

# PAM BONDI TARGETS MEDICAL PROFESSION

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).*

U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi is zeroing in on the medical profession's role in providing services to sexually confused minors. She will focus on "the medical community's fraud and exploitation of parents and children who have fallen prey to radical gender ideology." She said the Department of Justice (DOJ) will not sit back and allow doctors who are "motivated by ideology, profits, or both [to] exploit and mutilate our children."

Bondi is not making a talking point—she means business. She is putting "medical practitioners, hospitals, and clinics on notice" that they will be held accountable for engaging in sex-reassignment surgeries of children. She is also instructing her lawyers to draft legislation that will allow "children and the parents of children whose healthy body parts have been damaged by medical professionals through chemical and surgical mutilation" to take action against them.

What motivated Bondi to act were reports that the Biden-Harris administration aided and abetted the suffering of children by the medical profession, all in the name of providing "gender affirming care." There is nothing noble about sexually reconstructing children. It is a monstrous act done for politics or cash.

The American Medical Association (AMA) is a disgrace. The elites who run it know that sex is binary yet they pretend it is not. It is so far gone that it opposes designating sex on birth certificates as male or female, as if there is some

legitimate third choice.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) is just as irresponsible. It not only agrees with the AMA, it does not allow doctors to set up a booth at its annual conference challenging its flawed transgender position.

According to the medical watchdog, Do No Harm, between 2019-2023, approximately 14,000 children underwent sex-change operations. This was supported by both the AMA and the AAP.

Attorney General Bondi is right to go after the medical schools as well. Here's a quick look at the elite ones.

Harvard Medical School houses Mass General, the oldest and largest medical school in the country. It specializes in gender-affirming care. It is so specialized that it even offers vocal feminization and masculinization services. They just don't get it: If there is no such thing as a biological man or woman, why are they tinkering with kids' vocal cords to make them sound like a man or a woman? Are they that ideologically drunk that they don't see how this undercuts their position?

Boston Children's Hospital is also affiliated with Harvard Medical School. It is the first pediatric and adolescent transgender health program in the nation, providing "Gender Multispecialty Services" such as "menstrual suppression" and "dilation therapy and care of neovaginas." This is really sick. They are boasting about manipulating the bodies of women to stop their normal cycle of menstruation, and they are also bragging about creating new vaginas for men who hate their bodies.

Johns Hopkins Medicine runs the Emerge Gender and Sexuality Clinic for Children, Adolescents and Young Adults. It starts playing with the bodies of individuals "between the ages of 5 and 25 years." In other words, when Johnny is still on his tricycle, he is a prime candidate for these exploitative

doctors. They even provide “penile construction” for little girls who want to become a boy.

Stanford Medicine not only makes new vaginas for the guys, it removes the ovaries from the gals. In doing so, it works “hand-in-hand” with the Stanford LGBTQ+ Health Program. Did they forget the “I”? At least they didn’t forget the +, which covers them.

The Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania offers “facial feminization and facial masculinization surgeries.” Again, these savants are giving away the store—every time they say one’s sex is subjective, they offer proof that it isn’t. Do they teach logic at any of these schools? They sure don’t teach ethics.

Attorney General Pam Bondi should hold all of these predators responsible. They are preying on individuals who suffer from serious mental issues. They are not only injurious to their health, they are anti-science. Bondi should declare a mental health emergency and shut these Frankenstein facilities down ASAP.

---

## JESUIT COLLEGES HAVE A FREE SPEECH PROBLEM

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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 Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression

periodically does a study of some colleges and universities, rating them on their tolerance for free speech. The 2025 report on 251 schools found that the University of Virginia ranked #1 and Harvard ranked #251.

Jesuit schools generally do poorly, and the latest study is no exception. Fordham ranked 234, Marquette was 235 and Georgetown came in at 240. Other Jesuit institutions did better: Creighton was 144, Boston College placed 189 and Loyola of Chicago ranked 209.

Other Catholic institutions of higher education did not fare very well. The University of Notre Dame placed 167, Villanova was 185, the University of Dayton registered 192, DePaul was 201, and Duquesne placed 222.

It is striking that Georgetown, year in and year out, is the least tolerant of free speech of any Catholic college or university. It is also home to two pro-abortion clubs, one at the undergraduate level and one in the law school.

---

## NEW YORK TIMES MALIGNS IRISH NUNS AGAIN

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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 2013, Bill Donohue published a monograph, "Myths of the Magdalene Laundries," that debunked the myths about the rotten living conditions in homes for unwed mothers run by Irish nuns from the mid-eighteenth to the late nineteenth century.

In 2014, Donohue published another monograph, "Ireland's 'Mass Grave' Hysteria," that debunked the myths about a mass grave containing the remains of nearly 800 children that were alleged to have been found outside a former home run by nuns in Tuam [pronounced Chewum] near Galway.

On May 6, 2025, the *New York Times* published a front-page story that repeats all the falsehoods that were previously told about the homes and the "mass grave." Ironically, one of the persons who showed the mass grave story to be a hoax was a *New York Times* reporter. They really ought to read their own newspaper before publishing another story on the same subject.

Even the title of Ali Watkins' article, "75 Years of Longing for a Child Taken From Her," is bunk. The baby was dead on arrival. Furthermore, no one "took" the baby from Chrissie Tully—she was in a jam and had to give the baby up.

When Tully was a teenager, she got pregnant out-of-wedlock and her "family disowned her." A priest took her to St. Mary's Mother and Baby Home in Tuam. As Watkins says, "for some like Ms. Tully, there was nowhere else to go." Not exactly. There was always the street. She made the right choice.

Watkins bemoans the fact that Tully's boy, whom she named Michael, "was taken away" from her and "never held him or saw his face." But she went to the home because she could not care for her baby—that's why the homes exist— and because he died at birth, she never had a chance to see him. At the time, she thought the nuns were lying, but she doggedly pursued this issue for decades, and finally obtained the hospital paperwork. It read, "Stillborn." This settles it. She was never lied to.

Right on cue, Watkins tells readers about the homes being "one of Ireland's enduring moral stains," where "forced labor for young mothers, high infant mortality rates, pervasive shame and emotional abuse" occurred. The facilities, known as the

“Magdalene Homes,” were established in England in 1758 and in Ireland in 1765. Similar homes existed until the 1960s.

Unlike today, where there is no shame for girls who get pregnant out-of-wedlock, there was back then. Of course, the young girls were required to work—it would have been unethical not to demand that they contribute to their livelihood. Infant mortality rates were common all over Europe during those days—the homes had no monopoly on that.

Watkins just doesn’t get it. She contends that the homes were horrid, yet she admits that Tully returned to the same Tuam home after she got pregnant again! Why would she do that? Was she a masochist? Or was she being prudent? It was obviously the latter—she admitted that the father was “not the marrying type.”

Moreover, Watkins is apparently unaware that the McAleese Report on the Magdalene Laundries, a government study published in 2013, found that the women were not abused and that the conditions were not “prison like,” as critics have contended. In fact, they were relatively good.

Regarding the mass graves hoax, Watkins writes, “In 2017, a mass unmarked grave was discovered in a septic tank at St. Mary’s, which was shut down in 1961. Within it were the bodies of at least 796 children.”

This is simply wrong. The allegation that a “mass grave” was found was first made in 2014, not three years later. That is when a “local historian,” Catherine Corless, made this claim (she is actually a typist who has no academic credentials). What Watkins is referring to is the 2017 statement on this subject made by the Mother and Baby Commission. What she failed to say is that it *made no mention of a mass grave*.

There never was a “mass grave.” As Donohue previously detailed, Douglas Dalby, a *New York Times* reporter, quoted what Barry Sweeney said (he is one of the sources who

testified about what he found when he was 10 years old). “People are making out we saw a mass grave. But we can only say what we seen [sic]: maybe 15 to 20 small skeletons.”

The septic tank story is also bogus. Dr. Finbar McCormick, who teaches at the School of Geography, Archeology and Palaeoecology at Queens University in Belfast, said the so-called septic tank was “more likely to be a shaft burial vault.” He said that “Many maternal hospitals in Ireland had a communal burial place for stillborn children or those who died soon after birth. These were sometimes in a nearby graveyard but more often in a special area within the grounds of a hospital.”

It does not speak well for the *New York Times* to peddle such trash.

---

## GERMAN BISHOPS DISPUTE THERE ARE TWO SEXES

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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 creating men ‘male and female,’ God gives man and woman an equal personal dignity.” That is what the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches. Pope Francis not only agreed with this fundamental Catholic tenet, he said that those who deny there are only two sexes, male and female, are fostering a false anthropology.

Evidently, the German bishops disagree. Indeed, they also disagree with Pope Francis’ proclamations on gender ideology,

which he called “demonic.”

In a special handout prepared by the German Bishops' Conference that was recently published, the bishops made clear their vision of humanity. Indeed, the title of their document, “Blessings for Couples Who Love Each Other,” says it all.

“Couples who love each other” obviously applies to same-sex couples. Indeed, it also applies to father-daughter and mother-son couples. That may not be their intent, but this is what happens when being “inclusive” becomes an obsession.

It gets worse. The handout speaks to extending blessings to “couples in all the diversity of sexual orientations and gender identities [that] are part of our society.”

This means there is a sexual orientation that extends beyond heterosexual and homosexual. The German bishops should tell us what it is. It also means there are more than two gender identities. They should name them. In both instances, it would be helpful if they provided us with pictures of these people so we know what they look like.

In all seriousness, the dissemination of this handout comes at a critical juncture in the Church's history. We have elected a new pontiff, Pope Leo XIV, and Catholics everywhere are anxious to know what direction he wants to take us.

Will he ratify the African Catholic vision of sexuality, which emphasizes fidelity to the Church's teachings? Or will he opt to ratify the German Catholic vision, which rejects those teachings?

There is a reason why Catholic attendance in Germany is abysmal. In a vain attempt to be “inclusive,” the bishops' conference has unwittingly alienated orthodox Catholics, making them feel *excluded*. By contrast, Catholic attendance in most parts of Africa is surging, and that is due in no small way to its embrace of traditionalism.

Bishops who are prepared to believe there are a multiplicity of sexual orientations and gender identities are not only rejecting the teachings of the Catholic Church, they are rejecting what science affirms. Moreover, they are driving the faithful to exit the Catholic Church. Strike three.

---

## MAHER MOCKS EUCHARIST

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).*

While most people treated the news of the passing of Pope Francis with somberness and dignity, notorious Catholic-basher Bill Maher could not keep himself from making crude and irreverent comments. On the April 25 episode of “Real Time,” the bigoted HBO host used the eve of the papal funeral to insult a central tenet of the Catholic faith, the Eucharist.

Maher began talking about Pope Francis with some of the clichéd lines about priests that we have seen far too often from him. He seems to think it is the pinnacle of wit to say that “the outpouring of grief” for the pope has led to priests asking altar boys to “just hold me.”

Continuing this theme, later while Maher was trying to explain why conservatives had disagreements with Pope Francis, he ran through a litany of things that supposedly conservatives found infuriating about the late Holy Father. One thing that supposedly got the goat of conservatives, according to Maher, was Pope Francis’ “child sex ring took the focus off Hillary’s child sex ring.”

What really stood out on Maher’s list were his loutish remarks

about the Eucharist. Maher went on to say that another thing that Pope Francis did to raise the ire of conservatives was that he advocated for “men eating another man’s body.” At that exact moment, on screen appeared an image of Pope Francis consecrating the Eucharist.

To take a sacrament and a core pillar of Catholicism and turn it into some sort of sick, sexualized “joke” is grotesque, but to provide such an insult at the moment 1.4 billion Catholics around the world are commemorating the death of Pope Francis is beyond the pale.

Maher is an irreverent bigot who has not been funny in years. As his star continues to diminish, he is forced to rely on mean-spirited attacks to get cheap chuckles from the handful of people who still find him interesting.

---

## Fr. MARTIN DISTORTS TRUTH ABOUT DISSIDENT NUN

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).*

Fr. James Martin, the Jesuit champion of gay and transgender rights, recently wrote a column in the *New York Times* that was intellectually dishonest.

He cites the case of Sister Jeannine Gramick as testimony to Pope Francis’ outreach to “L.G.B.T.Q. people.” He notes that “Her saga began in 1999, during the papacy of St. John Paul II. That year, Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, later to become Pope Benedict XVI, barred Sister Gramick and the Rev. Robert

Nugent, two Americans, from ministering to 'homosexual persons.'" He goes on to say that Pope Francis met with Gramick and praised her for her work.

It is not clear how much Pope Francis knew about Gramick. At the time, we assumed he was given a selective interpretation of her work, which is why we accused his handlers of "manipulating" him. In any event, Fr. Martin gives the impression that Benedict is the ogre. In fact, what he did was long overdue. Here is what happened.

In 1999, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, written by Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, issued a "Notification Regarding Sister Jeannine Gramick, SSND, and Father Robert Nugent, SDS." It was directed at the work of New Ways Ministry (NWM), which was founded by Gramick and Nugent in 1977.

Ratzinger noted that in 1984, "James Cardinal Hickey, the Archbishop of Washington, following the failure of a number of attempts at clarification, informed them [NWM] that they could no longer undertake their activities in that Archdiocese. At the same time, the Congregation for Institutes of Consecrated Life and for Societies of Apostolic Life ordered them to separate themselves totally and completely from *New Ways Ministry*, adding that they were not to exercise any apostolate without faithfully presenting the Church's teaching regarding the intrinsic evil of homosexual acts."

Ratzinger then detailed the many attempts by Church officials to persuade Gramick and Nugent to abide by Church teachings on this subject. He concluded that they "are permanently prohibited from any pastoral work involving homosexual persons and are ineligible, for an undetermined period, for any office in their respective religious institutes."

Three years later, in 2002, Archbishop Tarcisio Bertone, Secretary of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, wrote that "New Ways Ministry does not promote the authentic

teaching of the Catholic Church.”

In that same year, Archbishop Thomas Kelly of Louisville told organizers of the group’s conference that they should not celebrate the Eucharist at the NWM event. Following suit in 2007 was St. Paul-Minneapolis Archbishop Harry Flynn: he barred NWM’s national conference from celebrating the Eucharist.

In 2010, Cardinal Francis George, president of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops, stated that he can assure Catholics that “in no manner is the position proposed by New Ways Ministry in conformity with Catholic teaching and in no manner is this organization authorized to speak on behalf of the Catholic Church or to identify itself as a Catholic organization.”

In 2011, Cardinal Donald Wuerl of the Washington Archdiocese, and chairman of the Committee on Doctrine, joined with Oakland Bishop Salvatore Cordileone, and chairman of the bishops’ Ad Hoc Committee on the Defense of Marriage, issuing an affirmation of Cardinal George’s denunciation of NWM.

For Fr. Martin not to make mention of any of this is to completely distort the record. He was also wrong not to mention that Gramick continued to defy Church teachings as late as a few years ago. On January 7, 2022, she said that in 1999 the Vatican wanted her and Nugent “to say that homosexual activity is objectively immoral and that we personally believed that. And I could not do that.”

Worse, Gramick showed more sympathy for the greatest child rapist priest in American history, Father Paul Shanley, than she did his many victims. For decades, the Boston priest raped males of all ages, and he liked to blame the victims, famously saying, “the kid is the seducer.”

In 2005, Gramick said that she “grieved for this man I had not seen in almost 20 years, but whose principles and whose

advocacy for the downtrodden I had applauded for three decades.” Journalist Maureen Orth, who was married to “Meet the Press” host Tim Russert, was horrified by what she said, adding that she interviewed nine of Shanley’s victims, and that Gramick never spoke to one of them.

Pope Benedict XVI acted honorably when, as a cardinal, he called out Sr. Jeannine Gramick. To imply otherwise is scurrilous.

---

## DAVID HOROWITZ, R.I.P.

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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](#).*

*Bill Donohue offers a personal note to a personal friend.*

David Horowitz, the former radical turned conservative, died April 29 after battling cancer. He was 86. He was a good friend, a brilliant speaker and writer, and a man of tremendous courage.

David was born and raised in Queens. To this day, when I take the Long Island Rail Road leaving Manhattan, passing into Queens, I look out the window and see the sign for Skillman Avenue. I think of David—that is where he grew up, in Long Island City.

His parents were diehard communists, and raised him as a “Red Diaper Baby.” Their indoctrination paid off, at least initially. In the 1960s and 1970s, he was a leader of the New Left, stoking anti-Americanism. He befriended Huey Newton, founder of the Black Panther Party, but later split with them

once he learned they were involved in the death of a friend of his, Betty Van Patter.

David, and his friend, Peter Collier, founded Ramparts, a radical magazine that cheered for a communist victory in Vietnam. But as he watched what the communists did in Vietnam, his enthusiasm for Marxism soured. The final straw came in the late 1970s when Pol Pot murdered two-in-five of his fellow Cambodians. This shook him intellectually.

Then came the election of Ronald Reagan. This further triggered the reset: David became a rabid pro-American conservative. In 1987, he held a "Second Thoughts Conference" in Washington D.C. This is where he, and other ex-New Left activists, explained why they had had "Second Thoughts" about their political philosophy. Communist genocide has a way of shaking honest people up.

In the early 1990s, he and Peter founded Heterodoxy, a brilliant monthly that broke new grounds. Later in the decade, the David Horowitz Freedom Center was launched, and with it the influential publication, FrontPage magazine.

Peter had made such a turnaround that he called me at the Catholic League in the late 1990s to congratulate me on my work. More important, he said he made his way back to Catholicism.

It was about that time when David asked me to speak at a conference in Los Angeles that would assess the cultural impact that Hollywood was having. I was scheduled to be there anyway—Jeffrey Katzenberg invited me to review his yet-to-be released movie, Prince of Egypt (which I applauded), so I agreed.

It was an enormous room— full of actors, producers and directors—and virtually all of the speakers put a positive face on Hollywood. Until I spoke. After I finished with my remarks, the man sitting next to me on the platform turned to

me and said, "They are going to have to get extra security to escort you out of here."

What did I say that upset the elites? I told them they were a bunch of phonies. One after another, I said, you came to the microphone to tell us that you don't allow your children to watch the television shows that you make. No, you said, your children watch Nickelodeon. I asked, "So whose children are your shows good for?" They knew exactly what I meant. The room was dead silent. But David loved it.

David was fond of saying that many conservatives don't get it. They are so nice. The problem with that is they seriously underestimate how vicious the Left is. They need to toughen up. They don't understand how driven and malicious radicals are.

In more recent years, David wrote a blurb for one my books, and I endorsed one of his. He was always honest and full of energy.

As he grew intellectually, David, who was Jewish, became a staunch advocate of Christianity. He saw the cultural rot that militant secularism wrought, concluding that an ascendant Christianity was badly needed.

Not surprisingly, the Left turned on him, hating his slide to conservatism. But he didn't care—all he cared about was telling the truth.

America has lost a great one. I was honored to have known David Horowitz as a friend. May he rest in peace.

---

# VEILED THREAT?

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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 April 30, Erik Loomis, a history professor at the University of Rhode Island, wrote, "David Horowitz is dead. Bill Donohue, one of the worst living Americans, is sad." That is how he began his screed attacking Horowitz. He concluded with what could be interpreted as a veiled threat.

"The good news is that evil people dominating America today will be dead one day. Of course so will we. But at least I have lived in a nation without David Horowitz. I didn't have Horowitz on my obit list. But at least this reminds me to put Donohue on the list."

The man is a coward. A true man would challenge Donohue to a debate.

---

# POPE FRANCIS AND THE POOR

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

Here's a thought experiment. There are two teachers. One is known for his compassion for struggling students, but he is not a gifted teacher, and as a result his students do poorly in school. The other is known as lacking in compassion, but he is a gifted teacher, and as a result his students do well in school.

There are two doctors. One is known for his compassionate bedside manners, but he is not a gifted doctor, and as a result his patients suffer. The other lacks bedside manners, but is regarded as a gifted doctor, and as a result his patients thrive.

Ideally, we would all like to be served by compassionate and competent teachers and doctors, but when given the choices afforded by the thought experiment, who would really choose the compassionate yet incompetent teacher or doctor over their insensitive yet competent counterparts?

No one doubts that Pope Francis showed great compassion for the poor. Indeed, that is one of the most heralded aspects of his legacy. But his harsh criticisms of capitalism, and his affinity for socialism, must be taken into account.

It is undeniably true that capitalism has done more to induce upward social mobility and alleviate poverty than any economic system in history. It is also undeniably true that socialism has proven to be the greatest generator of poverty in the world.

In capitalist countries, the leaders may talk more about economic efficiency than the interests of the poor, yet their free market policies invariably prove beneficial to them. The leaders in socialist countries talk a great deal about the interests of the poor, yet their statist policies invariably prove harmful to the poor.

In short, rhetoric means little in the end if the policies that are pursued result in failure.

When Mao took over in 1949, he dressed like a peasant and talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, he owned 50 villas, and devastated the economy with his socialist policies.

When Fidel Castro, an affluent lawyer, took over in Cuba in

1959, he dressed down and talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, he lived the high life and devastated the economy with his socialist policies.

When the Sandinistas took over in Nicaragua in 1979, they donned fatigues and talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, they live in palaces and have devastated the economy with their socialist policies.

When Nicolás Maduro took over in Venezuela in 2019, he talked incessantly about the plight of the poor. Meanwhile, he is living a luxurious lifestyle and has devastated the economy with his socialist policies.

Pope Francis meant well in showing compassion for the poor. But his understanding of economics was not his strong suit, and the economic policies he championed did more to punish the poor than help them. On that score, the next pope has to do better.

---

## MEDIA COVER FOR COMEY'S THREAT

*This is the article that appeared in the June 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 patrons tell bartenders it is time to “86” that guy at the end of the bar, they mean he’s drunk and should be cut off. In other contexts, it might mean to nix, or to cancel, someone. It might also mean something more serious.

When James Comey aligned seashells to read, 86 47, he knew

what he was doing. He sent a message to those who loathe the man who has survived two assassination attempts. It is hardly a stretch to conclude that—given his well-known hatred of our 47th president—that this was his way of signaling his wish that someone try again. After all, this is not virgin territory for Comey: he is the former Director of the FBI and he knows what to “86” someone means; he surely wasn’t suggesting that the teetotaler be cut off at the bar.

Some in the media, still burning with rage that Trump won, are covering for Comey by pretending he is being misunderstood.

Many media outlets, including ABC News, are saying that Merriam-Webster defines to “86” someone or something means to “get rid of” someone or something. True enough. In this instance, the someone is the president of the United States. Comey needs to be asked: What did he think would happen if someone took him seriously and tried to “get rid” of Trump?

In some popular circles, to “86” someone is to kill him. Indeed, *Cassell’s Dictionary of Slang* says “to 86” means “to kill, to murder; to execute judicially.” Comey has previously shown himself to be an extremely embittered man. Now he has proven to be beyond reckless— he is salivating over the death of President Trump.

Those who think this is an exaggeration need to explain why a majority (55 percent) of self-identified “left of center” adults recently told Network Contagion Research Institute pollsters that murdering Trump is justified. Comey is playing with fire, and he knows it. He’s not a dumb man.