. Loyola and Boston College were in the bottom ten worst schools in the nation, both Jesuit run.

The topics that ignite the greatest intolerance on campus—subjects that are considered too hot to discuss—are the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, abortion, the presidential election of 2024 and transgender rights. The Left, which controls most schools, is virulently against Israel and Donald Trump, and strongly favors abortion and transgender rights. In other words, conservatives find it hard to speak freely on most campuses.

What was perhaps the most alarming finding was the percentage of students who find violence to be an acceptable response to stop campus speech—34 percent are okay with it. This is up

from 24 percent in 2021. Who do they want to stop? It is not left-wing speakers—they are always welcome.

For example, students were asked about six controversial topics and whether they thought a speaker should be allowed to discuss them on campus. Three-in-four said no one should be allowed to discuss whether “Black Lives Matter is a hate group” (76 percent), and the same proportion (74 percent) said no one should be allowed to discuss whether “Transgender people have a mental disorder.”

This is striking given that some Black Lives Matter leaders taught its followers to hate white people (they also ripped off the organization to such an extent that it barely exists), and a number of the most prominent psychiatrists in the nation are convinced that transgender people have a mental disorder. Yet such speakers are treated as if they belonged to the Flat Earth Society.

Interestingly, one of the six controversial topics the students were asked about was whether “The Catholic Church is a pedophilic institution.” While 62 percent said such speakers should not be allowed on campus, the entry begs the question—why was it included in the first place? We know that four percent of the priests between 1950 and 2002 had an *accusation* made against him for sexually abusing minors, but most of the abuse was committed by homosexuals, not pedophiles. Thus did the survey seriously misrepresent this topic to the students.

When students were asked if they felt comfortable disagreeing with a professor about a controversial topic, only 41 percent said they did. A majority (52 percent) said they felt uncomfortable expressing their views on a controversial political topic during an in-class discussion. From what we know, they were obviously conservatives.

The greatest intolerance for free speech was experienced by

those who expressed themselves on social media. Two-in-three (66 percent) said they felt uncomfortable discussing an unpopular political opinion to their fellow students on a social media account tied to their name. One more reason not to trust social media—it is flooded with crazies.

In short, reasoned debate does not exist on most campuses. This is precisely what Charlie Kirk died defending—the right to speak freely in colleges and universities. Lucky for him he dropped out of college. No wonder he spoke so clearly and persuasively. He was never corrupted by tyrannical professors.

POPE “DISAPPOINTS” LGBTQ CATHOLICS

Trying to get accurate information about the LGBTQ Catholic participation in the Holy Year Jubilee can be frustrating. Misinformation and disinformation abound, but in the end the consensus was these disaffected Catholics did not get what they wanted—a big shout-out from the pope. It never happened.

“Did Pope Leo welcome LGBTQ Catholics at Jubilee events?” Putting this question in a search engine yields a response from AI (Artificial Intelligence) that says, “Pope Leo XIII did not specifically address LGBTQ issues during his papacy.” True enough. Pope Leo XIII died in 1903 at a time when transgender persons barely existed.

On a second try, accessing a different search engine, more misinformation was given. “During the Jubilee events, Pope Leo met with diverse Catholic groups including the LGBTQ community.” Wrong. He did not.

AI was twice mistaken, but when seasoned journalists get it wrong, that is more serious.

CNN said the Jubilee was “the first officially recognized pilgrimage of LGBTQ Catholics to Rome.” PressReader.com is a widely used digital newspaper platform, and it reported that “LGBTQ+ Catholics” participated in “a Vatican-sanctioned event that many had believed impossible.”

These are examples of disinformation—intentionally distorting the truth.

The *Washington Post* noted that when “the gay jubilee” began, “many participants said they would be disappointed to leave without a public gesture from Leo.” It correctly noted that it was not forthcoming. The *New York Times* reported that “Pope Leo XIV did not individually welcome the contingent [of LGBTQ Catholics] at a Jubilee audience on Saturday morning, as he did with some other groups in attendance.”

CBS News and Fox News quoted Vatican officials as saying that being listed in the Jubilee calendar of events was one thing, but they hastened to add, “They are not sponsored activities.”

The *National Catholic Reporter*, which is pro-LGBTQ and is opposed to the Church’s teachings on sexuality, said of this contingency that it “is not explicitly endorsed by the Vatican—nor will participants receive a dedicated papal audience as other groups have.” CBS News also said when the pope addressed the Jubilee audience on Saturday, he “made no special mention of the LGBTQ+ Catholics.”

The queer Catholic group responsible for organizing this contingency is La Tenda di Gionata (Jonathan’s Tent), an Italian LGBTQ association. It drew the support of Outreach, DignityUSA and New Ways Ministry.

An internet search of the principal organizer turned up bizarre results. Trying to access information on Jonathan’s

Tent was nearly impossible. "The page you are trying to reach no longer exists, or has been removed." Typing in "La Tenda di Gionata" was a little better, but no less puzzling.

A page appears saying that it was founded in 2018 by Don David Esposito, "a prematurely disappeared priest." That's an odd way to say he's dead.

We know more about Outreach. It was founded by Father James Martin, who ministers to these people. He openly rejects the Church's teaching on homosexuality, taking great umbrage at the *Catholic Catechism* for saying that the homosexual inclination, and homosexual acts, are "intrinsically disordered." He wants that changed to "differently ordered" people, thus normalizing homosexual behavior.

On the website of DignityUSA, a Catholic queer group, it says that one of its goals is to seek changes "to harmful church teachings on gender and sexual orientation." New Ways Ministry, one of the boldest groups that publicly rejects the Church's teachings on sexuality, likes to make a fetish of our bodies. It is advertising an event in October called, "Honoring Our Bodies."

There are Catholics who are struggling with their "intrinsically disordered" orientation who want to be chaste. Courage is the name of a Catholic ministry that was founded explicitly to serve them. It is not the kind of ministry that wins the applause from any of the aforementioned rebel groups.

The Catholic Church welcomes everyone, but it does so on its terms, not on terms that are subversive of its teachings. That would be suicidal.

Pope Leo is trying to bring unity to the Church. There are times when that can be tricky. He does not want to humiliate anyone, but he also wants to be honest. Prudence is the most cardinal of the cardinal virtues, and his exercise of it is exemplary.

APPEAL TO TRUMP: EXPAND PANEL ON RELIGION

The day after the mass shooting of Catholic schoolchildren, Bill Donohue wrote to President Trump asking him to do more about anti-Christian bigotry. After commending him and FBI Director Kash Patel for treating this incident seriously, he said the following.

“What happened in Minneapolis was not an isolated incident. Attacks on Catholics, and indeed all Christians, have risen sharply in recent years. Our website provides plenty of documentation on this issue, including violent assaults on persons and property.

“It is indisputable that the mass shooter hated lots of demographic groups, but he saved his real hostility for Catholics. He did not choose a public school to attack, nor did he wait until the children were in the classroom to go on his killing spree—he deliberately chose to kill them while they were praying in church.

“We know from what he has said in writing, and on video, that his rampage was born of an anti-Catholic animus. He laughed at Jesus dying on the Cross, cursed at Catholics for worshipping him, mocked the Eucharist, and expressed his admiration for Satan. He may have had serious issues, but he was also very calculated in his game plan.

“The time has come to deal with this problem in greater detail.

“On February 6, you announced the formation of a Presidential Commission on Religious Liberty, putting Attorney General Pam

Bondi in charge. She was authorized to create a task force to 'eradicate anti-Christian' bias. The focus, you said, would be to stop 'all forms of anti-Christian targeting and discrimination within the federal government.'

"On February 19, I wrote to Attorney General Bondi alerting her to the trove of documents that we have on this subject. I asked her to provide us with a contact person. On March 24, she did, and subsequently we turned those documents over to Michael Gates, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. On May 20, I met with him in Washington, D.C. Furthermore, on May 20, we sent all the members of the Commission information on how to access the documents that we gave to the DOJ.

"I would like to recommend that the Commission not limit itself to anti-Christian bigotry emanating from the federal government. To be specific, anti-Christian bigotry stemming from civil society needs to be addressed, either by this Commission or a new one. Its seeds lie outside government, especially in those institutions that shape the content and contours of our culture."

IT'S OFFICIAL—MOST DEMOCRATS ARE SOCIALISTS

There was a time, not too long ago, when to call someone a socialist was to stigmatize him. No more. Most Democrats proudly admit they are now socialists. Even communism is making a comeback.

Gallup released a survey on September 8 that found most Americans still view capitalism more favorably than socialism,

but this is not true of Democrats. The researchers found that when comparing Republicans, Independents and Democrats, “Democrats are the only partisan group of the three that views socialism more positively than capitalism—66% to 42%, respectively.”

That 24 percent gap is significant. It explains the enthusiasm for New York City mayoral candidate Zohran Mamdani, a professed socialist whose views more closely align with communist thought.

In April, CATO Institute, a libertarian think tank, released the findings of a survey that found “more Democrats have positive views of socialism (67 percent) than capitalism (50 percent). Strong liberals lead the way with 82 percent having favorable views of socialism compared to 28 percent who feel positive toward capitalism.”

Even more stunning, fully a third (34 percent) of Americans have a favorable view of communism. Even though the communists in the twentieth century murdered over 150 million people—mostly in Stalin’s Russia, Mao’s China and Pol Pot’s Cambodia—communism is gaining popularity in some quarters. Yet none of Marx’s fans want to move to North Korea.

The Democratic Party is no longer the Party of JFK, LBJ, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton. And it is not merely its affection for socialism that sets it apart. Their support for open borders, a relaxed attitude towards crime, and transgender mania have nothing to do with socialism—they represent a total loss of common sense and a penchant for self-destruction.

These Democrats may be highly educated—in the sense that they stayed in school for a long time— but that doesn’t mean they are well educated. Too many have adopted the ideological vision of man and society force-fed to them by an alienated and angry professoriate. Despite what they say, there is no such thing as democratic socialism: the Scandinavian countries

are welfare-state economies—they are not an example of socialism. The face of socialism is Venezuela, not Sweden.

Anyone who says he believes in socialism, as do most Democrats these days, and denies its legacy—it is one of poverty and oppression—needs to talk to those Americans who have lived under socialist regimes. The Dems may be too far gone to change, but they will have no riposte worth noting.

Marx taught that “religion is the opiate of the masses.” More accurate was the French sociologist, Raymond Aron. He aptly observed that “Marxism is the opiate of the intellectual.” It’s now the official brand of the Democratic Party.

SPINNING THE CATHOLIC KILLER’S BIO

FBI Director Kash Patel got it right when he labeled the Minneapolis mass shooting as an act of domestic terrorism and an anti-Catholic hate crime.

Did Robert Westman (who changed his name to Robin after he falsely identified himself as a woman) also hate others, besides Catholics? Yes, there were many demographic groups whom he hated, but he only chose one group to murder—Catholic children. He did not go into a public school, nor did he choose to kill at a Catholic school—he killed two Catholic kids (and injured 18 others) while they were praying at Mass.

Many reporters and pundits downplayed the anti-Catholic motive behind the shootings. Jake Tapper at CNN said Westman did not have “a specific motive,” noting that his “manifesto” was “kind of rambling.” Had he entered a mosque and killed Muslim

children, would Tapper be just as bewildered?

Similarly, the radical left Southern Poverty Law Center said the killer expressed “a mix of ideologies” that “may not fit neatly in a box.” However, if he hated lots of people, but only shot black kids, it’s a sure bet it would be seen as white racism, and nothing else.

When riots broke out after the death of George Floyd, Zohran Mamdani, the would-be mayor of New York City, blamed “white supremacy.” But he could not bring himself to blame anti-Catholicism for the Minneapolis mass shooting. He blamed guns.

In short, it’s hard for some to acknowledge Catholics as victims. The left is so used to treating Catholics as part of the oppressor class that it’s not easy to see them as the oppressed.

One person who was not confused about Westman’s motive was Rosie O’Donnell. She said he was a “Republican, MAGA person, white supremacist.” After she was proven wrong, she apologized.

The *New York Times* did not apologize for attacking conservative commentators for drawing attention to the transgender status of Westman. They had every right to do so: such persons are generally suffering from severe mental disorders and have a history of violence (well documented by the Catholic League).

Westman left notes saying how much he regretted his transgender status, saying it screwed up his life. He also blamed his marijuana smoking for messing up his mind. Importantly, he warned parents not to let their children smoke weed or attempt to change their sex. But the media downplayed these remarks.

Liberal politicians and reporters are ever-so sensitive to trans persons, yet they never treat Catholics that way. Again,

in their Manichean dualistic vision of reality, Catholics are the bad guys. If it appears they are actually victims, it throws them into a state of cognitive dissonance.

The mayor of Minneapolis could not bring himself to condemn anti-Catholicism, but he wasted no time condemning anyone who might use this “as an opportunity to villainize our trans community.” The media took a more oblique approach, but it was just as political.

The Associated Press could not refer to Westman as a male so it opted for illiteracy when it said that “the shooter was in their early 20s” (our italics); it had four reporters on this story. NBC apologized for referring to Westman as a male, even though he was.

Westman may not have had a consistent political stance, but if anything he was on the left. An international news agency referred to his “pro-communist ideologies.” The *New York Post* mentioned his “far-left politics.”

It is not conservatives who are calling for Trump and Musk to be killed, which is what Westman did. Nor is it conservatives at Ivy League universities who are leading the war on Jews. Westman wrote about “Free Palestine” and those “filthy Zionist Jews.” He argued that “Israel must fall” and that “6 million wasn’t enough.” That is the voice of left-wing Jew haters these days.

It is also not conservatives who hate Catholics; it’s those on the left.

Westman did not stumble when he chose to kill Catholic kids. “Maybe I could attack an event at the on-site church,” he wrote. “I think attacking a large group of people of kids coming in from recess is my best plan...Then from there I can go inside and kill, going for as long as I can.”

We know that he scouted the church and he knew the children

would be at Mass. According to one of his coworkers, “recent events have been the catalyst for this thing he has been planning for a long time.” In a video, he said about his Catholic victims, “Who’s listening to your prayers now?” “Where’s your [expletive] God?”

Westman also ripped the Eucharist, mocking the words, “take this all of you and eat.” He laughed at an image of Jesus pinned to a shooting target and drew an inverted pentagram promoting Satanism, scribbling “666.” This is the work of a virulent anti-Catholic bigot, which is why it is too easy to simply mention his mental issues.

He was not all negative. He admired the left-wing killer Luigi Mangione, and he sported a sticker that said, “Defend Equality”; it featured a machine gun overlaid on a gay pride flag. Not exactly what we would expect from a conservative.

For the media and commentators not to acknowledge that Robert Westman was primarily an anti-Catholic, left-wing, transgender bigot is intellectually dishonest. He may have had many demons, but to discount these elements of his biography amounts to a coverup.

THE INAUTHENTICITY OF ZOHRAN MAMDANI

Bill Donohue

Privileged Background

Many politicians are chameleons who walk back their positions with alacrity, but it is not every day when someone comes

along whose biography and stated policies smack of rank inauthenticity. Meet Zohran Mamdani.

He is the little-known 33 year old New York Assemblyman who beat former New York Governor Andrew Cuomo in the June Democratic mayoral primary. He stunned everyone, in and out of New York City. He won largely because young white people and Asians turned out to support him.

Ironically, the Muslim socialist, who promised the poor an array of freebies, lost the vote of lower income New Yorkers: they voted for Cuomo. He got his biggest support from young college-educated liberals, most of whom are white and affluent.

His donors include the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR). Its Unity & Justice Fund contributed \$100,000 to New Yorkers for Lower Costs, the largest pro-Mamdani PAC. CAIR has terrorist ties and was named as a co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation case; it provided over \$12 million to Hamas.

To say Mamdani is a walking contradiction is an understatement. According to the standards of left-wing activists, Mamdani— who is one of them—is “filthy rich.” Born to a wealthy Indian family in Uganda, his family moved to South Africa when he was five years old. When he was seven, his family moved to the United States, finding a home in New York City.

Like most other rich New Yorkers, Mamdani did not attend the local public school. He spent his elementary school years at the Bank Street School for Children. It is not a school for the middle class, never mind the poor: Tuition is over \$66,000 a year. He also did not attend the local public high school. Instead, he went to one of the most elite public schools in New York City.

In other words, for a man who is ideologically committed to the working class and the poor, his wealthy parents kept him

far away from them. He never fraternized with the proletariat any more than Marx did (Marx never set foot in a factory in his entire life).

Radicals are very good at bashing anyone who even remotely fits the label "privileged." That would be Mamdani. Peter Wood, president of the National Association of Scholars, accurately sums up his upbringing. "There is little room here for doubt that Zohran grew up in an environment that was affluent, privileged, and high status; but also strongly disdainful of Western values and most of what we think of as legitimate government."

Political strategist Hank Sheinkopf is just as pointed, saying the would-be mayor "grew up with three silver spoons in his mouth." Mamdani even admits that his parents provided him with a "privileged upbringing." Indeed, he is such a product of nepotism that he proudly calls himself a "nepo baby."

Mamdani hates capitalism, but he loves the lifestyle it affords. His parents' net worth is estimated at between \$2 million and \$10 million. His mother, in particular, did very well milking the capitalist system.

Mira Nair is a product of privilege and a successful filmmaker. She sold her tony New York City loft in 2019 for \$1.45 million. His father, Mahmood Mamdani, is a Marxist who holds a chaired professorship in African history and colonialism at Columbia University.

Most people have one marriage ceremony in their home country. Not Mamdani—he had ceremonies in three continents. He got engaged last year to Rama Duwaji, a Syrian artist from Brooklyn. The engagement party was in Dubai, where her parents live. Dubai is one of the world's 20 richest cities ranked by millionaires. It is home to over 81,000 millionaires, and hundreds more whose wealth exceeds \$100 million. No diversity at this engagement party.

Most American Muslims marry in their local mosque. Not Mamdani. In early 2025, he and Rama got married in a secular venue, at City Hall. A clerk presided.

In keeping with his privileged background, the couple more recently celebrated their marriage in his family's uber-rich compound in the wealthiest area of Uganda. Though Mamdani is opposed to ICE agents wearing masks, he made sure there were plenty of masked security guards at his bash. He also made sure they carried military-style weapons, an odd choice for someone who wants to ban guns. The troops also employed a cellphone jamming system in the two-acre home that overlooks Lake Victoria. They made sure to keep this a closed-door party with no intruders.

Radical Politics

Mamdani's parents wasted no time grooming him to be a hardcore leftist. His middle name is "Kwame," in recognition to Kwame Nkrumah, the African dictator. Nkrumah was prime minister of Ghana in the 1950s, when it gained independence from Britain. He was such an admirer of the Soviet Gulag that he was awarded the Lenin Peace Prize from the Soviet Union in 1962. A socialist, he did away with elections, naming himself "president for life." This is Mamdani's parents' hero, whom they consider a "democratic" socialist.

Mamdani's father, who is a Ugandan settler colonialist, has made his academic career attacking settler colonialism. His views are so extreme that he blames the United States, which he says is a settler colonialist state, for creating a model that has inspired many nationalist projects, including Nazi Germany, Israel and the Palestinians.

Zohran's radical politics explains why he screamed, "Take it down," when talking about a statue of Columbus in New York City. In fact, he flipped his middle finger at the statue. This is not something associated with liberals—it is the work

of far-left wing activists. In point of fact, Mamdani wants nothing to do with liberals, which is why he despises Barack Obama. He is quite blunt about it. "Hasn't Barack Obama shown that the lesser evil is still pretty damn evil?"

Nothing defines Mamdani's radical politics more than his hatred of Israel. He says his opposition to Israel is "central to my identity." He means it. "The struggle for Palestinian liberation is at the core of my politics and continues to be." This is not something new. When he was at Bowdoin College, majoring in Africana Studies, he cofounded the school's chapter of Students for Justice in Palestine. He led the fight to boycott Israeli institutions, and still does today.

Once again, the apple didn't fall far from the tree. His father has called for a "Third Intifada," meaning a third uprising against Israel. He has also written of his desire to destigmatize suicide bombings.

His mother said in 2013 that she refused to attend the Haifa International Film Festival, saying she would only visit Israel "when the walls come down." She proceeded to support the Palestinian campaign for a cultural boycott of Israel. The filmmaker reportedly tried to have Gal Gadot disinvited from the Oscars because the actress has "openly and repeatedly expressed her support for Israel's military actions."

If Mamdani had his politics nurtured by his father and mother, his parents had their views nourished by Edward Said, one of the most prominent anti-Israeli intellectuals in the United States. They were best of friends.

A Columbia University professor, Said not only opposed the state of Israel, he was the number-one spokesman for the Palestinian cause in the United States. He was also a confidant of Yassir Arafat, the leader of the Palestine Liberation Organization. But Arafat, who sponsored terrorism, was later considered to be too moderate for Said: the two

stopped talking once Arafat signed the Oslo Peace Accords.

It is due to circumstances like these that Zohran became the radical that he is. After Hamas attacked Israel on October 7, 2023, in an unprovoked assault, the mayoral hopeful never once condemned the terrorists. Instead, he condemned Israel, accusing it of apartheid. Just as revealing are the views of Hadeeqa Malik, one of his prized former interns. She is known for characterizing her work as “all jihad.” She refers to herself as a “true believer” of Allah.

Mamdani has consistently accused Israel of “genocide.” He has also consistently refused to call out those who want to “globalize the intifada.” When pressed on this issue, he says he does not encourage use of this phrase, but he nonetheless refuses to condemn it. This does not satisfy critics like New Jersey Democratic Rep. Josh Gottheimer. He says those who want to “globalize the intifada” are calling for “a wave of terror against the Jewish people.”

There is nothing moderate about Mamdani. His natural gait is a leftwing quick step, putting him in the company of history’s most destructive actors. Some say this is a reflection of his radical Islamic views. This is a shortsighted perspective—he has more in common with radical secularists than he does radical Muslims.

Religious Beliefs

President Joe Biden is at war with the teachings of the Catholic Church on many issues, especially those that deal with marriage, the family and sexuality. But he calls himself a “devout Catholic.” Similarly, Mamdani is at war with the teachings of Islam on many issues, especially those that deal with marriage, the family and sexuality. But he calls himself a “proud Muslim.”

Biden and Mamdani know that symbols matter. This explains why Biden always carries a set of rosary beads; it impresses his

friends in the media. Similarly, when he wants to make a point, Mamdani adorns Muslim attire. He usually wears business clothes, but he is featured on his website wearing a white thobe, the collar-less lengthy one-piece gown favored by Muslim men. It impresses his friends in the media, as if that makes him authentic.

Biden at least attended Mass on a regular basis, but Mamdani's record of being an observant Muslim is spotty. For example, when he celebrated Ramadan in 2018, he confessed that this was the first time he had done so in years. The timing is curious: the next year he announced his candidacy for office; in 2020 he was elected to the New York State Assembly. This gave him the appearance of an authentic Muslim. His wife is more honest—she does not wear the hijab.

Mamdani is described as being “discreet about his Shia Muslim identity.” Why discreet? Why is he selective about acknowledging it?

For example, his attendance at houses of worship has quickened in recent times, something that is advantageous to him in important circles. He now shows up at Jummah prayer, the Muslims' congregational Friday service. He follows the Twelver branch of Shia Islam, the one that forms the basis of Iran's Islamic Republic. Whether he believes that his religion's teachings on marriage are just—polygamy is okay for men but not for women—is unknown. The media are sure not to ask him.

Mamdani's mother may identify as Hindu, but that doesn't mean much to New York's Hindu population. They see her son as anti-Hindu, citing his strident denunciation of India's Prime Minister, Narendra Modi. Mamdani has called him a “war criminal.” This explains why so many Hindus are raising money for his challengers. Not unexpectedly, Mamdani calls them “Hindu fascists.”

Mamdani may call himself a “proud Muslim,” but he sure isn't

proud of many key Islamic teachings. Practicing Muslims, at least in the United States, are very supportive of religious liberty. Yet a Nexis-Lexis search reveals that he has never addressed this subject.

This is astonishing, especially coming from someone who is not shy about commenting on virtually every other public issue. He is very protective of Islam, but a search of his remarks objecting to anti-Catholicism, or anti-Christian words or deeds, failed to turn up one comment. It's fair to conclude that his interest in religious liberty is quite limited. Even worse, his interest in defending Islamic teachings on moral issues is abysmal.

Islam generally promotes the sanctity of human life; only in exceptional circumstances are abortions permitted after 120 days of pregnancy. Mamdani disagrees. He opposes any restrictions on abortion. That is why his voting record consistently receives a 100 percent score from Planned Parenthood. There is no abortion—for any reason and at any time of gestation—that he cannot support.

Islam depicts life as a gift from God. As such, it does not support suicide or attempts to end one's life. Mamdani disagrees. As a state assemblyman he has voted for every "medical aid in dying," or assisted suicide, bill. His embrace of an ethic of autonomy, which is a secular expression, overrides any interest in being faithful to the Islamic code.

Islam is even more specific about its teachings on sexuality. It abhors homosexuality. Mamdani disagrees. Whether consulting the Quran, or the sayings attributed to Muhammad, the hadith, Islam holds that homosexuality is sinful and deserving of punishment. Sexual relations are only permitted within the institution of marriage, and marriage is the exclusive province of a union between a man and a woman.

In May 2023, approximately 150 Muslim notables from across the

nation signed a statement on sexuality that was a full-throated defense of what Muslims are expected to hold.

“We urge Muslim public figures to uphold the sanctity of our faith and refrain from making erroneous pronouncements on behalf of Islam. We reject any attempt to attribute positions to Islam concerning sexual and gender ethics that contravene well-established Islamic teachings. To be clear, we cannot overstate the detrimental spiritual consequences for those who intentionally reject, advocate the rejection of, or misrepresent the will of God, as in doing so they endanger their status as believers.”

There is little doubt that Mamdani intentionally rejects Islamic teachings on marriage, the family and sexuality.

He is a huge advocate of the radical LGBTQ cause. He supports transgender rights across the board and disagrees with the Islamic belief that there are only two sexes. He regularly attends gay events, including parades. In June, a video caption of the New York City Gay Pride parade read, “Zohran can be seen jumping up and down with joy while holding a transgender flag with a firm grip.”

Mamdani also advocates “comprehensive sex education” in the schools, which obviously means supporting the LGBTQ curricula. He wants it to be mandatory in all New York schools, making no allowance for private or parochial schools. He says it should include information about “reproductive health benefits,” which clearly does not apply to the unborn.

The Democratic Socialists of America are working with Mamdani to declare New York City a “sanctuary city for LGBTQIA+ people and their families.” What this will entail is anyone’s guess, though Mamdani has already pledged that he will spend \$65 million in taxpayer money for sex-reassignment surgery, puberty blockers, chemical castration and genital mutilation for minors.

Like many radicals in western civilization, Mamdani believes there is a nexus between the sexual and the political. As Mamdani puts it, "Queer liberation means defund the police." In other words, if gay and transgender persons are to be free, the political apparatus must change. This, in turn, means that those who protect the social order, namely the cops, must go. This is the stuff of revolution, not reform.

Economic Beliefs

When asked about his commitment to "democratic socialism," Mamdani likes to hitch himself to Martin Luther King's star. "I call myself a Democratic socialist, in many ways, inspired by the words of [Martin Luther King] from decades ago, who said, 'Call it democracy or call it Democratic socialism: There has to be a better distribution of wealth for all of God's children in this country.'" However, what Mamdani means by democratic socialism is not analogous to what King meant.

In 1964, when King accepted the Nobel Peace Prize, he said the United States had much to learn from Scandinavian "democratic socialism." The Scandinavian countries were essentially welfare state entities that featured a wide safety net. The government did not own the means of production, which is what socialism means.

King's goal, as expressed in organizing the Poor People's Campaign, was to secure an Economic Bill of Rights. It included proposals such as full employment, guaranteed income and affordable housing. That is not socialism. In fact, King had nothing to say about what Mamdani wants, which is a government takeover of the private sector.

Truth be told, "democratic socialism" is an oxymoron. Venezuela is a case in point.

Until recently, Venezuela was the richest country in South America. Now it is a basket case of poverty. This didn't happen by mistake: the socialist agenda advanced by President

Hugo Chavez in 2014, and his successor, Nicolás Maduro, was a recipe for disaster. The economic crash can't be because of natural resources—Venezuela is awash with crude oil reserves. No, it is due to the evisceration of human resources, a function of socialist policies.

Islam is mostly agnostic on economic models, holding to the view that the laws of Allah are what count. Though it does not nominally embrace either capitalism or socialism, historically when Muslim economies have experienced growth, it has come by adherence to capitalist principles.

Guy Sorman is an editor and author of a book on Islam. He notes that “The Koran has only good words for successful businessmen. Entrepreneurs must pay a 2.5 percent tax, the *zakat*, to the community to support the general welfare, but otherwise can make money guilt-free. Private property is sacred, according to the Koran.”

Now contrast this view with that of Mamdani's. He rails against capitalism, even to the point of blaming it for women being “undervalued, underpaid and overworked.” This would surely come as a shocker to millions of middle and upper-class women; they live a lifestyle that is the world's envy. It would also come as a surprise to most South Asian women who have settled in New York City— it's not just his mother who has done very well in a capitalist society.

Mamdani takes a page straight out of Marx when he boasts that one of his goals is “seizing the means of production.” In other words, he wants the government ownership and control of the economy. This is exactly the verbiage that Marx used in his classic communist tract, *Das Kapital*. Not surprisingly, Mamdani believes that the “abolition of private property” is a viable option to achieve his socialist agenda.

His economic philosophy colors his thinking about all aspects of public policy. For example, in discussing the homeless,

Mamdani takes aim at those who live in “luxury condos,” arguing the need to “Seize these properties.” To be sure, this might satisfy his appetite for vengeance, but it would do nothing to help those suffering from severe psychological and physical problems.

Mamdani’s animus to private property does not extend to himself. He owns four acres of land in Uganda, the tyrannical state where he was born. It is worth between \$150,000 and \$250,000.

Oprah is a billionaire. Is she a problem? You bet. “I don’t think we should have billionaires,” Mamdani says. This is odd coming from someone who got engaged in Dubai, home to at least 20 billionaires. No word on whether they are also a problem.

Mamdani may not be happy with Oprah’s wealth, but at least she is black. That matters a lot to him. He explicitly notes that we need to “shift the tax burden from overtaxed homeowners in the outer boroughs to more expensive homes in richer and whiter neighborhoods.” In other words, the rich can keep their money as long as they look more like him than Cuomo.

His overt racism may explain why he considers himself to be black, even though everyone knows he is not. When he applied to Columbia University, on his application he checked the “African American” box. Now he may have been born in Uganda, but his parents are of Indian descent. White people get born in Uganda, too, and if they migrate to the United States, they don’t exploit the affirmative action system by claiming to be African American. But Mamdani does.

Taxing the rich has led two million people in New York State to leave between 2015 and 2024. That’s a loss of \$111 billion in income. Mamdani’s plan, if it were to succeed, would lead to a stampede of wealthy New Yorkers (many of whom have dark skin) bolting for Red States. They would take their jobs and tax base with them; they would also deplete the Electoral

College numbers for Blue States, shifting them to Red States. That's a prescription for economic collapse in New York City.

Economic Policies

A review of the 2024 Democratic Party Platform reveals support for a \$15 per hour minimum wage. The Democratic Socialists of America agree. The Socialist Party USA favors a \$25 minimum wage, as does the Communist Party USA. Mamdani wants it pegged at \$20 in 2027 and \$30 in 2030. But as Milton Friedman said long ago, if increasing the minimum wage doesn't lead to unemployment—which it does—then why not jack it way up? For instance, why not \$100 an hour?

Healthcare is expensive. One reason why is due to the nearly 5 million able-bodied, working-age adults who refuse to work and are on Medicaid; there are also more than 1.2 million illegal immigrants on Medicaid. All of these people are threatening Medicaid benefits for those who legitimately need them.

What does Mamdani want to do about this? He likes the status quo and resists attempts to change it. So what's his answer to the high cost of healthcare? "Abolish 'medical bills.'" Yeah, that'll work. What about private insurance? "We need to abolish private insurance," he says. This is the world he lives in—freebies for all.

Raising kids is expensive. Should childcare be free as well? Absolutely. He says he wants free childcare for New Yorkers aged 6 weeks to 5 years. Should this just be for the poor? No way. How about those dreaded billionaires? Do they qualify? You got it. This is the politics of inclusion par excellence.

Bus fare is expensive. Mamdani has a solution: make it free. Can the rich ride for free as well? Yes, those that can afford to buy a bus can go for free. More inclusion.

This is not a new issue for him. He was the one behind an experiment launched a few years ago in New York City. In 2023,

the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) launched a pilot program that allowed free bus fare along five routes, one in each borough. It was targeted at low income New Yorkers.

A year later, Mamdani looked at the numbers and declared it a success. "The results have now shown us that this pilot has been an unequivocal success." Wrong. It bombed. Here's the proof. Once the program ended, nearly half (48 percent) of riders refused to pay the fare. Only a fool would not have been able to figure out why: what started as a privilege quickly became a right. As a result, the MTA lost hundreds of millions to bus fare evaders.

Food is expensive. Mamdani has a solution: socialized grocery stores. He claims that city-owned grocery stores will keep prices down, and he proudly exclaims that they will not be allowed to make a profit. But current grocery stores make so little profit they can hardly make it, so why would we expect government-owned stores to make it? Moreover, this is not going to sit well with those who currently own stores.

John Catsimatidis owns Gristedes, a Manhattan-based grocery store chain. If New York decides to nationalize a swath of supermarkets, he's cashing out. It's not just wealthy owners who feel this way. Hispanics who own bodegas are already joining forces to oppose this scheme—they won't be able to compete and will have to close.

It's not as though we don't know what will happen. This gambit has been tried elsewhere. Government owned grocery stores were a disaster. Municipal employees have no direct stake in these stores, and their lackadaisical attitude shows. After seven years, the city-owned Sun Fresh Market in Kansas City, Missouri, closed its doors on August 12, 2025. Perishables sat well past their expiration date. As one reporter put it, "a rotting smell comes through the door."

Housing is expensive. Profits being a taboo, Mamdani wants to put the screws to landlords by freezing the rent for all stabilized tenants. So how will they pay for repairs? That's their problem. Mamdani pledges a revamped 311 hot line to report on landlords who don't make repairs.

It is striking to note that he has nothing to say about all of those wealthy New Yorkers who currently live in rent-stabilized units, effectively ripping off the working class and the poor. That's because he's one of them.

Mamdani and his wife can well afford to live in any neighborhood in New York City. Instead, they live just outside Manhattan, in Astoria, Queens, in an apartment that was not intended for the rich—it's rent stabilized. Cuomo called on him to "move out immediately and give your affordable housing back to an unhoused family who needs it." He added, "We're not supposed to be providing rentstabilized apartments to the children of millionaires."

Quality education is one of the most important agents of upward mobility. Mamdani, who never stops talking about the plight of the poor, wants to deny them the same opportunities available to people like him.

New York City has long had a select group of elite public schools open to everyone. Jews, and now Asians, have taken good advantage of them.

To a lesser extent, so have Hispanics and African Americans. Mamdani objects, saying admission criteria are too restrictive and should be changed. In effect, he wants to radically change the way schools like Brooklyn Tech, Stuyvesant High School and the Bronx High School of Science operate. He is a graduate of the Bronx High School of Science.

Black and Hispanic students have done very well in charter schools, private schools and parochial schools. Success Academy in New York City, the epic charter school system that

enrolls 22,000 students, recently posted numbers that settle the argument. Black students had a 95.5 percent pass rate in math, compared to 43 percent in public schools. For Hispanics, the pass rate for charter students was 96.8 percent, compared to 43.1 percent in the traditional public schools.

Mamdani wants to close charter schools and is opposed to every school-choice initiative, effectively keeping black and brown students in their place. White racists could not do a better job of punishing the poor than this.

Crime

Illegal aliens are responsible for some of the most horrendous crimes in New York City. Serial criminals, they continue to prey on the innocent, and that is because of the catch-and-release system that exists. Moreover, sanctuary city policies thwart the effectiveness of ICE agents to apprehend them. Mamdani hates ICE and has promised not to cooperate with them. He wants to “stop masked ICE agents from deporting our neighbors.” This includes “neighbors” such as child-rapists.

Guns are used by responsible persons to protect the innocent; they are used by irresponsible persons to kill them. The problem is not the gun—it is the character of the person who uses them. What does Mamdani want to do about this? “We need to ban all guns.” What about knives? No word on that yet.

Currently, once murderers are caught, prosecuted and found guilty, they are sentenced to prison. Mamdani disagrees with that approach. He wants to do away with prisons. He says, “our prison system relies on dehumanization and brutality, so the goal must be to abolish this exploitative system entirely.” Where should we put car jackers? He does not say. All he says is we need to “Defund & dismantle” the prison system.

What should we do about the cops? Now that he wants to be mayor, he says he no longer wants to defund the police. But who can believe him? In 2020, he was unequivocal, saying, “We

want to defund the police.” He said, “the NYPD is racist, anti-queer & a major threat to public safety.” Moreover, “There is no negotiating with an institution this wicked & corrupt.”

When someone believes that the police are wicked racists—and has said so repeatedly and publicly— that kind of deeply held sentiment cannot realistically be turned on and off like a light switch. It’s who that person is.

It is because of this vile assault on the police, led by left-wing extremists like Mamdani, that New York City has lost over 15,000 police officers in the last 10 years. Former Police Commissioner Ray Kelly has warned that if Mamdani wins, more cops will flee.

Mamdani wants to replace some police work with social workers. Armed with their MSW, he says they will take to the streets and stop violence before it starts. The newly established Department of Community Service will dispatch social workers to intervene when trouble appears imminent. What kinds of crimes will they address? Wife beating. That’s right, Mamdani specifically mentions “domestic violence” as a crime the police will not be allowed to deal with in the future. All this from a man who says he supports women’s rights.

Roving mobs of young men have been crashing urban stores, walking away with expensive merchandise. They do so with impunity. Few are arrested and those that are pay no price for their crimes— they are routinely released without bail.

Mamdani not only supports these measures, when asked why retail theft is so common, he blames it on the mentally ill. A New York business leader recently asked him to explain the rise in retail theft, and was left puzzled by his response. “He went into a lengthy discussion about people with mental illness. You scratch your head and say, ‘He didn’t answer the question. Unless you believe everyone who commits retail theft

is mentally ill.'”

On a related note, Mamdani believes that the mentally ill who live on the streets should be allowed to do so. “People should be allowed to make their own mental care decisions.” This is certainly true of those whose mental faculties are intact, but the mentally disabled are not capable of making such judgments. Leaving them to perish on the street does not respect their autonomy—it disrespects their humanity.

High crime areas of New York are awash with drugs and prostitution. Because they go unchecked, they act as magnets for degenerates, delinquents and the deranged. Mamdani wants to allow drug addicts to shoot up in public and he wants to legalize “sex workers,” also known as prostitutes.

He needs to visit Roosevelt Avenue in Jackson Heights, Queens. This multi-ethnic neighborhood it is being overrun by drug addicts and hookers. A local writer notes that “sex trafficking and solicitation, illegal vending, sanitation and other issues” have overwhelmed the community. As one New York City notable, Hiram Monserrate, puts it, “There are more brothels than there are bodegas in this community. We have an active 24-hour brothel across the street from two elementary schools. Our kids are seeing this.”

In East Harlem, there is an injection site for druggers where “addicts so zonked out they routinely have sex in broad daylight, often at the doorstep of neighbors forced to endure the X-rated freefor-all.” According to one resident, “They have sex in our yards, they defecate behind our cars. It’s a mess.” The injection sites attract the worst elements in the city. It’s a nightmare that Mamdani will only make worse.

It took Rudy Giuliani to reform New York City. He did by instituting common-sense conservative ideas, much of them taking from the work of researchers at the Manhattan Institute. Michael Bloomberg kept most of Giuliani’s policies,

and left the city intact. Then came a Marxist millionaire, Bill de Blasio, who nearly destroyed the city with his far-left policies. Already, he has been in touch with Mamdani, offering ideas and recommending personnel.

Mamdani is a man of privilege who has never run anything. Like a child, he believes money grows on trees. His biggest victims will be the poor. They are the ones he will keep trapped in high crime neighborhoods, consigned to public schools that no one would ever choose if they had a choice. That this is being touted as social justice is mindboggling. New York City will not survive de Blasio II. There are other choices, and any one of them is head over heels more realistic about urban affairs than Mamdani.