

PUBLIC OPPOSES ABORTION-ON-DEMAND

Two recently released Gallup surveys on abortion show how mixed Americans are on this subject. One of them is titled, "Americans Still Oppose Overturning Roe v. Wade." This a gross simplification. Indeed, by analyzing Gallup's own data, the opposite case could also be made.

It is true that when asked whether Roe v. Wade should be overturned, only 32% agree; 58% disagree. But when the survey digs deeper, it finds something altogether different. For example, only 32% believe that abortion should be legal in all circumstances; 67% disagree. Of that last number, 48% say it should be legal in certain circumstances while 19% say it should be illegal in all circumstances.

With regard to the meaning of Roe v. Wade, Gallup says the ruling "specifies that states may *regulate* abortion before fetal viability in the interests of maternal health, but not ban the procedure before that developmental stage (its *italic*)." That is technically true. It is also intellectually dishonest.

In practice, Gallup knows very well that the way this ruling has been interpreted and applied in most parts of the country, Roe means abortion-on-demand. And that, according to its own data, is precisely what Americans reject.

So why would only a third of Americans want Roe overturned given their overwhelming opposition to what Roe, in practice, allows? That's because many, if not most, falsely believe that Roe does not permit abortion-on-demand.

Gallup admits that support for abortion falls off dramatically after the first trimester. In other words, the average American does not want an outright ban because that would mean

abortions in the early stages of pregnancy would also be illegal, hence the reluctance to overturn Roe. But the average American is also unhappy with totally unrestricted abortions, which is what Roe basically permits.

No one can make an informed decision on any subject unless the facts are made clear. When it comes to abortion, they rarely are.

FLAWED SURVEY ON TRANSGENDER RIGHTS

When the public is asked about the rights of Americans, from any demographic group, the issue is usually couched in terms of equality. But when it comes to the rights of transgender persons, there are two other variables that ineluctably come into play: equity and privacy.

Equality is not equity: it means sameness; equity means fairness. Giving all students the same grade is an example of equality and inequity. Privacy is self-evident.

A new Gallup poll on the rights of transgender persons taps measures of equality and equity, but neglects to tap the issue of privacy.

Asking respondents whether or not transgender persons should have a right to serve in the military is a measure of equality. Most Americans are predisposed to treating everyone equally, so it comes as no surprise that 7 in 10 adults say they favor allowing openly transgender persons to serve in the military.

Asking whether transgender athletes should only be allowed to compete against those of their same birth sex, or whether they should be allowed to compete against those who match their sex identity, is a measure of equity. Most Americans (62%) prefer the former choice, thus showing a preference for equity over equality. In other words, most do not think it fair that those who are born male should have the right to compete in sports against those born female.

Gallup did not ask about the privacy issue, namely, whether biological males who consider themselves to be female should have the right to use the same bathroom and shower facilities as females.

Previous Gallup polls on the restroom issue, taken in 2016 and 2017, showed that most Americans do not agree that those born of one sex should be allowed to use the same public restroom of those who belong to the opposite sex, though the margins were not great. In 2016, 50% said transgender individuals should use the public restrooms of their birth sex; 40% disagreed. In 2017, the respective numbers were 48% to 45%.

There are a few problems with these Gallup surveys.

For one, why didn't Gallup pose the question differently in 2016 and 2017? For example, why didn't it ask respondents whether they approve of those in grades K-12 using the same bathroom and shower facilities of those who belong to the opposite sex? Is there not a profound difference between adults using the same public restrooms as those of the other sex, and boys and girls using the same school bathrooms and shower facilities?

Second, if most Americans today are not in favor of allowing biological males to compete against biological females in sports, isn't it likely that an even higher percentage would oppose them showering together? Why didn't Gallup ask this question?

Allowing males to compete against females in sports, and to access the same locker rooms after competing, does violence to all three variables relevant to this discussion: equality, equity, and privacy.

Males and females are not equal in their biologically determined athletic attributes; allowing males to compete against females is patently unfair; and mixing the sexes in bathrooms and showers is a violation of privacy rights. No one should be afraid to call this for what it is—madness.

DISHONORING MARTIN LUTHER KING'S LEGACY

The legacy of Rev. Martin Luther King is being dishonored on a daily basis. Those who are trashing his noble record are not white supremacists; rather, they are professionals who claim to be fighting racism. These people work primarily in education, law, and the media. Regrettably, they are as heavily populated in the for-profit sector of the economy as they are the non-profit sector.

It was in King's 1963 "I Have a Dream" speech where he articulated his vision of America. While he made several references to problems that blacks were faced with, ranging from discrimination in public accommodations to police brutality, he did so against the backdrop of respect for the American commitment to liberty, equality and justice for all. Indeed, his "dream" was based on his conviction that these goals would eventually be reached.

Unlike today, where street anarchists and professional agitators are tearing down statues of American icons, King was

celebrating these heroic figures. He opened his speech by referencing the Emancipation Proclamation, calling its author (Lincoln) "a great American." He also credited the Founders, whom he called "the architects of our republic," for writing "the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence."

King knew that the goals of these documents were a work in progress, but he was wise enough to know that the Founders gave us "this promissory note," without which appeals to liberty, equality and justice were impotent. "America has given the Negro people a bad check," he noted, but "we refuse to believe the bank of justice is bankrupt." He never gave up hope, insisting that "Now is the time to make justice for all of God's children." That was a very Christian response.

Now contrast what King said with what our new U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations recently said. Linda Thomas-Greenfield told reporters in New York City that "the original sin of slavery weaved white supremacy into our founding documents and principles." Wrong. It was our inalienable rights that were weaved into our founding documents and principles.

King would have been appalled. He had nothing but praise and admiration for our founding documents and principles. His problem was with our failure to make good on what they embodied, namely the contents of the American creed.

Indeed, it was precisely the documents and principles that galvanized him to act—they were, as he said, the "promissory note." If anything, the existential reality of white supremacy at the time of the founding was the complete opposite of what our creed entailed, and it was this inconsistency that he used, to great effect, to leverage the civil rights movement.

"I have a dream that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character."

This classic statement by King is now seen as contemptible by those who promote critical race theory. The proponents expressly judge people by the color of their skin, treating the content of their character as meaningless. Their demonization of white people—asking them to repent for their alleged positions of privilege—is patently racist. To them, the individual does not count; only his collective ascribed status does. Ironically, that’s what the slavemasters believed about blacks.

Martin Luther King would be very happy with legislation recently passed in Idaho. This law prohibits public schools from teaching that “any sex, race, ethnicity, religion, color, or national origin is inherently superior or inferior.” Who objects? Critical race theory advocates. This explains why the entire Oklahoma City School Board of Education slammed a law that is based on the Idaho legislation. One critic said the non-discrimination law was done to “protect white fragility.”

The governor of Oklahoma, Kevin Stitt, sounded very much like King when he said, “I firmly believe that not one cent of taxpayer money should be used to define and divide Oklahomans by their race or sex.” He added that “We can, and should, teach this history without labeling a young child as an ‘oppressor’ or requiring he or she feel guilt or shame based on their race or sex.”

Rev. Martin Luther King sought to bring the races together. Today’s brand of “anti-racism and discrimination” activists seek to drive the races apart. In doing so they are at odds with the principles upon which our nation was founded. Indeed, they are fomenting racism, thus dishonoring King’s legacy.

THE THORNY ISSUE OF GAY PRIDE

To many Americans, gay pride month is about giving due recognition to lesbians, gays, bisexuals, transgender persons and queers (LGBTQ). These are Americans who have been marginalized because of their status and are seeking an end to it. To be sure, there is near unanimity that bullying of any kind is unacceptable and that unjust discrimination should not be tolerated. Beyond that, the issue gets thorny, though there is a reluctance on the part of elites to admit it.

Today more than ever before, gay activists have succeeded in gaining the support of a large swath of government officials, and an even bigger slice of corporate America. It does not exaggerate to say that these key decision-makers see no reason to tap the brakes on any issue of importance to the LGBTQ community. To that extent, the gay rights movement has been a stunning success.

The Biden administration led the way, offering full-throated support to gay pride month. For example, the U.S. Embassy to the Vatican flew a gay rainbow flag, and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi was front and center celebrating the “beauty, bravery and vibrancy” of this movement.

Similarly, corporate America has signed on to gay pride month in a way that is startling. The biggest banks, department stores, airlines, professional sports teams, liquor and beer companies, hotel chains, TV networks, newspapers, tech companies, and pharmaceutical houses are all on board without reservation. There’s the rub—without reservation.

It is one thing to recognize the equal dignity of all Americans—this is a staple of Catholic teachings—independent of their sexual orientation; it is quite another to endorse everything associated with the gay pride agenda.

For example, why is it necessary for those elites who want to

show respect for LGBTQ people to remain silent about the child abuse that is taking place in the name of gay pride? To be specific, anyone who sanctions sex transitioning for minors is promoting child abuse, whether it is intentional or not. Most teens who express a desire to transition will change their mind if given time. Moreover, hormone blockers are irreversible and the next step is sex reassignment surgery. From what we know, the results, in terms of wellbeing, are not auspicious.

Another issue that must be addressed is a close look at who the founders of the gay rights movement were and what they stood for. Their profile is not inspiring.

Harry Hay is regarded by many as the founder of the gay rights movement. He not only endorsed adults having sex with minors, he said the young men would love it. "If the parents and friends of gays are truly friends of gays," he said, "they would know from their gay kids that the relationship with an older man is precisely what thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen-year-old kids need more than anything else in the world." He was also a supporter of NAMBLA, the gay pedophile group.

Brenda Howard is responsible for the first gay pride march held in 1970. Known as the "Mother of Pride," the bisexual was a devotee of sadomasochism, bondage and polyamorous relationships. Gilbert Baker created the rainbow flag. He was an anti-Catholic bigot drag queen who went by the name "Busty Ross," a play on Betsy Ross.

Allen Ginsberg is known as among the first intellectuals associated with the modern gay rights movement. He was a strong defender of NAMBLA, the organization committed to normalizing child molestation. Larry Kramer founded ACT-UP, some of whose members crashed St. Patrick's Cathedral during a Sunday Mass and spat the Eucharist on the floor; Kramer was also a NAMBLA advocate. Harvey Milk, the famous San Francisco activist and politician, was heralded by President Obama.

According to the gay author Randy Shilts, who wrote a book about him, Milk also had sex with minors.

Last year, statues of iconic Americans were destroyed by urban anarchists. Every effort was made to eradicate historic figures from American history texts, and annual celebrations in their name came under fierce attack. The elites, almost without exception, stood by and watched; some applauded.

If these Americans are worthy of being scrubbed from our history, why should those who founded the gay rights movement not be excised as well?

Make no mistake about it, the Catholic League is opposed to censoring American history, regardless of the profile of those who shaped it. Ditto for those who crafted the gay pride movement. Even seriously flawed persons are capable of making notable public achievements. And judging those who lived long ago by today's standards smacks of ethnocentrism.

The duplicity, though, is repugnant. Why is it okay to trash Harry Truman but not Harry Hay? Those who launched the cancel culture—they are all on the left—cannot now claim that what they started should stop at their doorstep. If they want to recognize flawed gay leaders, let them recognize flawed American heroes.

The best path forward is to cancel the cancel culture and stop with selective moral indignation.

BIDEN, THE BISHOPS AND

COMMUNION

The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops will meet June 16 for a few days to discuss many issues, among them being what to do about President Biden's suitability to receive Communion.

It appears that most bishops consider several of the president's policies to be at odds with some Catholic teachings. The question is what to do about it. This would not matter much if the president were not a Catholic. What makes matters worse is that he and those in his administration boast of his Catholic status.

Some Catholics, as well as those who are not Catholic, are confused. The Catholic Church teaches that we must respect the right to life of the unborn. It also insists that we cannot accept the notion that men can "transition" to women, and vice versa. These are two fundamental biological realities, both of which are under assault. Worse, Biden is one of those leading the charge.

This, of course, raises the question of Biden's Catholicity. Is he a Catholic in good standing when he leads efforts to undercut Catholic teachings on such grave matters? If he is, what would it take for him to be sanctioned? If he is not, what should be done about it?

In May, the Vatican issued directives to the bishops instructing them to be careful about adopting stringent policies. Indeed, it laid down conditions that tilt favorably to Catholic politicians like Biden who persist in rejecting Church teachings on serious matters. The bishops are faced with some tough decisions.

WHY DID BIDEN NIX GOD IN PRAYER ADDRESS?

President Biden raised more than eyebrows when he omitted any mention of God in his National Day of Prayer proclamation. What he did was unprecedented: No previous president has failed to mention God since the day it was created in 1952 by a joint resolution of Congress and signed into law by President Harry Truman.

When asked about Biden's omission, Rev. Franklin Graham was generous in his remarks. "It was probably a staff person that wrote it and maybe not even ran it by him—because I don't think Joe Biden would have approved that one." Maybe.

Even if Graham is right, that doesn't settle the issue. Why would a speechwriter nix God from a presidential speech about prayer?

It is no secret that the Democratic Party is home to secularists. Those who have no religious affiliation, as well as agnostics and atheists, have laid anchor in the Party, many of whom are openly hostile to religion and people of faith. It is not a leap to conclude that this mentality colored Biden's prepared remarks.

Last summer, Secular Democrats of America was welcomed at the Democratic National Convention. They were given three panels to voice their concerns, and they did not hold back in lambasting Christian conservatives. At another session, held on August 18, 2020, hundreds of secular Democrats tuned in to an event hosted by this group. It featured congressmen, state lawmakers and activists: they focused on what they said were constitutional threats made by some Christians.

Last fall, Humanists for Biden was established, an offshoot of Secular Democrats of America. It was headed by a professor who calls himself a chaplain, even though he is an atheist and the term chaplain refers to a clergyman.

In December, Secular Democrats of America submitted a 28-page report to Joe Biden and Kamala Harris outlining their animus against religious liberty. They essentially want to secularize religious institutions, gutting most religious exemptions. Their demonization of white Christians was perhaps the most odious aspect of the report.

Militant secularists have long hated the National Day of Prayer. In 2003, the American Humanist Association established a National Day of Reason; even the secular-minded media ignore it. Cribbing off the National Day of Prayer, which is celebrated on the first Thursday in May, the atheists chose the same day to mark their event. Looks like it didn't accomplish too much this year—there were no events. “There is no specific location where this holiday is celebrated,” it said.

In 2010, Freedom From Religion Foundation, a Christian-bashing atheist organization, argued in court that the National Day of Prayer was unconstitutional. It won in a district court but lost on appeal. A federal appeals court ruled that the organization lacked standing, adding that its “feeling of alienation” was not sufficient grounds to file suit. “Hurt feelings differ from legal injury,” the court said.

The National Day of Prayer Task Force organizes this annual event; it is privately funded. Those who are averse to prayer are free to ignore it. But those who choose to participate are expected to pay tribute to God, which is why what President Biden did was inexplicable at best and objectionable at worst.

To the extent that Biden's remarks reflect the sentiments of those who are running the White House, this does not speak

well for him or his administration. More important, it doesn't bode well for the country.

ETHICS OF FETAL RESEARCH UNDER BIDEN

Too many Americans find it hard to get worked up about fetal research. Perhaps if they knew more about the moral implications of such practices, they would be more concerned. Once we treat the least among us as “material,” bad things happen. Consider the following.

In 2019, a jury awarded \$58 million in damages to ten plaintiffs after finding that the Biological Resource Center in Phoenix had deceived families into donating the body of a deceased family member. The families thought the body would be used for medical research. Instead, the bodies were dismembered and sold for profit.

FBI agents raided the facility in 2014 and found chopped up bodies in buckets, including feet, shoulders, legs, and spines. Freezers were packed with penises. They even found a torso with a different head sewn on, reminiscent of “Frankenstein.” The owner of the human chop shop, Stephen Gore, was convicted of deceiving the families who donated the bodies; he also broke the law by deceiving the buyers who were sold body parts with infectious diseases.

How could something like this happen? It's actually not hard to understand. When we objectify human beings, treating them as inanimate objects, such practices logically follow.

The Catholic Church has a long and proud record of opposing

attempts to dehumanize men, women, and children, ranging from denouncing pagan practices such as infanticide to Nazi eugenics. Their latest salvo is a shot at the Biden administration for lifting limits on human fetal research that were placed by the Trump administration.

Archbishop Joseph Naumann, chairman of the bishops' conference on Pro-Life Activities, released a statement on April 21 that was superb. "The bodies of children killed by abortion deserve the same respect as that of any other person. Our government has no right to treat innocent abortion victims as a commodity that can be scavenged for body parts to be used for research. It is unethical to promote and subsidize research that can lead to legitimizing the violence of abortion."

White House press secretary Jen Psaki was asked about this statement on April 27. She said the White House "respectfully disagrees," explaining that "it's important to invest in science and look for opportunities to cure diseases."

As expected, she never acknowledged the humanity of the unborn child. If she were to do so, the administration that she serves would have to rescind many executive orders and other policy prescriptions that service the pro-abortion industry. They would never do that—they have too much invested in the culture of death.

It's easy to ignore the humanity of the unborn if we call fetal tissue "material." That was the choice of words used by Planned Parenthood in the 70s. In the 80s, Newsweek described the dismembered body of an unborn baby extracted in a D&E abortion as "fetal material being pulled from a woman's vagina." In the same decade, Rachel Conrad Wahlberg, an abortion-rights advocate, contended that the unborn do not have an independent existence. Referring to the pregnant woman, she said, "It is hers. It is her *possession* (*italic in the original*)."

The same mindset marked the *Dred Scott* decision that legalized slavery. In the 1857 Supreme Court decision, the court affirmed public opinion by noting that black people were “articles of property and merchandise.” Nearly 400 blacks were used as guinea pigs in the infamous Tuskegee experiment that began in 1932. For 40 years, rural sharecroppers who took part in the experiment never knew they had syphilis, nor were treated for it. They were not seen as human beings with rights equal to that of others.

After World War I, prisoners in San Quentin received transplanted sex organs from rams, goats, and boars. Tuberculosis treatments were tested on other prisoners. Inmates of Stateville Correctional Center in Illinois were exposed to malaria in the hope that a cure could be found. The drug companies had a field day experimenting on the incarcerated, and did so without controversy right up until the 1970s.

Not only were prisoners seen as subhuman, so were mentally retarded children. From the mid-1950s to 1970, those housed at Willowbrook State School in Staten Island, New York were infected with hepatitis so that doctors could track the spread of the viral infection. More than 700 children were infected to see how they responded to a drug treatment.

After what Jews went through at the hands of Nazi physician Josef Mengele—he performed painful and often deadly experiments on twins—it led to the establishment of the Nuremberg Code, a guideline for conducting research on humans. The first stricture insists that the subject must provide consent before research can begin.

A child in his mother’s womb can never give consent.

Archbishop Naumann got it right when he said “it is deeply offensive to millions of Americans for our tax dollars to be used for research that collaborates with an industry built on

the taking of innocent lives.” Worse, this morally indefensible decision was rendered by our “devout Catholic” president.

BIDEN’S BORDER PROBLEM IS EXPLODING

President Biden is getting high marks for his overall performance, but if there is one issue that is dogging him, it is the crisis at the border. He even refuses to call it a crisis. Indeed, neither he nor his border-in-chief vice president has shown any interest in visiting the border.

Two new surveys spell disaster for the president on this subject. A Pew Research Center poll found that almost 7 in 10 Americans say Biden is doing a bad job dealing with the increasing number of migrants who are crashing our border. Most want more staffing and resources made available to handle the throngs of people, often unaccompanied children, who are seeking asylum. The majority also favor improving the safety and sanitary conditions facing these people.

The public knows that the situation is worse now than before. In fact, over the past year there has been a 20% increase in the share of Americans who say illegal immigration is a “very big” national problem.

A poll by tippinsights (TIPP), commissioned by the National Sheriffs’ Association, found that 55% of Americans think the border crisis is making matters worse for migrant women, many of whom are forced into indentured servitude and prostitution. Almost 6 in 10 say that the increase in migrants who are suffering (e.g., drowning) is preventable. Half believe the

southern border crisis is contributing to the spread of Covid.

Since Biden took office, he has issued almost 100 executive orders on immigration, approximately half of which reversed initiatives taken by the Trump administration. According to Rep. Scott Franklin, "What's happening to our border is unprecedented. We are on track for more illegal border crossings in 2021 than any time in the past 15 years—perhaps ever."

Biden is not only out-of-step with the public; he is at odds with the bishops as well.

The bishops along the border of the United States and northern Mexico released a joint statement in April saying, "Undoubtedly, nations have a right to maintain their borders. This is vital to their sovereignty and self-determination. At the same time, there is a shared responsibility of all nations to preserve human life and provide for safe, orderly, and humane immigration, including the right to asylum."

The Pew survey suggests that the public and these bishops are pretty much on the same page. We need to protect our borders and improve conditions for migrants. It is Biden who is out of sync.

A Lexis-Nexis search of Donald Trump and "we must protect our borders" turned up 884 instances where his name appeared with these words in a news story. A search of Joe Biden on this measure turned up one (that was over a year ago, and it was conditional in nature).

We need to know why. Why is there such reluctance on the part of President Biden and Vice President Kamala Harris to speak forthrightly about this issue? Why do they seemingly want to have more illegal aliens in our country? Moreover, Harris needs to stop with talk about "root causes." It is a dodge: If we treated every problem this way, it would be a prescription for paralysis.

At the very least, Harris needs to speak directly to those who are suffering, as well as to border patrol agents who are burdened by current policies. That, however, cannot be done from Washington, D.C.

FLORIDA AND INDIANA LEAD ON SCHOOL CHOICE

Policymakers who wish to offer a preferential option for the poor should mirror recent legislation passed in Florida and Indiana, two states that have demonstrated the effectiveness of school vouchers.

Recently, Florida has expanded its existing school choice vouchers making them available for more families. Already one of the most ambitious voucher programs in the country, last academic year the state offered more than 36,000 students an average of \$7,000.

Additionally, Florida created special-needs scholarships for about 20,000 students. These scholarships are similar to education savings accounts that families can use for tutoring and related purposes. But perhaps one of the best elements of this is that it offers Florida students already enrolled in Catholic or charter schools eligibility for these vouchers.

Indiana, too, has recently expanded its decade-old voucher program. Indiana will now offer vouchers to 48,000 students a year. Families making \$145,000 a year would be eligible for vouchers amounting to 90 percent of tuition support levels. Like Florida, the Hoosier State would establish education savings accounts for children with special needs. Further, Indiana's budget increases per student grants for charter

schools.

In a recent interview, former Indiana Gov. Mitch Daniels, who signed Indiana's first school voucher bill into law, reflected on the success of the program. "Providing poor and minority families the same choice of schools that their wealthier neighbors enjoy is the purest example of 'social justice' in our society today."

WISCONSIN ATTORNEY GENERAL OVERREACHES

Wisconsin Attorney General Josh Kaul recently announced that he was going to launch an investigation into sexual abuse in the five dioceses of the Catholic Church in Wisconsin.

Bill Donohue wrote to him about his plan. "I am not sure how much you know about this issue," he said, "but you should know that *almost all the molesting priests (who comprised a very small portion of the clergy) are either dead or no longer in ministry.*" Donohue noted that he has a book coming out this fall on this subject.

"In the course of my research," Donohue said, "I found that there is virtually no segment of society where adults intermingle with minors where this has not been a problem, beginning, sadly, in the home. Will you undertake a probe of stepfathers and live-in-boyfriends? Trial lawyers have zero interest in doing so—there's no money in it for them. Will you investigate all the clergy—probing all religions—or will you focus exclusively on Roman Catholic priests? Will you address the public schools?"

Donohue brought to Kaul's attention a 2014 survey by the Wisconsin Department of Health Services which found that one in five students in the state (19.9%) said that someone forced them "to do sexual things they did not want to do." In 2016, USA Today did a major study of this problem in the public schools across the nation. Wisconsin's overall score was a "C," but it received an "F" in "Sharing Misconduct Information."

"In other words," Donohue wrote, "Wisconsin shipped molesting teachers off to some other school without letting them know what they were getting. This is so common in the public schools that it is called 'passing the trash.' Regrettably, Wisconsin has lots of trash. USA Today found that 80 educators had their licenses revoked yet weren't listed in the national clearinghouse of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification."

It seems that some public officials in Wisconsin have an animus against the Catholic Church. In 2019, there was an attempt to bust the seal of the confessional—forcing priests to disclose confidential information they may have learned about sexual abuse. We asked at the time where the evidence was that this is such a problem. No one had any. We also asked if the lawyer-client privilege and the exemption afforded psychologists and psychiatrists would also be violated. Of course not. Alas, the bill died.

Donohue concluded by saying, "The only ones happy about an investigation of the Catholic Church are rapacious trial lawyers, motivated by greed and ideology, and anti-Catholic organizations such as Freedom From Religion Foundation (it is already cheering you on)."

The selective probing of old cases of abuse does nothing to further the cause of justice; it also smacks of bias. Moreover, given Wisconsin's record in the public schools, it appears there is much that needs to be done to ameliorate

current conditions. It was on this basis that Donohue asked Kaul to reconsider his plan.