

COMPASSION IS NOT NECESSARILY VIRTUOUS

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](#).

In our therapeutic world, where feelings too often dominate reason, it is almost sinful to question the merits of compassion. But to have real-life meaning, we need to know the object of compassion before applauding. In other words, when compassion is misplaced, it is not virtuous.

A popular dictionary definition of compassion reads, “sympathetic pity and concern for the sufferings or misfortunes of others.” It cites as an example, “the victims should be treated with compassion.”

This is accurate. We should show compassion for the “sufferings or misfortunes of others,” such as those who have lost their homes in southern California. We should also show compassion to “victims,” such as those who have been victimized by illegal aliens. [The initial phase of the deportation roundup is targeting criminals.]

The latter is now a matter of contention in some quarters. Many hold that those who are now being deported are victims deserving of compassion. Which begs the question: Why is it compassionate to deport those who have entered our country illegally and have victimized innocent Americans?

Not to distinguish between victimizers and victims is immoral. Surely it is immoral to show compassion for Nazis and not the Jews they baked in ovens. Surely it is immoral to show compassion for child abusers and not the children. So why is it compassionate to show compassion for illegal aliens who

have committed violent crimes against Americans but not their victims?

The same people who turned a blind eye to the sufferings of women being raped by illegals are now apoplectic at the sight of the rapists being deported. This is a classic case of misplaced compassion.

Those who have entered our country illegally, but have not engaged in criminal behavior, may not be a threat to the well-being of Americans, but they are not innocent either.

No one likes line jumpers. Kids know this to be true, which is why they object when someone cuts in front of them while waiting in line at an amusement park. Adults complain when someone jumps the line at supermarkets. And those who are waiting in line in foreign countries to enter the United States legally have every right to express their indignation at those who are crashing our borders.

To show compassion for line jumpers but not those who are playing by the rules is immoral.

Context matters when making moral judgments, but too often it doesn't. That's because we have allowed feelings to guide our moral compass. This is a serious mistake. Feelings should never be discounted, but they are not dispositive.

We need to employ the faculty of reason before cheering those making public displays of compassion. If we do, we may decide they are more deserving of our contempt.

CBS ' DUPLICITOUS NEWS COVERAGE

CBS, quite like the other broadcast networks, is not known for taking the side of the U.S. bishops. But now that Donald Trump is president, things are changing.

On the January 26 edition of the CBS show, "Face the Nation," Margaret Brennan grilled Vice President J.D. Vance for being oppositional to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.

Clearly taking the side of the bishops, she pressed Vance, who is Catholic, on why the Trump administration would disagree with the bishops on the issue of sending law enforcement into schools and churches to round up illegal aliens who have committed violent crimes. Vance stood his ground, arguing that the roundup is exactly what the public wants Trump to do.

[Note: The Immigration and Nationality Act prohibits anyone from knowingly harboring an undocumented immigrant "in any place, including any building."]

We have been following CBS for decades, and this stance is certainly "breaking news" to us. We can't remember when CBS has been so supportive of the bishops on any issue. But we do have a file on its Catholic-bashing reporting over the years.

More important, there is no record of Brennan, or any CBS journalists, ever trying to pin the Biden administration's policies against the bishops, even though it was led by a "devout Catholic."

Five months into Biden's term, we issued a 12-page-report, "President Biden's Policies: Departures From Catholic Teachings." Our report of June 15, 2021, which listed one example after another, was sent to every bishop in the nation.

At the end of Biden's term, when Vice President Kamala Harris was selected to challenge Trump, we issued a 22-page-report, "Harris and Trump On Religious Liberty," comparing Trump's first term to the Biden-Harris years. Released on May 2, 2024, we found that much of the Biden administration's record was at odds with the policies of the bishops' conference, yet the media were wholly disinterested in reporting on this.

Among the issues that the Biden team differed with the bishops were abortion; transgender policies; school choice; neutering faith-based programs; the Department of Justice probe of Catholics; singling out pro-life Catholics for breaking the FACE Act; forcing Catholic doctors and hospitals to perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgery; and support for the Equality Act (which would gut religious liberty).

CBS showed no interest in doing a story on any of these policy differences.

TRYING TO NAIL NEW ORLEANS ARCHDIOCESE

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](#).

In violation of a court order, someone leaked some 300 email exchanges between the New Orleans Saints and the Archdiocese of New Orleans that show how the football team provided public relations advice to the archdiocese on cases of priestly sexual abuse. The emails were given to the Associated Press, the *New York Times* and the *Guardian*; other media outlets now

have them as well.

This is a story that is largely contrived. No charges of illegal behavior have been made by anyone against any party to this story. Moreover, it is hardly breaking news that elites in one sector of society offer advice to elites in another sector of society. So what gives?

Mark Florio of NBC Sports aptly notes that “it appears that the violation [of the court order] was conducted to create maximum embarrassment for the Saints. Strategically, it’s smart. The Saints are hosting the Super Bowl on Sunday. The Monday morning of Super Bowl week traditionally becomes a perfect spot to drop a nugget that will get attention, since it’s usually slow. Until, of course, the [NFL] Commissioner commences his annual Super Bowl press conference.”

Commissioner Roger Goodell has already downplayed this “story.”

It is well known in New Orleans that its owner, Gayle Benson, is a devout Catholic who is on good terms with New Orleans Archbishop Gregory Aymond. Indeed, it was Aymond who introduced Benson to her husband; he has since passed away. So it is to be expected that friends would do what friends do, and offer advice on how to handle a problem.

What prompted the email exchange was a news story in 2018 about a deacon and schoolteacher who had been accused of sexual abuse and was removed from ministry in 1988, yet was still involved at a New Orleans church. When Aymond found out he said he was “utterly surprised and embarrassed.” It was then that Greg Bensele offered to provide “crisis communications” to the archdiocese; he is the Saints senior vice president of communications. Subsequently, a 2020 lawsuit revealed that the football team offered public relations advice to the archdiocese.

Most of the accusations are about offenses that took place

decades ago. We know from the most authoritative sources that the overwhelming number of cases took place between the mid-1960s and the mid-1980s, and that the offenders are either dead or have been kicked out of the priesthood. There are almost no cases of abuse taking place today, whether it be in New Orleans or anywhere else.

It should also be noted that the Associated Press is wrong to report that the offending priests were pedophiles. They were not. Over 8-in-10 were homosexuals, men who had sex with postpubescent males. Only 3.8 percent were pedophiles. The data from researchers at the John Jay College of Criminal Justice are conclusive.

The one outstanding question in this instance is whether some names of the accused that were released by the Archdiocese of New Orleans in 2018 were removed from the list. The New York Times says "it is not clear if names were actually removed from the list." James Gulotta, a lawyer for the Saints, says no Saints employee was involved in creating the list.

The big media have no business feeling emboldened about this story. Their record of covering up sexual abuse crimes has been well detailed (see my book, *The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*). Take the *New York Times*.

In 2017, when four female journalists accused *Times* reporter Glenn Thrush of sexual misconduct, there was no independent investigation; the probe was done in-house. Dean Baquet, the executive editor of the paper, decided his behavior did not deserve termination. Instead, Thrush was allowed to undergo counseling. He still writes for the *Times*.

Yet when the Catholic Church does not act with dispatch, the editorial board slams them.

The same year that accusations were made against Thrush, three women accused Michael Oreskes of sexual harassment. Two of the

alleged incidents occurred in the 1990s, when Oreskes was the Washington, D.C. bureau chief. At the time, Jill Abramson, who would later become the executive editor for the *Times*, was deputy to Oreskes. She admitted that she knew of his alleged offenses but did nothing to stop them.

It should also be said that Protestant, Jewish and Muslim groups are not averse at seeking to access the PR services of blue chip firms. There is nothing wrong with any of this.

Wouldn't it be interesting if the mainstream media did a story on how deeply involved local and state public officials are in working with public school officials in handling cases of sexual abuse in the schools? It is well known that the teachers unions generously grease the Democrats.

So if the "story" on the Saints and the New Orleans archdiocese merited the front page in the *New York Times*, below the fold, a story of this kind surely deserves an above the fold spot, if not a spread.

We don't have to wait and see—it will never happen.

CORPORATIONS ASKED TO DROP DEI POLICIES

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](#).

American culture is going through one of its periodic changes. One good change is the decision of corporations to drop their DEI policies. They are divisive and ineffective. Worse, they create a hostile environment for some workers, including

Christians.

The Catholic League staff acquired the email addresses of the top officials in 552 companies listed by the Human Rights Campaign in its 2023-2024 “Corporate Equality Index” report; all have DEI policies. We wrote to all of them, asking the CEOs to follow the lead of some prominent corporations and abandon these policies. We cited research that proves what a disaster they are.

It is not enough for major changes to be made in the political arena. We need to make changes in the business community and in the culture as well.

THE DEATH OF DEI

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](#).

DEI (diversity, equity and inclusion) policies are dying. This became inevitable once the Supreme Court struck down affirmative action in college admissions in 2023. Subsequently, the corporate elite began to reconsider the wisdom of keeping their DEI policies. Pressure from advocacy groups, such as the Catholic League, added to the momentum. Most important, President Trump is currently busy putting the final nails in the coffin.

Killing DEI is not enough. We need to know why these policies were implemented in the first place, and why they failed.

DEI was born of cultural Marxism, white guilt and elite cowardice.

Cultural Marxists believe that progress is best achieved by identifying the oppressors and the oppressed, and then establishing policies that punish the former and reward the latter. White heterosexual male Christians are the oppressors. The oppressed are their mirror opposite. In real life, this means that poor white guys from the hills of West Virginia are the bad guys, and rich black lesbians from Hollywood are the good guys.

This may sound unfair, but not to cultural Marxists. They know they are right because they can chart their taxonomy on the blackboard and in the corporate board room.

White guilt plays a major role. Now it is not normal for anyone to be ashamed, or feel guilty, about the color of his skin. Such a pathology must be taught. In this case, those who indoctrinate their subjects with white guilt are mostly wealthy white liberal parents, teachers and activists. It makes them feel virtuous to assume a high moral mantle upon which they can lecture.

Elite cowardice is also important. The ruling class is easily intimidated by current fashions, so much so that they would rather not confront cultural bullies before standing fast. Hence, the creation of DEI offices. The potentates decided that at least it keeps the barbarians at bay.

DEI was dead on arrival for a much more significant reason: America is not a racist country.

Indeed, there is no nation on earth where men and women of all races, ethnicities, religions, classes and sexual persuasions are able to climb the social mobility ladder easier and more quickly than in the USA. Migrants know this to be true—which is why they keep on coming—even if wealthy white liberals do not.

To see a real-life example of the almost total absence of racism, consider sports.

People of all races and ethnicities partake in collegiate and professional sports, and whenever a fight breaks out between opposing team players, the melee that ensues is purely along team lines, not racial lines. Black, white, Hispanic and Asian athletes rush to defend their teammates who get into a fight with the other team. We never see black guys from one team joining with black guys from the other team to beat up white players; the obverse is also true. Teams matter. Race does not.

Similarly, there is great camaraderie between team players of all races and ethnicities. Black and white players congratulate each other and support each other in a myriad of ways, both on and off the playing field. In many ways, they are a role model for those who want to envision what a post-racial, or color blind, society looks like.

Some years ago a friend of mine went to a Mets game and witnessed an unusual event.

Before the game began, a famous black player from the San Francisco Giants walked by two New York City policeman (one was white, the other black). The black cop asked the player to sign a mini baseball bat that he had. He did. Then the white cop asked him to do the same. He was told no. The black player explained that the black cop was his "brother." The black cop quickly smashed the bat on the railing, breaking it in two. He pointed to his fellow officer and said to the player, "He's my brother."

Every decent person wants racial justice. But flawed policies that serve a noble cause are not virtuous, and when the outcome actually exacerbates matters, they must be condemned. In short, when it comes to behavioral outcomes, results matter more than intent.

ATTACKS ON THE CONFESSIONAL

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](#).

On January 23, Bill Donohue wrote a letter to all Montana lawmakers protesting a bill that would vitiate the seal of the confessional. On January 29, the bill was tabled by the legislators. A more serious case then emerged in Washington. Below is an excerpt of Donohue's letter to the state's lawmakers.

The issue of the sexual abuse of minors is a serious one, and efforts to combat it are meritorious. But good intentions are not enough. Public policy must also be judged on what it yields. If it does not correct the problem, and indeed creates new ones, then it is flawed. This is true of Senate Bill 5375 and House Bill 1211.

These bills would remove the clergy exemption from reporting information about child abuse learned in the confessional. Not only would they do nothing to curtail child abuse, they would eviscerate the priest-penitent privilege.

State encroachment on religious liberty is proscribed by the First Amendment. Accordingly, it must be weighed against the right of the state to protect children from abuse. Balancing these vital interests can be done. Indeed, it was done last year when a compromise was proposed: The priest-penitent privilege would remain, but if the priest learned that a child was in imminent danger, he had to contact the authorities. This bill passed in the Senate but languished in the House. Now the Senate is going along with the House version.

This begs a series of questions.

What broke? Where is the evidence that the compromised bill is inadequate? For that matter, where is the evidence that child molesters—in any state—report their crimes to priests in the confessional? We have been studying this issue for decades but we can't name a single instance where this has happened. If any lawmaker has evidence to the contrary, you have an obligation to make it public. If not, what exactly are you trying to do?

Similarly, does any lawmaker really think that if priests have to choose between violating their vows and abiding by the strictures in this bill, they would choose the latter? If so, they need a reality check. A priest who breaks the seal of confession would be excommunicated from the Catholic Church. They would rather go to jail before doing so.

State Sen. Noel Frame says she is sympathetic to religious lawmakers who have a hard time dealing with this issue, but she also knows that “far too many children have been victims of abuse—the Legislature has a duty to act.” She's right.

This begs another round of questions.

What exactly have Washington lawmakers done about child sexual abuse? As a sociologist who has written a book on this subject, I can tell you that the most likely persons to abuse a child are live-in boyfriends. Has anyone done anything about this? What about the sexual abuse of minors in the public schools? Now there is a rich subject.

In 2022, under the Biden administration, the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights studied all 50 states and found that in 2017-2018, only three states had more sexual assaults per 1,000 students than Washington. When it comes to rape or attempted rape per 1,000 students, only six states had a worse record.

Last year the Seattle Public Schools agreed to pay \$16 million to a former student who said that the district failed to protect her from being sexually assaulted by two coaches. How could this possibly happen?

Now we have learned that House Democrats have introduced a new bill that would withhold notifying parents about the sexual assault of their child in school for up to 48 hours. In doing so, this bill directly overturns a parental rights bill that the voters previously approved. Worse, these same lawmakers have taken steps to permanently negate the will of the people. What's going on? There seems to be more interest in defending the rights of assailants than there is the welfare of the child or the rights of their parents.

Those who are lobbying to promote the House and Senate bills include the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP) and the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF). The former is a shell of what it once was, having been shown by the courts to be a total fraud. The latter is one of the most anti-Catholic atheist organizations in the nation. So these are the kinds of people some lawmakers are listening to?

There is time to reconsider this bill. Please do so.

OUR RESPONSE TO CRÈCHE DENIAL

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](#).

Here is a copy of Bill Donohue's letter to the cooperative board in Westchester, New York that initially allowed the

display of a menorah in the lobby of a building but prohibited the display of a nativity scene. The resolution of this matter is on p. 1.

December 12, 2024

Mr. William J. Archer
Property Manager, 16 N. Chatsworth Ave. Cooperative
Archer Property Management
105 Calvert Street, Ste. 3
Harrison, NY 10528

Dear Mr. Archer:

As president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, it is my job to combat discrimination against individual Catholics and defamation against the Catholic Church.

One of our members lives in your Cooperative and he says that his request to display a nativity scene in the lobby of the building has been denied. As long as all religious symbols are prohibited, there is no legal issue. But such is not the case.

The lobby reportedly has a Christmas tree and a menorah. The tree is a secular symbol, so no problem there. But the menorah is clearly a religious symbol—the candles represent a miracle (see Exodus, chapter 25). This is not a matter of opinion: the United States Supreme Court has ruled that it is.

Therefore, to allow a menorah while prohibiting a nativity scene constitutes discrimination. It should also be noted that the Catholic League currently has a life-size nativity scene in Central Park; a huge menorah will soon grace the same area. It's all constitutional—we get a permit each year from the Parks Department of the City of New York.

Christmas is upon us. This issue needs to be resolved immediately. If I do not hear from you by December 17, I will

assume you are satisfied with your decision. I will then take steps to rectify it.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

cc: Erin Mersino, Esq.
Bartlene Sages

We can be reached by email at: pr@catholicleague.org

ELECTION RESULTS WORTH PONDERING

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 results of the presidential election show that well-educated, wealthy secularists are not like the rest of us. In virtually every demographic group, Donald Trump either won, or did better than he did in 2016, with the exception of this cadre of voters.

All the exit polls show that Trump beat Kamala Harris among men, whites, middle-age voters, and seniors; she won with women, non-whites and young people. But Trump won the white women's vote, and the married women's vote. Harris won among women who were not married. Indeed, single women—those who never married or are widowed or divorced—always vote for the

Democratic candidate. Security is clearly an issue with these voters.

Regarding education, Harris won the college graduate vote and did even better among those with a postgraduate degree. Trump did best with those who attended high school (or dropped out) and among those with some college or an associate's degree. The effect that college has on one's political views is a reflection of the liberal-left bias of the faculty; there are very few conservatives among the professoriate.

Religion is another important factor. Catholics and Protestants voted handily for Trump; Harris won the Jewish and the Muslim vote, also by wide margins. Orthodox Jews voted for Trump but secular Jews, who are the majority, voted for Harris. Muslims lean Democratic though in local elections, where gender ideology reigns in the schools, they turn to the Republicans.

Why, if Trump either won or did better than he did in 2016 with most segments of the population, did he fail with those who (a) have an income of \$100,000 or more (b) possess a post-graduate degree and (c) are religiously unaffiliated?

Wealthy, well-educated persons do not have the same kinds of experiences that most Americans have. They live in comfort and in low-crime areas, which means it is easy for them to exercise their virtue-signaling muscles: they show how much they care for the poor by voting for those who support generous welfare policies. This allows them to not feel guilty about doing nothing for the poor themselves.

Having spent many more years in school than the rest of us, they are natural candidates for believing what their professors believe in—nothing. Too smart to believe in God, they are obsessed with their own godly abilities. While they do not believe in the mystery of faith, they are much more likely than the rest of us to believe that a man who says he

is a woman is—bingo—a woman.

It's time we stopped calling those with lots of degrees well-educated, even if many of them are. It would be more accurate to say they are well-schooled. Moreover, it seems plain that there is an inverse correlation between education and common sense: the more years spent in school, the less common sense one is bound to have.

It's also time we started importing more working class people from around the world. We badly need more Americans with common sense.

CHRISTIAN BASHERS RIP HEGSETH AND HUCKABEE

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](#).

It took only a week after the election for the Christian bashers to attack president-elect Donald Trump's selection of Pete Hegseth to be Secretary of Defense and Mike Huckabee to be U.S. Ambassador to Israel.

Hegseth is a strong Christian who literally wears his religion on his body (he has more than a dozen tattoos emblazoned on his right arm and chest). To be sure, that is bizarre, but that is not what his critics are upset about. They don't like what the tattoos represent—Christianity.

If he had metal spikes hanging from his nose, or had tattoos honoring Lucifer on his neck, that would be fine. But once

Jesus is brought into the mix, that's a call to arms. Indeed, the Christian bashers are explicitly calling him out for wanting a call to arms—they are saying he wants to bring back the Crusades.

The Jerusalem Cross on Hegseth's chest is driving them mad. On his right bicep he has inscribed the Latin phrase, "Deus Vult," which means "God wills it."

Mike Huckabee is an Evangelical Christian who is a rock-solid supporter of Israel. But according to John Hudson at the *Washington Post* that is a problem. He is worried that people like Huckabee, who believe that in the covenant that God made to Abraham about Israel, "have turned that belief into a right-wing brand of Zionism."

Similarly, the militants at J Street have lashed out at Huckabee for his "extremist views." Louis Moreno, a former U.S. Ambassador who knows Huckabee, calls him an "utter nut case." Why? Because the former Arkansas governor believes in the biblical account of the end of times. If he believed the fiction that the sexes are interchangeable, that would be considered reasonable.

Radicals hate Pete Hegseth because he is a committed Christian and a patriotic American. They hate Mike Huckabee because he is a committed Christian who strongly defends Israel. It's really not all that complicated.

WHAT TO DO WITH ILLEGAL SEX

CRIME MIGRANTS

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](#).

Surveys show that the majority of Americans want illegal immigrants deported, especially those who have been convicted of crime. If they were asked exclusively about those convicted of sex crimes, that number would surely be greater. But many in Congress disagree—they want to keep them right here in America.

In the last year, a total of 158 Congressmen voted not to deport migrants convicted of sex crimes, and 140 of them were reelected in November. Everyone of them were Democrats.

Here are the names of those who were reelected and voted to keep illegal migrants convicted of sex crimes in the U.S.

Rep. Alma Adams, North Carolina
Rep. Pete Aguilar, California
Rep. Gabe Amo, Rhode Island
Rep. Jake Auchincloss, Massachusetts
Rep. Becca Balint, Vermont
Rep. Nanette Barragán, California
Rep. Joyce Beatty, Ohio
Rep. Ami Bera, California
Rep. Donald Beyer, Virginia
Rep. Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Georgia
Rep. Suzanne Bonamici, Oregon
Rep. Shontel Brown, Ohio
Rep. Julia Brownley, California
Rep. Salud Carbajal, California
Rep. André Carson, Indiana
Rep. Troy Carter, Louisiana
Rep. Greg Casar, Texas

Rep. Ed Case, Hawaii
Rep. Sean Casten, Illinois
Rep. Kathy Castor, Florida
Rep. Joaquin Castro, Texas
Rep. Sheila Cherfilus-McCormick, Florida
Rep. Judy Chu, California
Rep. Katherine Clark, Massachusetts
Rep. Yvette Clarke, New York
Rep. Emanuel Cleaver, Missouri
Rep. James Clyburn, South Carolina
Rep. Steve Cohen, Tennessee
Rep. Gerald Connolly, Virginia
Rep. Luis Correa, California
Rep. Jim Costa, California
Rep. Jasmine Crockett, Texas
Rep. Jason Crow, Colorado
Rep. Danny Davis, Illinois
Rep. Madeleine Dean, Pennsylvania
Rep. Diana DeGette, Colorado
Rep. Rosa DeLauro, Connecticut
Rep. Suzan DelBene, Washington
Rep. Mark DeSaulnier, California
Rep. Debbie Dingell, Michigan
Rep. Lloyd Doggett, Texas
Rep. Veronica Escobar, Texas
Rep. Adriano Espaillat, New York
Rep. Lizzie Fletcher, Texas
Rep. Bill Foster, Illinois
Rep. Valerie Foushee, North Carolina
Rep. Lois Frankel, Florida
Rep. Maxwell Frost, Florida
Rep. John Garamendi, California
Rep. Jesús "Chuy" Garcia, Illinois
Rep. Robert Garcia, California
Rep. Sylvia Garcia, Texas
Rep. Dan Goldman, New York
Rep. Jimmy Gomez, California

Rep. Al Green, Texas
Rep. James Himes, Connecticut
Rep. Steny Hoyer, Maryland
Rep. Valerie Hoyle, Oregon
Rep. Jared Huffman, California
Rep. Glenn Ivey, Maryland
Rep. Jonathan Jackson, Illinois
Rep. Sara Jacobs, California
Rep. Pramila Jayapal, Washington
Rep. Hakeem Jeffries, New York
Rep. Henry "Hank" Johnson, Georgia
Rep. Sydney Kamlager-Dove, California
Rep. Bill Keating, Massachusetts
Rep. Robin Kelly, Illinois
Rep. Ro Khanna, California
Rep. Raja Krishnamoorthi, Illinois
Rep. Greg Landsman, Ohio
Rep. Rick Larsen, Washington
Rep. John Larson, Connecticut
Rep. Summer Lee, Pennsylvania
Rep. Teresa Leger Fernandez, New Mexico
Rep. Ted Lieu, California
Rep. Zoe Lofgren, California
Rep. Doris Matsui, California
Rep. Lucy McBath, Georgia
Rep. Jennifer McClellan, Virginia
Rep. Betty McCollum, Minnesota
Rep. Morgan McGarvey, Kentucky
Rep. James McGovern, Massachusetts
Rep. Gregory Meeks, New York
Rep. Rob Menendez, New Jersey
Rep. Grace Meng, New York
Rep. Kweisi Mfume, Maryland
Rep. Gwen Moore, Wisconsin
Rep. Joseph Morelle, New York
Rep. Seth Moulton, Massachusetts
Rep. Kevin Mullin, California

Rep. Jerrold Nadler, New York
Rep. Richard Neal, Massachusetts
Rep. Joe Neguse, Colorado
Rep. Donald Norcross, New Jersey
Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, New York
Rep. Ilhan Omar, Minnesota
Rep. Frank Pallone, New Jersey
Rep. Nancy Pelosi, California
Rep. Scott Peters, California
Rep. Brittany Pettersen, Colorado
Rep. Chellie Pingree, Maine
Rep. Mark Pocan, Wisconsin
Rep. Ayanna Pressley, Massachusetts
Rep. Mike Quigley, Illinois
Rep. Delia Ramirez, Illinois
Rep. Jamie Raskin, Maryland
Rep. Deborah Ross, North Carolina
Rep. Raul Ruiz, California
Rep. Linda Sánchez, California
Rep. Mary Scanlon, Pennsylvania
Rep. Janice Schakowsky, Illinois
Rep. Bradley Schneider, Illinois
Rep. Robert “Bobby” Scott, Virginia
Rep. David Scott, Georgia
Rep. Terri Sewell, Alabama
Rep. Brad Sherman, California
Rep. Darren Soto, Florida
Rep. Melanie Stansbury, New Mexico
Rep. Haley Stevens, Michigan
Rep. Marilyn Strickland, Washington
Rep. Mark Takano, California
Rep. Shri Thanedar, Michigan
Rep. Mike Thompson, California
Rep. Bennie Thompson, Mississippi
Rep. Rashida Tlaib, Michigan
Rep. Jill Tokuda, Hawaii
Rep. Paul Tonko, New York

Rep. Norma Torres, California
Rep. Ritchie Torres, New York
Rep. Lori Trahan, Massachusetts
Rep. Lauren Underwood, Illinois
Rep. Juan Vargas, California
Rep. Marc Veasey, Texas
Rep. Nydia Velázquez, New York
Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Florida
Rep. Maxine Waters, California
Rep. Bonnie Watson Coleman, New Jersey
Rep. Nikema Williams, Georgia
Rep. Frederica Wilson, Florida