

# SET TO WORK WITH ATTORNEY GEN. PAM BONDI

*The following letter explains the Catholic League's interest in getting to the bottom of anti-Christian bias in the federal government.*

February 19, 2025

Hon. Pamela Bondi  
U.S. Attorney General  
U.S. Department of Justice  
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Bondi:

I am delighted that President Trump has established a Presidential Commission on Religious Liberty, and that you have been appointed to head a task force on anti-Christian bias. We will do everything we can to assist you in this effort.

The Catholic League has more documentation on this issue than any organization in the nation. We are currently collecting documents for you to make it easier to access our work; we will be sharing this with you when the process is complete. Please see our website, [catholicleague.org](https://catholicleague.org), for detailed news releases, essays and reports on anti-Christian bigotry.

It would be helpful if you could identify someone with whom we can work with in this endeavor. Please don't hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

---

# THE CRISIS OF TRANSGENDER VIOLENCE

[Bill Donohue](#)

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](#) 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.

---

## WE LOST AN HONEST LIBERAL SCHOLAR

[Bill Donohue](#)

Unlike most sociologists, I am not a man of the Left. Moreover, I have little respect for most of what passes as sociology today. But Durkheim was still right—it is the queen of the social sciences (properly executed).

We just lost one of the titans of American sociology, Christopher Jencks. The Harvard sociologist was not a conservative; indeed, he was a socialist and an egalitarian. But what made him special is that he was an honest scholar, one who drew his conclusions based on the data. Sadly, that makes him unique.

Jencks died on February 8 of complications traced to Alzheimer's disease. His 1972 book, *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*, broke new ground: he challenged the conventional wisdom on the effects that nature and nurture have on generating inequality.

Jencks, found, as did sociologist James S. Coleman before him, that what happens in the home is more important in affecting academic achievement than what happens in the school. This is

not what an egalitarian wants to hear: it showed that public policy could only do so much to decrease inequality. But he did not allow his ideological predilections to conquer.

He studied people with identical IQs who were raised in similar families with nearly identical educational and social backgrounds. He found that some did well economically and others did not. Taking into consideration both hereditary and social factors, he could explain roughly one-quarter of the reasons why some were “winners” and others were “losers.” So what mattered most? Luck. This residual category—it accounts for 75 percent of all the variables—was a matter of timing, chance, and other anomalies. He called it luck.

It is important to note that Jencks never suggested that luck was more important than virtue and a strong work ethic. His point was that there is as much inequality within families as there is in society.

This should make sense to everyone. The typical family is one where some siblings do well and others do not. Yet they come from the same parents and are raised in the same household. In other words, nature and nurture are similar yet the outcomes are quite different. Being at the right place at the right time, making important connections, maturing at a late age—there are all kinds of reasons why some family members excel and others do not.

If luck accounts for the lion's share of what makes for success, there is little that public policy can do to ameliorate inequality. This is not a plea to do nothing: it is simply a frank admission of the limits of education and social engineering.

What Jencks found needs to be heeded by today's social scientists, educators, administrators and government officials. Too often they think they can treat human beings as if they were silly putty—shaping and reshaping our milieu to

yield equality. Not only does this have little effect, it typically tramples on our dignity and freedom.

Christians understand that humans are not toys to be played with by the ruling class. Jencks found good social science reasons not to even try.

---

# CULTURAL CORRECTION LONG OVERDUE

[Bill Donohue](#)

Economists often note that the stock market occasionally goes into spasms, or sudden downturns that gets everyone nervous. But, they caution, such changes are often necessary: they amount to a market correction. Cultures change as well: wild swings of the pendulum typically abet a strong reaction.

We are now witnessing a cultural correction. But it is folly to think that all of those responsible for our cultural rot have gotten the memo. In other words, the Trump effect is real, but it would be foolish to overestimate the cultural correction.

It is gratifying to learn that those responsible for woke cultural ideas are on the defensive. DEI is now being panned in places few would have thought possible a year or two ago. Critical race theory is losing support, and elites are no longer lapping up to Black Lives Matter, a thoroughly discredited flash-in-the-pan entity. Compassion for those who entered the country illegally is now shifting to compassion for the victims of migrant criminal behavior. Those who succumbed to pressure from the Biden administration and

engaged in censorship now regret doing so.

A *New York Times*/Ipsos poll released in February found that when Americans are asked what the Democrats stand for, most of them listed abortion, LGBTQ issues and climate change. The survey also found that most people are concerned about bread and butter issues and migrants crashing our border, not the ones Democrats are excited about. In other words, the Dems are seriously out of touch with most Americans. Look for some to change their ways.

Are these changes genuine? Some are, but many are not. No matter, even unprincipled shifts that move the right way are worthy of some applause.

While it is true that many members of the ruling class—the senior decision-makers in government, corporations, the media, education, the entertainment industry, and the like—are rethinking their political preferences, many others are not. They are lying in wait. It would be more accurate to say that some elites are in retreat than it would be to conclude that they have turned over a new leaf.

The *New York Times* recently slung arrows at Meta CEO Mark Zuckerberg for saying he is putting an end to censorial Facebook policies. The esteemed “newspaper of record” said his company suffers from “a fundamental hollowness at its core,” and went on to berate him for caving into Trump’s influence. The *Times* was not altogether wrong. It does suggest a less than principled stance, so there is an element of hollowness to Zuckerberg’s moral compass. But at least he is not tone deaf.

Can Trump change the culture? To some extent he already has. He played a major role in putting the final nails in the DEI coffin (diversity, equity and inclusion). He has also turned the entire transgender industry upside down, putting an end to the federal role in what is surely the greatest child abuse

scandal in American history. Mutilating genitals, chemical castration, puberty blockers—this is a shameful chapter in the history of the medical profession.

Trump has even scored overseas, beckoning Hamas to release the hostages. No sooner had he slapped Mexico with tariffs when our southern neighbor pledged to send 10,000 troops to seal our border. This is great news, but expectations of a glacial shift in the culture are wrongheaded.

It is true that culture affects every aspect of society, but it is also true that other sectors, such as the political and economic, affect the cultural landscape. Trump was elected in large part because the American people were fed up with excess: excessive inflation; excessive numbers of migrants crashing our border; excessive rights given to the accused and the convicted; excessive deference to the medical profession (e.g., Covid policies and transgenderism).

Trump can reverse some of these conditions, but the forces of resistance must not be discounted.

Most of those who work in higher education will do all they can to subvert Trump's agenda. The teachers unions who govern elementary and secondary education are not going to change their stripes. Neither will those who work in Hollywood. Many in Wall Street are not on his side—they gave lavishly to Harris. The mainstream media is almost as corrupt today as it was yesterday. Left-wing activist organizations will double down. A new survey found that 42 percent of federal government managers in Washington, D.C. intend to work against the Trump administration. And disdain for our Judeo-Christian heritage is deeply embedded in elite and radical quarters.

To be sure, there will be progress, and that is because of the pressure being exerted from the bottom up. It was the average Joe who voted for Trump, not the ruling class.

It behooves those of us who want to push the pendulum back to



a state of normalcy to be vigilant, keeping a close eye on those who say they are turning over a new leaf. As for those who won't budge an inch, they need to be outed and defeated. We plan to do our part.

---

## WASHINGTON STATE WEIGHS ATTACK ON CONFSSIONAL

[Bill Donohue](#)

The state of Washington is considering a House and Senate bill that would bust the seal of the confessional, without doing anything to check the sexual abuse of minors.

To read my letter, click [here](#).

---

## TRUMP NAMES TASK FORCE ON ANTI-CHRISTIAN BIAS

[Bill Donohue](#)

President Donald Trump announced today that he is forming a new Presidential Commission on Religious Liberty. To accomplish this goal, he appointed Attorney General Pam Bondi to chair a task force to "eradicate anti-Christian bias."

"The mission of this task force will be to immediately halt all forms of anti-Christian targeting and discrimination

within the federal government,” Trump said. He specifically cited the Department of Justice, the FBI and the IRS, but he also said the probe will extend to other agencies.

More than any other organization in the nation, the Catholic League has documented anti-Christian prejudice and discrimination. To cite one example, we have a very detailed list of abuses that took place under the Biden administration. We will be happy to share our work with Attorney General Pam Bondi.

The scourge of Christian bashing, which Catholics, in particular, have had to endure is astounding. While some Republicans have contributed to this plague, the overwhelming attacks on Christians have come from members of the Democratic Party. We have the evidence and we will make sure the Trump administration has it as well.

---

## **BUTTIGIEG FLEES WORLD OF THEY/THEM/THEIRS**

**Bill Donohue**

Pete Buttigieg, the former Secretary of Transportation, is known in LGBTQ circles as the self-described “Pronoun Warrior.” But now the homosexual politician has removed the “He/Him” pronouns from his social media account. This has gravely upset those who still live in the world of “They/Them/Theirs.” They have every right to be angry. What he has done is traitorous.

What broke? Buttigieg wants to be either the next governor or senator of Michigan. He is a native of Indiana but there is no

future for the failed mayor of South Bend there, so he laid anchor in Traverse City, Michigan in 2022. Michigan Governor Gretchen Whitmer is term limited, and cannot run again in 2026. Senator Gary Peters has said he will not run again in 2026. So Buttigieg sees a few openings.

He could, of course, run for office by not abandoning his "Pronoun Warrior" reputation. But he is well aware that millions of Americans are turned off by this stunt. He also knows that Trump has tapped into this angst with great effect, constantly reminding voters that the Democrats are the "They/Them/Theirs" Party.

A recent *New York Times*/Ipsos poll provides further evidence that transgender politics is running out of steam. When respondents were asked what issues matter most to them, they said immigration, the economy and healthcare. When asked what matters most to Democrats, they answered abortion, LGBTQ issues and climate change. In other words, the Democrats are wildly out of touch with the average American.

Buttigieg knows this which is why he is downplaying his radical LGBTQ stance. But he can't run from the past. For example, he still insists he is married to a man. That, however, is a legal fiction: his "marriage" may be recognized by the positive law, but it is not recognized by the natural law. To wit: a man can have a wife but he is denied by nature, and nature's God, from having a husband. Similarly, two men cannot have a baby, though they may acquire a baby born as a result of a normal heterosexual union.

Just three years ago, CNN host Fareed Zakaria was blasted by left-wing pundits and activists for saying the Democratic Party is too obsessed with "pronouns." The year before, Chasten Buttigieg, who still insists he is married to the former "Pronoun Warrior," got ripping mad at those who refuse to respect the fabricated pronouns favored by the LGBTQ crowd. He went so far as to say that for these people, using the

“wrong” pronouns can do great damage.

LGBTQ activists concur. The website gaythrive says “Misgendering someone (using incorrect pronouns) can cause distress and perpetuate feelings of exclusion.” It also says that “disrespecting someone’s pronouns can have profound emotional impacts.”

This raises the question: Now that Pete Buttigieg is running away from his “Pronoun Warrior” legacy, will he be so insensitive as to disrespect those who prefer to be identified as “They/Them/Theirs”? What about those who go by “Ze/Zir/Zirs,” or “Xe/Xem/Xir”? Both sets of pronouns are liked by those who don’t identify as either male or female. We also need to hear from his partner Chasten about this.

There is a sizable Muslim population in Michigan, and they are not exactly big fans of this insanity. Good luck trying to win their vote. Unlike many Christians, Muslims are not inclined to normalize abnormalities.

---

## NEW ORLEANS SAINTS ADVISES CHURCH ON SCANDAL

[Bill Donohue](#)

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.

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.

---

# VANCE IS RIGHT ABOUT CHRISTIAN LOVE

[Bill Donohue](#)

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”

[Bill Donohue](#)

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 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"? Consider the pictures below.

Why are Musk and Robinson giving the "Nazi salute," but Barack, Elizabeth Warren, Hillary and Kamala 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.

