RELIGIOUS LIBERTY AFFIRMED; ANTI-CHRISTIAN BIAS TO END

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 February 6, President Donald Trump announced 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.

Trump's executive order was pointed. He accused the Biden administration of ignoring the violence, theft and arson against "Catholic churches, charities, and pro-life centers." He specifically cited the FBI's attack on "radical-traditionalist" Catholics; they were seen as a domestic threat.

"My Administration will not tolerate anti-Christian weaponization of government or unlawful conduct targeting Christians." Trump pulled no punches nailing his predecessor.

"The Biden Department of Education sought to repeal religious-liberty protections of faith-based organizations on college campuses. The Biden Equal Employment Opportunity Commission sought to force Christians to affirm radical transgender ideology against their faith. And the Biden Department of Health and Human Services sought to drive Christians who do not conform to certain beliefs on sexual orientation and gender ideology out of the foster-care system. The Biden team declared March 31, 2024—Easter Sunday—as 'Transgender Day of

Visibility.'”

The task force will review the activities of all executive departments and agencies, seeking to purge any vestiges of bigotry against Christians. Information gleaned from this review will be widely shared; we will make good use of it. Periodic reports will be published and a final report will be given before the task force expires in two years.

Of great interest to us, the task force will “solicit information and ideas from a broad range of individuals and groups.”

More than any other organization in the nation, the Catholic League has documented anti-Christian prejudice and discrimination. There are other Catholic advocacy organizations, but none has a website chock full of data on this issue that can even come close to what we have detailed.

As soon as the executive order was issued, we started collecting a huge amount of information. Indeed, there is not a single issue mentioned by Trump that we have not led the way in combating. Our list of anti-Christian bias committed by the federal government is extensive.

The scourge of Christian bashing, which Catholics, in particular, have had to endure is astounding. While some Republicans have contributed to it, most of the attacks have come from the Democrats. We have the evidence and we will be happy to share it with the Trump administration.

POPE IS FAILING

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.

When we went to press, Pope Francis was being hospitalized for double pneumonia and was not doing well. All scheduled events were cancelled. At 88, he appears to be failing.

He has long had respiratory problems. As a young man he had part of one lung removed due to an infection, leaving him susceptible to respiratory illnesses. More recently, he has appeared breathless in public.

Already there is wide speculation about his successor, but from what we learned when Pope Benedict XVI resigned, much of it is idle chatter. Those who will vote in the conclave are cardinals under the age of 80. There are 253 cardinals and 138 will partake in the voting process. Francis has appointed approximately 80 percent of them.

We looked at media reports on who was likely to succeed Benedict and only one credible source mentioned the eventual winner, Cardinal Jorge Mario Bergoglio. But even then, it was said that “His ‘moment’ seems to be over.” Most Vatican observers mentioned Cardinal Angelo Scola as the most likely to succeed Benedict.

There are those Catholics who say we need to continue the legacy of Pope Francis and select another pope just like him. Others say we need to push the pendulum the other way, correcting the “progressive” drift that Francis espoused. Either way, there is only a limited amount of change that the Holy Father can deliver.
Our prayers are with the pope. We also pray for his successor.

CULTURAL CORRECTION LONG OVERDUE

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.

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 on 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.

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. Mannion (NY-D)	N/A	N/A	Pro-abortion
Rep. April McClain 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 is 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.

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 does’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.