

# POLITICIZING SEXUAL ABUSE

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

The sexual abuse of children is one of the most evil acts that anyone can commit. That is why accusations must not be made casually—this is serious business. Yet that is exactly what is happening when Democrats charge that enforcing norms to ensure that males cannot compete against females in sports leads to child sexual abuse. That is a lie.

On March 3, Democrats in the Senate voted against “The Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act,” effectively killing it (60 votes were needed and the 51 mustered by the Republicans were not enough). The bill sought to amend Title IX to prohibit schools from allowing boys and men to compete with girls and women in athletic programs.

Common sense dictates that because males are, on average, stronger and faster than females, there should be separate sports for males and females. Common decency dictates that males and females should have separate locker rooms and shower facilities. But common sense and common decency are not commonplace among Democrats.

It is bad enough to allow men to crash women’s sports—all in the name of showing tolerance for transgender individuals—but it is worse when some of those who support this travesty maintain that stopping them from doing so will cause the sexual abuse of minors.

When the House took up this bill, Minority Leader Hakeem Jeffries called it the “Republican child predator empowerment act.” He explained that the bill “risks unleashing child predators on the children of America in the sports context.”

Similarly, New York Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez said the bill allows “genital examination into little girls in this country.”

Massachusetts Rep. Jim McGovern claimed the bill is an example of Republicans’ “creepy obsession with your kids’ private parts.” Vermont Rep. Becca Balint said that the “logical conclusion” of the bill is to violate the bodies of young girls. More recently, Rep. Jennifer McClellan went even further claiming “the only way” to enforce this bill is “to pull children’s pants down to determine what sex they are.”

When the Senate voted on the bill, Sen. Catherine Cortez Masto said that because the bill would ban male school athletes from competing with females, the law would “allow anyone to subject girls to invasive physical exams just because of the way they look,” leading to “an increased risk for abuse and harassment.” Sen. Dick Durbin agreed, saying the bill would allow “the right to physically inspect a girl or a young woman if the other opposing team accuses them of being transgender.”

Not one of these persons offered a scintilla of evidence to back up their outrageous claims, and no one from the media challenged them. However, they unwittingly undercut their position that self-identification determines one’s sex: if that were the case, why would the Democrats argue that “the only way” to determine one’s sex is to pull down their pants?

We decided to check the links that Google AI provides as evidence that banning males from competing with females in sports leads to child sexual abuse. What we found was another unsupported assertion. Florida Rep. Jessica Miranda said the bill “would require children to have genital exams to play high school sports,” claiming this was “nothing short of state-sanctioned sexual abuse.” So much for AI: *This is not evidence—it is an opinion.*

It is not as though evidence is lacking altogether. Roughly

half the states have laws ensuring that males cannot compete against females, and as a result *not one of them has experienced child sexual abuse*. That's because most of them insist on just one criterion: provide a birth certificate. This is true in Florida, as well, making mince meat out of Rep. Miranda's bogus theory.

Democrats need to stop making false accusations about child sexual abuse and start explaining why they want to destroy women's sports and women's privacy.

---

# THE CRISIS OF TRANSGENDER VIOLENCE

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

It is commonplace for LGBTQ activists, as well as many in the media, education and government, to complain about the high rates of violence that transgender persons experience. But with the exception of the Catholic League, virtually no one is telling the truth about this condition: the majority of the violence committed against transgender persons is committed by other transgender persons.

A recent tragic incident puts this in perspective. A 24-year-old woman who falsely considered herself to be a man, Sam Norquist, was tortured to death in upstate New York. The police decided it was not a hate crime because all five people charged with the crime are themselves transgender persons.

This is reason enough to do away with the concept of "hate

crimes.” It is purely subjective. More important, we need to address the crisis in transgender violence. It is not frat boys who are beating up transgender individuals—they are doing it to themselves.

Research on this subject that we have previously cited (see our website) is consistent with more recent research.

In May 2023, the *Journal of Family Violence* published an article co-authored by nine researchers, “Intimate Partner Violence and Mental Health Among Transgender and Gender Diverse Young Adults.” They found that the rates of psychological, physical and sexual abuse among transgender persons committed by those just like themselves is startling. They studied young adults in New York City and concluded that those who consider themselves “gender diverse,” meaning they do not consider themselves to be either male or female, experience the highest rates of violence.

A study of 3,560 transgender and gender diverse California adults was published in June 2024 by the *Journal of the American Medical Association*. It found that they were “significantly more likely to face physical, sexual, and intimate partner violence in the past year relative to cisgender respondents [those who accept their sexual status].” This was especially true of transgender men, meaning women who falsely identify as male.

It was reported in July 2024 that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) found that 44 percent of lesbians and 61 percent of bisexual women experienced rape, physical violence, or stalking committed by those in their same community. Also in July 2024, The Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law reported that “between 30% and 50% of transgender people” are victims of violence committed by other transgender persons.

In December 2024, the Radiological Society of America

published a study of 263 men who consider themselves to be female (transgender women) and compared them to women who accept their nature-given sex. It found that transgender women had eight times as many head injuries, 36 times as many facial injuries and five times as many chest injuries. Forty-two percent of the men who think they are female were violently attacked by other transgender women.

In 2025, the Human Rights Campaign, the large LGBTQ organization, updated data from 2017 and found that “More than half, or 54 percent of transgender and non-binary individuals have experienced intimate partner violence (IPV) in their lifetimes.” The *American Journal of Public Health* also published data showing how violence marks this community.

There needs to be a national discussion of this issue. We need to get to the bottom of it and find out why transgender persons, and those who think they are neither male nor female, are so violent, and why they take it out on those in their own community. We also need to stop blaming normal men and women for their violence.

---

## WASHINGTON POST BLUES

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Senior reporters and columnists at the *Washington Post* (WaPo) quit following a directive from owner Jeff Bezos that the paper will start taking a position that supports “personal liberties and free markets.”

Why would this set workers off? There are three possible

reasons: (a) they don't like being told what to write about, (b) they don't like personal liberties, and (c) they don't like free markets.

It is understandable that reporters and other staffers would object to anything that might compromise their independence. But how independent were they before? If a reporter, or someone on the editorial staff, were pro-life, how secure would that person be in expressing his independence from his colleagues?

Why would staffers object to free markets? After all, they make their living from a market economy. But maybe that doesn't matter. It is hardly a secret that WaPO is home to liberal and left-wing reporters, and for them, socialism is not a dirty word. Capitalism is. This is a reflection of what they learned in school. What about personal liberties? Why would staffers object to that? They don't when it comes to drugs and abortion. But when it comes to free speech, that is problematic. Even though they make their living by exercising their right to free speech, recent studies show that liberals are the least supportive of this First Amendment right.

Bezos is trying to move the newspaper away from being a forum for liberal-left thinking. He has no nefarious agenda: he simply wants employees to start showing an appreciation for the liberties that allow for a free society.

---

## SOME PEOPLE NEVER LEARN

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Some individuals are their own worst enemy. Some will admit that they shouldn't be taking drugs, while others confess that they eat, drink, smoke and spend too much. But they continue anyway. And then they die.

The same is true of political collectivities. After being badly beaten in the November election, many of the losers are digging their heels in, apparently learning nothing. They have already succeeded in rendering liberalism intellectually bankrupt, and now they are well on their way to destroying the Democratic Party.

The following is a random selection of news stories that were recently published.

Two-thirds of Israelis support President Trump's plan to take over Gaza. But American Jews, who voted overwhelmingly against Trump, are a bit more divided. Some of those who don't support the Trump plan, which is being promoted by the Israeli government, are not content to disagree—they are demonizing Trump. A column in the Jewish Forward compares the relocation plan to the Nazis. A full-page ad in the New York Times, signed by hundreds of rabbis—accuses Trump of “ethnic cleansing.”

It is striking that those who are closest to current conditions in Israel are applauding Trump, while those who are wholly unaffected are comparing him to Hitler.

One of the top issues driving Trump's mandate was immigration. The public wants the illegals out. But in many cities run by the Democrats, they are resisting cooperation with ICE. Even the Dallas chief of police wants illegal aliens to stay; he has pledged not to cooperate with the ICE deportation plan.

The most vociferous resistance to Trump's agenda is coming from the sexually confused, the mentally challenged, and their supporters. These people falsely believe that males who identify as female are, ipso facto, female. They not only find

it acceptable for males to compete against females in sports, and to share locker rooms with them, some even defend the distribution of pornography to children in the schools.

Regarding the latter, parents in a school district in Rochester, New York objected to putting a book on display in the library that showed homosexuals in bondage gear, drag queens, and naked men and women. It was accessed by a fifth grader and is readily available to kindergarten students. The school board wouldn't even allow parents to speak about this at a recent meeting, even though it is a modern-day expression of child abuse.

Every sane person knows there are only two sexes—male and female—but when a Trump order acknowledged this verity on the website of the Department of Health and Human Services, a federal judge intervened and assumed control. Another federal judge accused the Trump administration of showing an animus against transgender persons. Why? Because of an executive order that bars these persons from serving in the military.

A top school official in Maine wants boys to compete with girls, and to shower with them, which is why he objected to Trump's executive order to "keep men out of women's sports." Not to be outdone, the City Council in Worcester, Massachusetts voted to declare the city a sanctuary city for "transgender and gender-diverse people." It also compared the Trump administration to the Nazis.

Harvard Medical School is so upset with Trump's cutbacks that it is recommending students to comfort themselves by attending "pet-therapy sessions," programs that allow attendees to "pet and play." They even offer six therapy animals to play with, including "Hermie the therapy guinea pig."

This is how we are preparing tomorrow's elite fleet of doctors. Imagine if they freak out while doing heart surgery? Will they give Henry the Hamster a hug? Why not just grow up



and get a stiff drink?

Who is supporting this madness? Democrats.

A Gallup poll of Democrats found that half (49 percent) of self-identified Democrats consider themselves to be liberal, and that 45 percent of them want their Party to become more liberal; 22 percent want it to stay the same. Which means that more than 7-in-10 have learned nothing.

Some people never learn. What is really perverse about this is that the dumbest among them are also the ones who have stayed in school the longest, people who are typically—but erroneously—considered to be well educated.

---

# COLUMBIA TARGETS CATHOLIC STUDENTS

*This is the article that appeared in the May 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

*Columbia has a problem with Jewish **and** Catholic students.*

April 16, 2025

Ms. Claire Shipman  
Acting President  
Columbia University  
Office of the President  
202 Low Library, 535 W. 116 St., MC 4309  
New York, New York 10027

Dear Acting President Shipman:

As president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, I was disturbed to read of an anti-Catholic incident that took place at Columbia. The victim is Daniel Di Martino, Ph.D. candidate in Economics. The victimizer is Columbia University.

Mr. Di Martino was summoned to appear before "investigators" from the Office of Institutional Equity because of his professed belief in Catholic teachings. He was told that by posting on social media comments such as, "God does not teach us that we can change our gender," he was engaging in "conduct that could be considered discriminatory harassment." He was also told that what he did could be interpreted as "creating a hostile environment."

It would be more accurate to say that Columbia is creating a "hostile environment" for Catholic students. Indeed, most practicing Jewish, Muslim and Protestant students would agree with Di Martino's post.

It must also be said that there is a profound difference between conduct, such as taking over a campus building and stopping Jewish students from going to class—this is not protected under the First Amendment—and speech that in no way threatens public order (this is protected by the First Amendment).

Columbia boasts that it promotes "Inclusion & Belonging," saying they "are essential elements of a welcoming campus. At Columbia, all members of the community—students, faculty and staff—are expected to participate in creating a culture of inclusion."

That culture of inclusion was violated when staff members created a "hostile environment" for Daniel Di Martino, and others like him. To be specific, interrogating Catholics for publicly supporting their religion creates a "chilling effect" on their speech. Therefore, I respectfully ask that this

incident be investigated by agents from outside the Columbia community.

I noticed that in the “Inclusion & Belonging” section under “University Life” that it lists support for students who are Arab and Palestinian, Asian and Asian American, Black, Jewish, Latinx/e/a/o, LGBTQIA+, Muslim, Native American and Indigenous, and People with Disabilities. Why is there no support for Catholic students at Columbia? There is obviously a need.

In 2002, Columbia President Lee Bollinger personally apologized to me after a bigoted incident on campus. It involved an obscene anti-Catholic stunt committed by a band announcer at a football game against Fordham. This is more serious—it gets to the issue of thought control. Please take the necessary steps to rectify this problem.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

cc: Laura Kirschstein, Vice Provost for the Office of  
Institutional Equity  
Daniel Di Martino  
Erin Mersino, Esq., Thomas More Law Center  
Linda McMahon, U.S. Secretary of Education

---

## **CATHOLICS IN THE NEW CONGRESS SPLIT ON ABORTION**

*This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects*

*the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

The 119th session of the Congress that began on January 3 is overrepresented by Christians. While most are Protestant, 28 percent are Catholic. Nationwide, Christians make up 62 percent of the population, but they make up 87 percent of the new Congress. Almost three-in-ten Americans are religiously unaffiliated (28 percent), though the three Congressmen who fall into this category make up less than 1 percent of Congress.

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has repeatedly said that abortion is the “preeminent priority” for voters. Accordingly, we examined the voting record of every returning Catholic member of Congress, and sought to ascertain the position on this issue as expressed by Catholic freshmen when they were running for office.

We used the scorecard of National Right to Life, and the scorecard of Reproductive Freedom (formerly NARAL), to see how they rated these Catholics. As expected, the results of the pro-life organization and the pro-abortion organization showed wide agreement.

To simplify matters, we will refer only to the National Right to Life scorecard.

In the House of Representatives, there are 126 Catholics: 71 Democrats and 55 Republicans. From our analysis, more Catholic representatives are pro-abortion (70) than are pro-life (54); two can be regarded as moderates.

Six-in-ten (59) Catholic representatives received a score of 0 percent from National Right to Life, and all of them were Democrats. Two scored near zero (both Democrats) and two scored near the middle (one from each Party). There were 44 Catholic representatives who received a 100 percent rating from National Right to Life, and all were Republicans.

Nineteen, all freshman, had no scores.

In the Senate, there are 23 Catholics: 13 Democrats and 10 Republicans. From our analysis, more Senators are pro-abortion (14) than are pro-life (8); one, a Republican, can be regarded as a moderate.

Of the 14 Catholic Senators who are pro-abortion—they received a score of 0 percent from National Right to Life—all but one was a Democrat. There were 7 Catholic Senators who received a pro-life score of 100 percent; one was a freshman without a score, though he was endorsed by the Susan B. Anthony List.

The data show how sharply the Parties differ. The Republican Party is overwhelmingly pro-life and the Democrats are overwhelmingly pro-abortion.

National Right To Life: RTL   Reproductive Freedom For All (Formerly NARAL): RFFA								
NAME	RTL	RFFA	OTHER	NAME	RTL	RFFA	OTHER	
Sen. Lisa Murkowski (AK-R)	0%	83%		Rep. Mike Levin (CA-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. French Hill (AR-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Juan C Vargas (CA-D)	0%	100%		
Sen. Mark Kelly (AZ-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Jeff Hurd (CO-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life	
Sen. Ruben Gallego (AZ-D)	0%	100%		Rep. John B Larson (CT-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. David Schweikert (AZ-R)	100%	32%		Rep. Joe Courtney (CT-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Greg Stanton (AZ-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Rosa DeLauro (CT-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Raul M Grijalva (AZ-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Marco Rubio (FL-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Paul Gosar (AZ-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Neal Dunn (FL-R)	100%	0%		
Sen. Alex Padilla (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. John Rutherford (FL-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Mike Thompson (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Darren Soto (FL-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Mark DeSaulnier (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Mario Diaz-Balart (FL-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Nancy Pelosi (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Carlos Gimenez (FL-R)	100%	23%		
Rep. Kevin Mullin (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (IA-R)	100%	5%		
Rep. Sam Liccardo (CA-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Zach Nunn (IA-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Jimmy Panetta (CA-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Jim Risch (ID-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Jim Costa (CA-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Richard J. Durbin (IL-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. David Valadao (CA-R)	100%	32%		Rep. Jesus "Chuy" Garcia (IL-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Salud Carbajal (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Darin LaHood (IL-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Luz Rivas (CA-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Frank J Mrvan (IN-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Gil Cisneros (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Jefferson Shreve (IN-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life	
Rep. Pete Aguilar (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Mark Messmer (IN-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life	
Rep. Jimmy Gomez (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Steve Scalise (LA-R)	100%	0%		
Rep. Norma J Torres (CA-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Edward J. Markey (MA-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Ted Lieu (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Richard E Neal (MA-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Linda T. Sanchez (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Jim McGovern (MA-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Robert Garcia (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Lori Trahan (MA-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Nanette Barragan (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Stephen F Lynch (MA-D)	0%	100%		
Rep. Lou Correa (CA-D)	0%	100%		Rep. William Keating (MA-D)	0%	100%		

NAME	RTL	RFFA	OTHER	NAME	RTL	RFFA	OTHER
Rep. Andy Harris (MD-R)	100%	0%		Rep. John W. Mammion (NY-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion
Rep. April McClellan Delaney (MD-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Joseph D Morelle (NY-D)	0%	100%	
Sen. Susan Collins (ME-R)	75%	83%		Rep. Tim Kennedy (NY-D)	0%	N/A	Pro-abortion
Rep. Debbie Dingell (MI-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Bernie Moreno (OH-R)	NA	NA	Pro-Life
Rep. Tom Barrett (MI-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life	Rep. Bob Latta (OH-R)	100%	5%	
Rep. Kristen McDonald Rivet (MI-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Marcy Kaptur (OH-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Lisa McClain (MI-R)	100%	0%		Rep. David Joyce (OH-R)	100%	27%	
Rep. Brad Finstad (MN-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Mike Carey (OH-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Betty McCollum (MN-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Stephanie Bice (OK-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Tom Emmer (MN-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Cliff Bentz (OR-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Michelle Fischbach (MN-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Val Hoyle (OR-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Pete Stauber (MN-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Andrea Salinas (OR-D)	0%	100%	
Sen. Eric Schmitt (MO-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick (PA-R)	71%	74%	
Rep. Ann Wagner (MO-R)	100%	32%		Rep. Brendan F Boyle (PA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Bob Onder (MO-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life	Rep. Madeleine Dean (PA-D)	0%	100%	
Sen. Thom Tillis (NC-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Mary Gay Scanlon (PA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Greg Murphy (NC-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Rob Bresnahan Jr. (PA-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life
Rep. Virginia Foxx (NC-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Dan Meuser (PA-R)	100%	0%	
Sen. John Hoeven (ND-R)	100%	0%		Rep. John Joyce (PA-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Julie Fedorchak (ND-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life	Rep. Mike Kelly (PA-R)	100%	32%	
Sen. Pete Ricketts (NE-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Chris Deluzio (PA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Mike Flood (NE-R)	100%	27%		Sen. Jack Reed (RI-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Maggie Goodlander (NH-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Gabe Amo (RI-D)	0%	N/A	Pro-abortion
Rep. Jeff Van Drew (NJ-R)	100%	0%		Sen. Mike Rounds (SD-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Christopher H Smith (NJ-R)	100%	0%		Rep. Chuck Fleischmann (TN-R)	100%	44%	
Rep. Frank Pallone Jr. (NJ-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Pat Fallon (TX-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Rob Menendez (NJ-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Michael McCaul (TX-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Nellie Pou (NJ-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Veronica Escobar (TX-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Mikie Sherrill (NJ-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Joaquin Castro (TX-D)	0%	100%	
Sen. Ben Ray Lujan (NM-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Tony Gonzales (TX-R)	100%	27%	
Rep. Gabe Vasquez (NM-D)	14%	97%		Rep. Henry Cuellar (TX-D)	43%	64%	
Rep. Teresa Leger Fernandez (NM-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Sylvia R Garcia (TX-D)	0%	100%	
Sen. Catherine Cortez Masto (NV-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Vicente Gonzalez (TX-D)	17%	76%	
Rep. Susie Lee (NV-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Greg Casar (TX-D)	0%	N/A	Pro-abortion
Sen. Kirsten Gillibrand (NY-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Tim Kaine (VA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Nick LaLota (NY-R)	100%	32%		Rep. Jen Kiggans (VA-R)	100%	N/A	
Rep. Andrew Garbarino (NY-R)	100%	32%		Rep. Ben Cline (VA-R)	100%	0%	
Rep. Tom Suozzi (NY-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Gerald E Connolly (VA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Laura Gillen (NY-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Sen. Peter Welch (VT-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Nydia M Velazquez (NY-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Maria Cantwell (WA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Adriano Espaillat (NY-D)	0%	100%		Sen. Patty Murray (WA-D)	0%	100%	
Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (NY-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Michael Baumgartner (WA-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life
Rep. George Latimer (NY-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion	Rep. Bryan Steil (WI-R)	100%	32%	
Rep. Mike Lawler (NY-R)	100%	56%		Rep. Scott Fitzgerald (WI-R)	100%	5%	
Rep. Pat Ryan (NY-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Tony Wied (WI-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life
Rep. Paul Tonko (NY-D)	0%	100%		Rep. Riley Moore (WI-R)	N/A	N/A	Pro-Life
Rep. Elise Stefanik (NY-R)	100%	0%					

## Postscript

On January 22, the U.S. Senate voted on the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act, a bill that would make it illegal not to attend to a baby born alive after a botched abortion. The American people are strongly in favor of such legislation. The bill lost. Every Democrat voted to kill it.

---

# VANCE IS RIGHT ABOUT CHRISTIAN LOVE

*This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

J.D. Vance makes a commonsensical comment about a Christian notion of love and immediately he is subjected to condemnation. Here is what he said that has “progressives” so upset.

“There’s this old school and I think it’s a very Christian concept, by the way—that you love your family and then you love your neighbor and then you love your community and then you love your fellow citizens and your own country, and then after that you can focus and prioritize the rest of the world.”

He also said, “A lot of the far left has completely inverted that. They seem to hate the citizens of their own country and care more about people outside their own borders. That is no way to run a society.”

As we shall see, Vance was right about what he said about Christian love. Regarding his quip about the far left hating America, it does not need to be defended—it is axiomatic. Indeed, it is one of their most defining characteristics.

Father James Martin was one of Vance’s more prominent critics. He said Vance’s comment about love “misses the point of Jesus’ Parable of the Good Samaritan.” But it is Martin who has

missed Vance's point: he never mentioned Jesus or the Good Samaritan. As he made clear when asked about his critics, Vance defended himself by referencing *ordo amoris*, or ordered love.

Vance was not taking issue with the biblical injunction to "love thy neighbor as thy self." This obligation is found in the Old Testament (Leviticus 19:18), as well as in the New Testament (Mark 12: 28-34). He understands that our "neighbor" means everyone. He is simply offering a practical understanding of the locus of love: it should begin with our family, and then extend outwards.

The idea of "ordered love" is indeed a Christian conception of love. It was given to us by Saint Augustine. "*Virtus est ordo amoris*," he wrote, which means virtue is the order of love, or love set in proper order. Vance is also right to say that this is an "old school" observation. In the First Letter to Timothy (5:8), it is written that "whoever does not provide for relatives and especially family members has denied the faith and is worse than an unbeliever."

Vance said that "the idea that there isn't a hierarchy of obligations violates basic common sense. Does [anyone] really think his moral duties to his own children are the same as his duties to a stranger who lives thousands of miles away? Does anyone?"

Practically speaking, we are limited in the number of people we can be friends with, never mind love.

Anthropologist Robin Dunbar has done the most extensive work on this subject; his research includes hunting and gathering societies. He found that humans are capable of having 15 good friends, 50 friends, 150 meaningful contacts, 500 acquaintances and 1500 people that we can recognize. Therefore, loving thy neighbor is a tall order, one most likely to be achieved by loving our family members, and then



embracing those outside our family unit.

Vance's remark about the "far left" caring more about people they don't know than their fellow Americans is incontestable. The champions of humanitarianism as identified by the "far left" are Rousseau and Marx.

Rousseau had five illegitimate children, refused to even give them a name, never mind support them. Marx impregnated his maid and made his colleague, Engels, assume paternity of his son, Freddy. But both of them proclaimed great love for mankind.

Rousseau and Marx set the table for left-wing Americans: they are the least generous persons in the nation, as measured by charitable giving and volunteering. The most generous are practicing people of faith. It's not hard to figure out. The former believe it is the job of government to help the poor, not individuals. Religious Americans see it as their job.

Mother Teresa understood what Vance was saying; she also knew that people like Rousseau, Marx and their ilk were phonies. "It is easy to love those who live far away," she said. "It is not always easy to love those who live right next to us."

It may be that the reaction against Vance has less to do with what he said than it does with who he is: he is a young convert to Catholicism, a conservative, and Vice President of the United States. Ergo, Christians on the left have their antennas in the stratosphere looking for anything he says that they can pounce on. They are off to a lousy start.

---

# THE POLITICS OF THE “NAZI SALUTE”

*This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

At an Inaugural rally on January 20, Elon Musk raised his hand in a celebratory moment to salute the crowd. He was instantly accused of making the “Nazi salute.” Now he has been outdone by what happened to Calvin John Robinson. He has been fired for making the same gesture.

Who is this man? Until yesterday the 39-year-old black man was a priest in the Anglican Catholic Church (ACC) in the UK. But he had his license revoked and is no longer a member of the ACC. His crime? On January 25, he waved to the crowd at the National Pro-Life Summit in Washington, D.C. But his bosses weren’t convinced he was waving. They said that “many have interpreted [it] as a pro-Nazi salute.”

The ACC did not say who these people are who can identify a fascist by the way he waves his hand. Nor did they provide an estimate of how many believed he was making a Nazi salute. Maybe if they took the time to ask the pro-life crowd what they thought, they might have learned that his hand waving was seen as nothing more than a friendly gesture.

The ACC’s official statement on this incident is revealing. “While we cannot say what was in Mr. Robinson’s heart when he did this, his action appears to have been an attempt to curry favor with certain elements of the American political right by provoking opposition.”

This is simply dishonest. They could have learned what was in his heart—all they had to do was talk to him. But they chose

not to. So they speculated, attributing to him the most scurrilous interpretation.

Let's face it. Father Robinson's crime was being heralded by a crowd of American conservatives. That's why they gave him the boot.

Robinson is a self-described Evangelical Catholic who is proud to be a conservative. He is not only pro-life, he opposes gay marriage, the ordination of women, critical race theory and Black Lives Matter. In left-wing circles, that's enough to label him a fascist. No hand waving is needed.

What is the difference between a friendly hand-waving gesture and a "Nazi salute"?

Why are Musk and Robinson giving the "Nazi salute" in pictures of them waving to crowds but pictures showing Barack, Elizabeth Warren, Hillary and Kamala waving to crowds are not? Snopes, the left-wing "fact checkers," has an answer. On January 25, they titled their article, "No, These Politicians Did Not Make the Same Gesture as Elon Musk."

Snopes is careful not to say that Musk was definitely giving the "Nazi salute," but it implies that he was. By contrast, it is cock-sure that the four American liberals are innocent.

Speaking of the latter, Snopes says those "images were taken out of context from speeches in which each politician was making an unrelated gesture, including waving or raising their [sic] hand to make a point. Their language, demeanor and the wider context of the video shows the gestures cannot be interpreted as Nazi salutes."

Why is Musk not accorded the same assessment? Weren't photos of his hand taken out of context? Why were the four liberals waving to the crowd but he wasn't? What language did he use that was Nazi-like? What was Nazi-like about his demeanor? For that matter, what exactly does Nazi "demeanor" look like?

Those who don't like Obama, Warren, Hillary and Kamala invariably refrain from calling them Nazis. But many of those who don't like Musk can't resist branding him a Nazi. And now there is a new "Nazi" on the block, Calvin John Robinson.

It's one thing to disagree with your adversaries; it's quite another to demonize them.

---

## HEGSETH'S CHRISTIAN TATTOO IS MERITORIOUS

*This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

At the confirmation hearing for Pete Hegseth, who was chosen by President Donald Trump to be Secretary of Defense, he was badgered by some Democrats for his Christian chest tattoo. In doing so, they followed the lead of the far-left Daily Beast which started this faux controversy in November.

At issue is the Jerusalem Cross. From the perspective of the uninformed, as well as bigots, the Jerusalem Cross is an extremist symbol. Some of them no doubt are offended by the sight of crèches at Christmastime.

Hegseth correctly said that "It is a Christian symbol." He aptly noted that on the front page of the program commemorating the death of President Jimmy Carter was the same Jerusalem Cross. Would that make Carter and the Democrats "extremist"? Someone should ask Senator Elizabeth Warren—she is the one who is leading this unseemly charge.

Republican Senator Kevin Cramer cleverly picked up on this smear tactic, sarcastically asking Hegseth, “What is this very offensive, racist tattoo?”

This is a bad omen. Trump has only recently started and some Democrats are stooping so low as to play the anti-Christian card. They are shameless.

---

## ST. PAT'S NYC MILESTONE MARCH; TEN YEARS OF BETRAYAL

*This is the article that appeared in the January/February 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

March 17 marks the tenth anniversary of homosexuals marching under their own banner in New York City's St. Patrick's Day Parade. When the decision was reached in September 2014 that gays could march in 2015, Bill Donohue pulled the Catholic League contingent from ever marching again. He did so because he was double-crossed—he was lied to by senior parade officials.

In late August 2014, Donohue was asked by John Fitzsimons, a lawyer and parade organizer, if he would object to including a gay group marching in 2015. Donohue, who was acting as the PR point man for the parade for 20 years, said it would be okay provided they made a formal change in the rules, and they included a pro-life group to march.

The latter was important because Donohue had been telling the media for decades that gays and pro-life people have always been free to march in the parade; they just could not do so

under their own banner. He was assured that would happen. On September 3, 2014, Donohue issued a news release about this development.

On September 4, William O'Reilly, the parade's spokesman, said that only one gay group (affiliated with NBC) would march. A few hours later, John Lahey, president of Quinnipiac University and vice chairman of the parade, announced that other gay groups could also apply to march.

On September 9, Donohue issued a statement about three new gay groups applying to march. He took a shot at Lahey for opening the door and for implying that a pro-life group might not be included.

On September 11, Lahey made it official. When asked if a pro-life group would be allowed to march, he said, "That won't be happening." That same day, Donohue released a statement titled, "We Will Not March."

This ugly chapter started only two weeks after the 2014 parade.

On April 1, 2014, Lahey sent a letter to the directors of the parade citing pressure from the corporate and collegiate elite. Heineken, Guinness, Manhattan College, Fairfield University, the Irish government, and the Ford Motor Company were threatening to pull their role in underwriting the costs of televising the parade on NBC. The latter found an ally in Frances X. Comerford, parade organizer and chief revenue officer for NBC. Irish Central also played a role in pushing for gays to crash the parade.

We had the law on our side, and the people on our side. It was corrupt members of the ruling class that lied and sold us out.

To this day, the Catholic League is the only group to pull its contingent from marching.