

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.



THE DEATH OF DEI

[Bill Donohue](#)

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.

COMPASSION IS NOT NECESSARILY VIRTUOUS

[Bill Donohue](#)

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 SIDES WITH THE BISHOPS

Bill Donohue

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.

It’s not just CBS. Lots of media—from Axios to USA Today—picked up on the “Face the Nation” interview, effectively defending the bishops. Where were all of these pro-Catholic media outlets when churches were being closed

during Covid—while liquor stores remained open?

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.

Here is a partial list of the policies that the Biden administration promoted that were against the positions enunciated by the bishops.

- Abortion
- Transgender issues (including the evisceration of women sports and privacy rights)
- School choice
- Neutering faith-based programs
- The Department of Justice's probe of Catholics
- Support for the Equality Act (which would gut religious liberty)
- Rescinding Trump's policies defending the rights of Christian students on college campuses
- Forcing Catholic doctors and hospitals to perform abortions and sex-reassignment surgery
- Singling out pro-life Catholics for breaking the FACE Act

- Taking away the conscience rights of healthcare workers

CBS, as well as all the other mainstream media outlets, showed no interest in doing a story on any of these policy differences.

This is just one more reason why the public holds the media in such low regard. Their duplicity and bias is palpable.

Contact: brennanm@cbsnews.com

BIDEN TEED IT UP FOR PRO-LIFE PARDONS

[Bill Donohue](#)

President Trump deserves great credit for pardoning 23 pro-life protesters who were arrested under the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances (FACE) Act. Kudos are also deserving for the Thomas More Society and all the pro-life organizations that never gave up. But it would be remiss not to cite the pivotal role of President Biden's Department of Justice (DOJ).

Biden teed it up for Trump. Indeed, the selective application of the FACE Act, and other laws, made it morally and politically easy for Trump to pardon the protesters. To be exact, Biden's DOJ showed little interest in going after those who violated the FACE Act when they blocked crisis pregnancy centers. Even top officials in his administration admit to this.

In November 2023, FBI Director Christopher Wray testified that 70 percent of the FACE offenses were committed by abortion-rights activists. Yet they resulted in just two charges.

Moreover, we learned from Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta that pro-lifers were disproportionately targeted. Subsequently, it has been reported that 97 percent of FACE Act cases have been invoked against pro-life demonstrators.

It is not just the unequal application of the FACE Act that angers those in the pro-life community.

Where was law enforcement when Portland, Seattle, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, New York, and other cities were being burned during the riots following the death of George Floyd? Why were Antifa and Black Lives Matter allowed to beat and kill with impunity? Why were there no consequences for torching police stations and widespread looting? Why were pro-Hamas students and professional agitators allowed to block entrances to college campuses, terrorizing Jewish students?

If the police disproportionately arrest black offenders, it is called racial profiling. If those who espouse one point of view are routinely censored, but those who espouse a contrary view are not, it is called viewpoint discrimination. So what should we call it when pro-life demonstrators are arrested for breaking the FACE Act, and almost all the pro-abortion protesters get away with violating the same law? Pro-life profiling?

If a cop were to arrest everyone for going between 60 and 70 miles per hour in a 60 mile an hour speed zone, but almost never arrests those who go more than 70 miles an hour, we would want to know why.

With regard to Biden's corrupt DOJ, we already know why. The Biden administration was angry over the Supreme Court ruling overturning *Roe v. Wade*. Ergo, they unleashed the powers of law enforcement to go after pro-lifers.

That all of this happened during the tenure of a man who calls himself a "devout Catholic" makes it all the more sickening.

MONTANA DEMS ATTACK CONFESSIOINAL

[Bill Donohue](#)

Seven Democratic Senators from Montana have introduced a bill that would eliminate the religious exemption from a mandatory reporting law for members of the clergy.

To read Bill Donohue's letter to Montana lawmakers, and many others, click [here](#).

OPEN LETTER TO DC BISHOP WHO LECTURED TRUMP

Contact her at: mebudde@edow.org

January 22, 2025

Bishop Mariann Edgar Budde
Episcopal Church House
Mount St. Alban
Washington, D.C. 20016

Dear Bishop Budde:

At the January 21 prayer service at Washington National Cathedral that featured President Trump, you mentioned that "people in our country are scared now." You singled out people

who “may not be citizens or have the proper documentation,” as well as LGBTQ persons. These people “fear for their lives.” You then made a plea to “find compassion.”

Your commitment to compassion is noble, but it is misplaced.

I work in New York City, and I witness daily how many New Yorkers are “scared” and “fear for their lives.” They are afraid of being mugged, beaten, raped and killed, often by people who have crashed our borders, people you refer to as lacking “proper documentation.” They, and in some cases their surviving families, are deserving of compassion. More than that, they are deserving of justice, and that means that illegal alien criminals must be apprehended and deported.

You are right to call attention to violence against LGBTQ persons. They have every right to be “scared” and “fear for their lives.” What you don’t mention is that the people who are most likely to victimize them are people just like them. In other words, it is not heterosexual guys who are beating up on gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transgender persons—it is people in their own ranks. It is called “intimate partner violence,” and the studies show how prevalent it is among LGBTQ persons.

In 2022, Psycom Pro, a psychiatry resource for clinicians, concluded that “More than half of transgender individuals experience partner violence or gender identity abuse.”

In 2020, seven experts published a study in the American Journal of Public Health on this subject and concluded that “Transgender individuals experience a dramatically higher prevalence of IPV [intimate partner violence] victimization compared with cisgender individuals [those who accept their sex identity], regardless of sex assigned at birth.”

The National Coalition Against Domestic Violence reviewed the literature on this subject and found that “43.8% of lesbian women and 61.1% of bisexual women have experienced rape,

physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner at some point in their lifetime, as opposed to 35% of cisgender women.” It also found that transgender individuals experienced the highest rate of intimate partner violence.

The Williams Institute, a think tank at UCLA Law, reviewed a number of studies on this subject. One of them found that “31.1% of transgender people and 20.4% of cisgender people had ever experienced IPV or dating violence.” It also said that three studies concluded that the lifetime intimate partner sexual violence prevalence among transgender people ranged from “25.0% to 47.0%.”

Even in sympathetic pop culture magazines, such as Portland Monthly, it is acknowledged that “statistically speaking, the most common perpetrators of violence against trans women are domestic partners.”

In short, misdirected compassion is not virtuous. You need to make a public statement addressing the fallacies of your remarks.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

POPE’S IDEA OF POOR MIGRANTS IS FLAWED

Bill Donohue

On the eve of the inauguration of President Donald Trump, Pope Francis called him a “disgrace” for pledging to deport illegal

aliens. The pope said that doing so “makes poor wretches, who have nothing, pay the price for the imbalance.”

If the typical illegal alien were a “poor wretch” who owns “nothing,” the Holy Father’s criticism would have merit. But such is not the case. To be blunt, his understanding of who these migrants are is flawed.

Historically, the poorest of the poor are rarely, if ever, the ones who migrate from poor countries to rich countries. Quite frankly, the poorest of the poor are so undernourished, and physically disabled, that they don’t have the stamina to migrate. It’s those who don’t share these characteristics who migrate.

This observation is backed up by the social science. Oxford economist Paul Collier has spent much of his career studying the poorest people on earth. A summary of his work found that “Those who seek entry to wealthy countries are rarely the poorest of the poor; they are those with the resources and skills necessary to migrate.”

This is certainly the case with those who have been crashing our southern border.

Migrants who are truly poor can’t afford cell phones. But many of those who have made their way to the U.S. come with them. If they don’t have one, U.S. taxpayers pay for them: we are spending over \$100 million a year supplying hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens with a smartphone. Moreover, if these migrants owned “nothing,” as the pope says, why is it that millions of them have money to pay the drug cartels, gangsters who exploit them in their quest for entry?

If these migrants were as poor as the pope thinks they are, why is it that most of them (54 percent) have a high school education or beyond? According to statistics provided by Migration Policy, 24 percent of “the unauthorized population” have a high school diploma or equivalent; 12 percent have some

college or associate's degree; 18 percent have a bachelors, graduate, or professional degree.

In terms of family income, 74 percent are at or above the poverty line. Indeed, 43 percent make at or above 200 percent of the poverty line. These are not "poor wretches."

Americans are a generous people, but they don't like to be played. Public officials, and those who police the border, have often noted how widespread the game of ripping off the taxpayers is. Even President Biden's Homeland Security Secretary, Alejandro Mayorkas, recently admitted that "The reality is that some people do indeed try to game the system." These are not "poor wretches."

A Pew Research Center survey found that almost 8-in-10 Americans (78 percent) believe that immigrants living illegally in the U.S. should not be eligible for public assistance. Also, "Majorities say immigrants living in the U.S. illegally are making things worse when it comes to public resources such as housing, education and health care (66%), crime (63%), and the economy (54%)."

Where is the compassion for these Americans?

Those who have come to America illegally are not a monolithic demographic. Some are fairly well off, some are not. Some are good citizens, some are not. Some are honest in their quest for citizenship, and some are gaming the system.

A prudent approach to the problem of illegal aliens requires that some basic distinctions be made. It also behooves us not to see them as "poor wretches" who own "nothing." Indeed, this is true of almost none of them.

CORPORATIONS ASKED TO DROP DEI POLICIES

[Bill Donohue](#)

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 has 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 are asking them to follow the lead of some prominent corporations and abandon these policies.

Beginning January 20, major changes will be made in the political arena. That is not enough: We need to make changes in the business community and in the culture as well.

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

To read the list of companies, click [here](#).

TWO SOCIAL SCIENTISTS JOIN OUR BOARD OF ADVISORS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Political Scientist Paul G. Kengor and Anthropologist Steven W. Mosher have joined the Catholic League’s board of advisors,

making our distinguished list even more distinguished. Both write extensively on Communism.

Kengor teaches at Grove City College, outside Pittsburgh, and is a *New York Times* bestselling author. He is also editor-in-chief of *The American Spectator*. His more than 20 books include works on President Reagan and Saint John Paul II, and Karl Marx.

Mosher is president of the Population Research Institute and is known as one of America's most influential students of China. His work detailing human rights abuses in Communist China is expansive and well regarded in Washington and around the world.

Both men are committed Catholics. Paul has eight children, two of which are adopted, and Steve has nine children.

We are delighted to have them both on board.