



CNN Discovers: Democrats' Kids Are Far MORE Intolerant Than Republicans' Kids

There's "wisdom from the mouths of babes" and then there's, well, what CNN found in a recent study. That is, despite liberals' chest-thumping about their "tolerance," they're not the ones raising tolerant kids. Oh, it isn't just that "Democrat-leaning" children are far more negative about Donald Trump than "Republican-leaning" children are about Kamala Harris. It's also this:

Liberals' kids are five times as likely as conservatives' children to say they wouldn't visit a pro-"other" candidate home.



Charity Disparity

The study was conducted by Arizona State University psychologist Asheley Landrum and Stanford University political science Professor Shanto Iyengar. Landrum interviewed 10- and 11-year-olds, showed them pictures of the candidates, and inquired about their reactions. For instance, the kids were asked what the *first word* entering their minds was when hearing a given candidate's name. In response to "Kamala Harris," a young boy answered "liar." A girl reacted to "Donald Trump" with "pure evil" (perhaps indicating that conservative kids are better with math).

martinedoucet/iStock/Getty Images Plus

In fact, [states](#) CNN-News 18 in a video segment:

The study found that these Democrat-leaning kids were about nine times more likely to express negative emotions about Donald Trump than Republican-leaning kids were about Kamala Harris. Why might that be? Psychologist Asheley Landrum has some ideas. "So, Donald Trump is a very polarizing figure and it's very possible that the kids are reacting to their parents reacting to Donald Trump being a very different kind of of political figure than what we've seen before," [she said].

So do the red state kids hold as strong of attitudes? "Well, not when we are talking about Kamala Harris," [Landrum stated]. "In part that could be because they don't know that much about her."



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 30, 2024

Polarization Prevarication?

Of course, it's well known that insofar as preteens express political sentiments at all, they usually reflect their parents' passions. Yet the idea of being "polarizing" is interesting. It certainly is true that Trump has a "big personality," is brash, and often makes impolitic statements. Yet it's also true that "it takes two to tango."

That is, if everyone agreed with Trump, he couldn't be "polarizing" because there wouldn't be two political groups, each occupying a different pole. Moreover, isn't the media largely responsible for the polarization by lying about Trump to make him seem more radical? (E.g., the "fine people" hoax.)

As for Harris, Landrum is surely correct about the kids not knowing "much about her." Why, however, is this so? Why do they not know, for example, of [Democrat Terry McAteer's testimonial](#) about how horribly she treats underlings? (She berates them and, like some bizarre ancient potentate, won't let junior staff "look her in the eye.") Why don't they know about [seemingly credible claims](#) that Harris has a drinking problem? Could this be because she mostly refuses to do media interviews and that, when she does, reporters won't ask her tough questions? Could it be because of the intense, continual, and [well-documented mainstream media bias](#) against Trump and conservatives generally?

In other words, could it be because the press — CNN being a prime example — simply refuses to do its job?

Note here: 32 percent of the children *did* know about and "brought up [Trump's] legal issues," informs CNN.

"There's No One as Illiberal as a Liberal"

Speaking of bias brings us to this piece's main subject. "The study found that Republican-leaning kids were more open to visiting a Democrat-supporting household," relates CNN. In fact, "The Democrat-leaning kids were about five times more likely to say they would not want to go to a pro-Trump house." (Video below.)

So what can be said about people who can't "agree to disagree"? For one thing, "Democrats really need to drop the whole 'party of tolerance' thing," said the above video's top commenter. This may be especially true since CNN's findings are just par for the course.

For instance, consider a 2020 Dartmouth University survey showing that Democrats are far more intolerant than Republicans. One example: "Democrats were consistently more likely to indicate conflicting politics negatively affect potential relationships," the researchers [found](#).

Then there was a 2016 study by the Public Religion Research Institute, focusing on online behavior. The results? "Liberals Nearly 3-Times More Likely Than Conservatives To Block, Unfriend Someone Over Political Posts," left-wing CBS [reported](#) in a headline.

Proof in the Pudding

None of this will surprise keen cultural observers. It is the Left, after all, that has

- authored the censorship called "hate-speech laws" (in other countries) and college-campus speech codes;
- created the merciless "cancel culture," which often persecutes people for speaking Truth;
- disrupted college-campus lectures by speakers they disagree with; and
- perpetrated the vast majority of political violence, as I demonstrated in 2020's "[Violence, Inc.: A Leftist Enterprise](#)."



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 30, 2024

It also won't surprise author Peter Schweizer. After all, he wrote the 2008 piece, "[Don't listen to the liberals — Right-wingers really are nicer people, latest research shows.](#)" The upshot?

There's much data showing conservatives "are happier, more generous to charities, [and] less likely to commit suicide," Schweizer summarized. Why, they "even hug their children more than those on the Left [do]."

All this may seem befuddling — *if* you consider liberals and conservatives just "political" groups. In reality, though, the political reflects a deeper realm: the philosophical/spiritual/moral one.

Liberals are [less likely than conservatives](#) to [believe in God](#), and this has serious implications. Put briefly, it correlates with moral relativism, which itself boils down to a "Whatever works for you" standard. Also, without Truth as a yardstick for behavior, emotion becomes the main arbiter. So why not just hate the politically incompatible if that feels right?

Moreover, if we're not divinely created beings, flesh and spirit, we're mere organic robots, some pounds of chemicals and water. And what could be wrong with hating robots whose programming you despise?

In fact, without Truth, what could be wrong with hate, period?

In a nutshell, the problem is a lack of virtue, which, sadly, gets handed down. And children marinated in vice end up not so nice.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.