

# CHRISTIAN GENOCIDE UNFURLS; JIHADISTS ON THE MARCH

The Middle East is coming apart as murderous Muslim madmen move from nation to nation killing everyone who does not accept their twisted beliefs. Christians, Jews, Kurds, the Yezidi—even Muslims who differ with them—are being slaughtered. Children are being beheaded, crucifixions are rampant, and monasteries are being ransacked, all in the name of Islam.

In the middle of August, Bill Donohue spoke at length with [cnsnews.com](http://cnsnews.com) about the situation. “President Obama over the weekend made a comment that we don’t want winners and we don’t want the vanquished. But that’s just plain silly. You can’t have two winners in war. You can’t have two winners in baseball. As far as I am concerned, you either have the forces of freedom or you have the forces of death. The Muslim jihadists are the forces of death.”

Referring to the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria, Donohue said, “ISIS is not like any other force that we’ve seen. If in fact they quit al Qaeda because al Qaeda was considered too wimpy, then you’re dealing with people who cannot be stopped by dialogue and diplomacy. So they have to be met with force.”

The Holy See’s Permanent Observer to the United Nations in Geneva, Archbishop Silvano Tomasi, referenced the U.N. Charter, saying, “there might be occasions in the life and in the relations between states when dialogue, negotiations, fail and large numbers of people find themselves at risk: at risk of genocide, at risk of having their fundamental, their basic human rights violated.”

Tomasi got very specific: “In this case, when every other means has been attempted, article 42 of the Charter of the

United Nations becomes possible justification for not only imposing sanctions of economic nature on the state or the group or the region that violates the basic human rights of people, but also the use of force. All the force that is necessary to stop this evil and this tragedy.”

The Pontifical Council for Interreligious Dialogue also weighed in with a list of specific atrocities committed by the terrorists. It called upon all religious leaders, “especially Muslims” to step up and use whatever pressure they had to end the violence.

It is important that the Islamic State barbarians not simply be contained, but defeated. We are dealing with a roving band of 15,000 militants; the likes of which the world has not seen since Pol Pot’s “killing fields” in the 1970s.

It is up to President Obama and our western allies to put an end to this genocide.

---

## **D.C. LIBRARY PIVOTS**

Over the summer we learned that the Library of Congress had scheduled a presentation titled, “The Book and the Reformation,” sponsored by the Rare Book and Special Collections Division.

We certainly did not object to an event on the Reformation, but what caught our eye was the way the Library of Congress flagged it. The flyer it disseminated was clearly anti-Catholic: There was a drawing of the pope as Satan, with the inscription, “Ego sum Papa,” or, “I am the Pope.”

We issued a news release asking those on our email list to

contact the communications director at the Library. The first reaction was defensive and sophomoric. We received a phone call from the chief of the Rare Books Division saying he has been “inundated” with criticism by people who are upset with a “600-year-old image” that he says is not anti-Catholic. He failed to say why a drawing of the pope as Satan might not be seen as offensive. Bill Donohue commented, “If I were to draw a picture of his loved ones depicting them as Satan, perhaps a light bulb would go off in his head. Perhaps.”

The second reaction was more mature: the bigoted depiction of the pope as Satan was deleted. This was a quick victory.

Mr. Rare Books who called our office ended his conversation by asking, “Is the Catholic League connected to Bill Donohue?” When he found out the answer, he said, “That explains a lot.” Donohue replied, “And it explains a lot about him that he had to be told how to do his job.”

---

## THE QUEST TO SCALP A BISHOP

*This is a special report which was originally published in the September 2014 issue of Catalyst.*

The Catholic Church has many enemies these days, some of whom are ex-Catholics who left the Church a long time ago. They are joined by the disaffected, those who pretend (even convincing themselves) that they are Catholics in good standing. Most of these malcontents are lay men and women, but some are priests, and a few are nuns. All of them are animated by a strong rejection of the Church’s teachings on sexuality. Because they have the support of the secular media, they comprise a formidable group.

What motivates them today is the debased desire to take down a bishop. Not any bishop: They want to drop a bishop who is an outspoken defender of the faith. They really get excited when they learn of a diocese that was riddled with dissidents and is now almost dissident free.

Geopolitics is at work, as well. While they will work overtime to disable a bishop anywhere in the nation, they prefer to scalp a bishop from the Mid-West. Why? Because that's where many of them live. It's also because it is easier for activists to dominate the news in mid-size cities, as opposed to larger ones where it is much more difficult. Their attacks are orchestrated and well-coordinated: lawyers feed the activists and they feed the media.

Cardinal Raymond Burke, formerly the Archbishop of St. Louis and now the prefect of the Vatican's highest court, has drawn the enmity of Mid-Western dissidents for years. He is despised because of his denunciations of Catholic public figures who reject the Church's teachings that bear on public policy issues. Burke's critics have no problem with the Nancy Pelosi who continually claim their Catholic status while doing everything they can to undermine the Church. They have a problem with him.

New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan hails from St. Louis and was the Milwaukee archbishop before coming to the Big Apple. He is hated because he cleaned up after his disgraced predecessor, Archbishop Rembert Weakland. Though Weakland embarrassed himself and the Church, he is still revered in left-wing Catholic quarters. He is liked because his views are similar to theirs.

They tried to take Dolan down because he moved the perpetual care fund, which was part of the regular archdiocesan accounts, to a cemetery trust fund. It did not matter that he was following the advice of his Financial Council; what mattered was that his enemies could play fast-and-loose with a

contrived controversy. When Dolan moved to New York, they stayed on his trail. Terence McKiernan, the founder of BishopAccountability, pledged a few years ago to “stick it” to Dolan, and has accused him of “keeping the lid on 55 priests.” Several attempts by me challenging McKiernan to release the names have failed. It’s a lie and he knows it.

When Bishop John Myers of Peoria took over the Newark archdiocese, his enemies followed him. They went wild when it was learned that a priest was not being properly supervised after he had an encounter with a teenager 12 years earlier; he grabbed the boy while wrestling with him (in front of the boy’s mother). In fact, what was really bothering his critics were Myers’ strong positions on sexuality. The editorial page editor of the *Newark Star-Ledger*, an angry ex-Catholic, specifically took umbrage with Myers for his defense of “marriage and life.”

Bishop Robert Finn of Kansas City-St. Joseph inherited a mess made by dissidents and cleaned it up. That made him a target. His enemies seized on the antics of a disturbed priest who took crotch-shot pictures of kids. It is important to note that the review board was contacted, the authorities were notified, and an independent investigation was ordered. But because much more offensive photos were later taken, Finn was found guilty of one misdemeanor for not reporting suspected child abuse. Had he done nothing, no one would have known about the priest because there was no complainant. No matter, they wanted his head and are still after him.

St. Louis Archbishop Robert Carlson was recently the victim of a campaign by anti-Catholics who tried to frame him. Their goal was to promote the pernicious idea that he did not know that child abuse was against the law. It failed, but what counts is that they tried. Because Carlson fought back, and because he rejects the libertine ideas of his critics, they sought to bring him down.

No one has endured a more vicious assault on his character than John Nienstedt, Archbishop of St. Paul and Minneapolis. Before examining his case, it is time to disclose who the principal players are in this quest to scalp a bishop.

Attorney Jeffrey Anderson, the Survivors Network of Those Abused by Priests (SNAP), and the *National Catholic Reporter* are leading the charge. Anderson is from St. Paul, SNAP honcho David Clohessy lives in St. Louis, and the *Reporter's* home is Kansas City, Missouri. All of them find a sympathetic ear with the media.

The *Kansas City Star*, the Minneapolis *Star Tribune*, and the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* are their biggest fans. Outside of the Mid-West, they have friends at the *New York Times*, *Boston Globe*, National Public Radio and *Commonweal* magazine; the latter has become increasingly strident.

Anderson is a tiny man with a big ego. A recovering alcoholic, he once described himself as a "dedicated atheist." His goal, he has admitted, is to "sue the s\*\*\* out of them" [the Catholic Church]. He has made good on his pledge; he is one of the richest lawyers in the nation. While he likes to sue Mid-Western bishops, the big prize for him remains the pope; several attempts to implicate the Vatican have failed.

In August, SNAP gave Anderson an award for his work. Or was it for his money? It is a matter of record that Anderson has lavishly greased Clohessy's efforts. David Clohessy, who indicts bishops for not reporting the slightest boundary violation to the authorities, never called the cops when he learned that his brother, a priest, was accused of molesting a minor. He also admits to lying to the media, though that has cost him nothing.

Four years after the *National Catholic Reporter* was launched, it came under attack by its Ordinary, Bishop Charles Herman Helmsing, for its "poisonous character" and attacks on the

Church. He said the paper had no right to claim the title "Catholic," a view that is not uncommon among many bishops today. Indeed, some experts maintain that the use of "Catholic" in its title is canonically illicit. The *Reporter* does not support the Church's teachings on sexuality, and it gives voice to those seeking to undermine the Church's hierarchy.

These are the main protagonists in the war on bishops, and they are the ones who have Archbishop Nienstedt in their sights. Along with Minnesota Public Radio and other media outlets, their pursuit of a bishop's scalp is so transparent that no objective observer could conclude otherwise.

Nienstedt got off on the wrong foot with these people when he took over from Bishop Raymond Lucker in New Ulm. He inherited a cadre of committed *National Catholic Reporter* types and moved with dispatch to restore order. There was much to clean up. Consider that Lucker wrote a book prodding the Church to change its teachings on 15 issues, including homosexuality. When he learned of a priest who had molested a minor, Father Francis Markey, Lucker moved him to another parish and school. Markey was a drug addict and a homosexual who preyed on teenage boys. By contrast, it took Nienstedt to discipline another miscreant priest soon after he took over from Lucker; he placed him on administrative leave without faculties.

Not surprisingly, Lucker liked the dissident priest character in the ABC-TV show "Nothing Sacred." Indeed, he loved the show so much that he signed a newspaper ad in the late 1990s condemning me for boycotting the show's sponsors. Bishop Thomas Gumbleton, who attends SNAP conferences, also signed the letter. Cardinal Roger Mahony also liked the show: He gave the actor who played Father Ray an award. No media outlet worshipped the show more than the *Reporter*. When we killed the show, a dissident Brooklyn nun held a prayer vigil commemorating her loss.

Bishop Lucker is relevant to the Nienstedt story because those out to get the archbishop never showed any interest in sacking his predecessor. As long as a bishop adopts the right positions, as defined by left-wing haters and angry ex-Catholics, he will get a pass, no matter what his record is. This is the real cover-up.

If there were two triggers that ignited the assault on Nienstedt it was his public defense of marriage, properly understood, and his criticism of the pro-homosexual film, "Brokeback Mountain." Had he said nothing about a ballot initiative recognizing the right of two men to marry, and had he been equally agnostic on the gay cowboy movie, he never would have been targeted by the Church's enemies.

It is against this backdrop that, out-of-the-blue, Nienstedt was accused of touching a boy's behind when posing for a group photo; the archbishop stepped down and called for an investigation. No other leader, religious or secular, would ever do so. Of course, he was exonerated. Then came more accusations, dating back many years ago, that he engaged in improper behavior with seminarians and priests (an ex-priest surfaced charging that Nienstedt once touched his neck). Again, the archbishop called for a probe, this time hiring a respected law firm.

From my perspective, there were two disturbed priests, both homosexuals, who should have been treated differently; their acting out occurred before Nienstedt took over. Red flags were ignored, and in one case, the fact that the priest was a homosexual actually redounded to his favor (they didn't want to out him). One of these two offending priests was permanently removed from ministry in the fall 2012, and the other was put on a leave of absence in the spring 2013 (he is not involved in ministry pending the completion of an investigation).

In October 2013, Nienstedt said, "There are no offending



priests in active ministry in our archdiocese.” This was disputed by Jennifer Haselberger, a canon lawyer who resigned from the archdiocese earlier that year. As it turned out, Nienstedt did not lie, but neither was he accurate. He did not know that two priests who had been accused of “boundary violations” were still in ministry. Their inappropriate behavior was not criminal and did not involve sexual abuse. Still, their status became a source of controversy. Two months later they agreed to a leave of absence; this was subsequent to a review by a Los Angeles firm, hired by the archdiocese, to see if there were any active clergy members in ministry with allegations against them.

In 2014, Nienstedt learned of an accused priest who escaped supervision. Though the priest was told not to celebrate Mass, he occasionally did so on weekends. He retired in 1998, and was the subject of allegations made against him in the 1980s about inappropriate behavior dating back to the early 1960s. As soon as Archbishop Nienstedt found out about this priest’s violation of trust, he had his faculties removed.

These constitute missteps, but they hardly justify the hysterical reaction against Nienstedt that has taken place. Media reports would have us believe that Nienstedt was involved in a major cover-up of known child molesters. This is patently false and a disservice to a great man. No, his big sin is his orthodoxy, not his decision-making. It is he who has been victimized: anonymous accusers, angry former employees, and a cadre of militants, are out to level him.

Haselberger is the darling of *Commonweal*, Minnesota Public Radio, and SNAP; she spoke at the latter’s conference in August. It is a source of great irony that she was suspended by the archdiocese for failing to deal expeditiously with a complaint, yet her signature complaint against the archdiocese is that it didn’t move expeditiously to deal with accused priests.

Over the summer, Haselberger submitted an affidavit to Anderson claiming to have endured “months of harassment, threats, and intimidation”; she pledged to provide examples. In fact, she provided not a single example of being threatened by anyone, and the examples that she offered of being harassed and intimidated are so weak they only work to undermine her credibility. Moreover, even she admits to at least 17 occasions where her version of events differed with that of her co-workers.

A week before Haselberger gave her affidavit, *Commonweal* printed a lengthy article detailing what she told them: the archbishop was under investigation for inappropriate sexual conduct with seminarians and former priests. Nienstedt announced the investigation on the same day, July 1, claiming innocence. She leaked this information after having learned of it from the law firm that was conducting an investigation, a probe initiated by Nienstedt.

Exactly one week after Haselberger’s uncontested affidavit was taken, Minnesota Public Radio aired a documentary that featured all the familiar players, complete with piped-in melodramatic music. For an outlet that prides itself on objectivity, it was nothing but a left-wing hit job. That teed things up for Anderson, who conveniently released Haselberger’s statement the next day. The day after that, Laurie Goodstein published her story in the *New York Times*, and two days later her newspaper published a scathing editorial on Nienstedt. On the same day, July 18, two journalists, one from the *National Catholic Reporter*, called for the archbishop to resign. This set the tone for Minnesota newspapers which then called for him to resign.

We decided to do a little investigating of our own: I asked the staff to research the internal policies that these media outlets have on employee misconduct, including violations of the law. A senior PR person from the *Star Tribune* initially got back to us saying we would hear from someone in the

editorial office. But no one ever contacted us.

The *St. Cloud Times* is a Gannett paper, and the parent company has a policy on what to do when an employee learns of "violations of the law or Company policy." It says nothing about reporting law violations to the authorities; all they need to do is report illegalities to their supervisor. The *New York Times* is the most shameless of them all.

The *Times* has a Business Ethics Policy that if adopted by the bishops would lead to calls for their mass resignation. "Any employee who becomes aware of any conduct that he or she believes to be prohibited by this Policy *or a violation of the law*...is expected to promptly report the facts forming the basis of that belief or knowledge to any supervisor of the legal department." (My italics.) In other words, crimes of sexual harassment need not be reported to the authorities. Now what if a false accusation is made against a fellow employee? They are subject "to discipline up to and including termination." The bishops should adopt this policy.

If this isn't hypocritical enough, consider that the former head honcho of the BBC, Mark Thompson, was made president and CEO of the *New York Times* after it was disclosed that he was told of a cover-up: a scheduled BBC documentary on BBC icon and serial child rapist Jimmy Savile was spiked for political reasons. Thompson wanted nothing to stop his quest to land the coveted *Times* job, so he played dumb. But we subsequently learned that he knew all about the decision to nix the film.

Nienstedt has tried to reach out to the media to tell his side of the story, but what interests them is not his account, it is his sexuality. To be exact, they want to know what he does in bed, and with whom: three media outlets questioned him about his sexual behavior. He told the *Star Tribune*, "No, I'm not gay. And I'm not anti-gay." When asked by the *Pioneer Press* if he had had sex with men since becoming archbishop, he said, "No. Not even before." A homosexual reporter for KMSP,

Fox 9 Minneapolis, also asked the archbishop about his sexuality.

Those out to get Nienstedt cannot be shamed, but they can be stopped. Unfortunately, too many Catholic activists and writers who know he is being railroaded have gone mute. This must end. We cannot stand by and watch these anti-Catholic zealots carry the day.

---

## **WE STAND WITH ARCHBISHOP NIENSTEDT**

St. Paul and Minneapolis Archbishop John Nienstedt is the target of a well organized attack by some very vindictive people. As my special report makes clear (see Special Reports), he is not the only bishop drawing fire these days; bishops from the Mid-West are particularly open to assault. We cannot allow a small but determined band of activists and media outlets to get away with their quest for a bishop's scalp.

The Catholic League proudly stands with Archbishop Nienstedt and all those bishops who are being unfairly maligned.

Bill Donohue

---

# **NEW DIRECTOR OF COMMUNICATIONS**

Marc M. Mullen, Esq. has been appointed the Catholic League's new director of communications.

Marc has been a practicing attorney in New York since 2003. He comes to us from the firm of Kwiatkowski & Kwiatkowski, LLP. He is a graduate of Iona College and Touro Law Center. Active in his Floral Park, Long Island parish, Our Lady of Victory, he and his wife Janine, who is a School Counselor at St. Mary's Elementary School in Manhasset, have three children.

---

## **OBAMA REJECTS RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION**

For 20 years, Congress failed to pass the Employment Non-Discrimination Act (ENDA), suggesting that the legislation must be burdened with more than just a few controversial features. President Clinton and President Bush respected the right of the legislature not to pass the bill, but President Obama is different: he said he signed it because the bill had stalled in the Congress. Why we need the Congress at all he did not explain.

The president not only issued an Executive Order imposing ENDA, he chose to sign that version of the bill which fails to grant a religious exemption; all he did was to preserve the limited religious exemption that was coined by the Bush administration. He explicitly rejected several proposals that would have insulated religious institutions from state

overreach. This is critical because of what is at stake: ENDA applies to “sex, sexual orientation [and] gender identity”; as we have learned, this includes behavior, not simply status.

Earlier versions of this bill said that “This Act shall not apply to a religious organization,” but in 2007 this exemption was made conditional. President Obama, who has no aversion to exemptions—over 100 million are exempt from his signature ObamaCare legislation—cannot bring himself to exempt religious institutions whenever the issue touches on homosexuality. Which is why the bishops oppose ENDA.

Most reasonable persons distinguish between sexual orientation and sexual behavior, but not this gay-friendly, religion-unfriendly, administration. What does this mean? Look for cross-dressers and other lovely types to spring forward demanding their rights. Look for homosexuals to sue Catholic institutions that do business with the federal government insisting on pension benefits for their “spouse.”

The heart of the problem is (a) the mad idea that sexuality is a social construction, when, in fact, it is rooted in nature, and (b) an unyielding hostility to religious liberty.

---

## **NEW ASSAULT ON RELIGIOUS RIGHTS**

Anticipating a loss in the *Hobby Lobby* case, the Obama administration, together with Congressional Democrats, worked overtime this year on a law that would effectively gut the high court ruling. They also plotted to gut the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), upon which the case was based. This assault on the First Amendment was recently presented

when the Senate voted on the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act.

RFRA was passed by an almost unanimous decision in 1993, and was signed by President Clinton. The sponsors of this new bill said they were not taking aim at RFRA, but in fact they were: it is a stop-gap measure designed to cripple RFRA. Rep. Diana DeGette, a co-author of the House version of this law, has already stated that this bill is "an interim solution"; she pledged to then "look at broader issues, including the Religious Freedom Restoration Act." Their goal is to ultimately kill RFRA.

This new bill has been a deliberate attempt to circumvent the will of the Congress, as expressed in RFRA, and the Supreme Court's *Hobby Lobby* ruling. It was being done in the name of women's rights, but its real impulse is to privatize religious expression, relegating it to the margins of society. Moreover, this bill had nothing to do with contraception, per se: the *Hobby Lobby* decision was driven by the right of some private employers not to pay for abortion procedures. This bill would force all employers to pay for abortifacients, and ultimately all abortions.

This law also sought to ratify the most odious elements of the Health and Human Services mandate: it wanted to redefine what constitutes a Catholic non-profit, effectively punishing Catholic social service agencies for not discriminating against non-Catholics.

The Catholic League strongly supports the statement that was released by Cardinal Seán O'Malley and Archbishop William Lori on this law: we need more religious rights, not less.

---

# BID TO KILL RELIGIOUS RIGHTS FAILS

Recently, the Senate voted on the Protect Women's Health from Corporate Interference Act.

The assault on religious liberty lost as the Senate failed to achieve the 60 votes necessary to advance this bill. While the outcome is welcome, the fact that a majority of Senators, almost all Democrats, are still bent on eviscerating the religious liberty rights of Americans is very disturbing. It seems they will stop at nothing to trample on our First Amendment freedoms.

The vote has been widely misreported by the media as a vote on contraception. It was not. The issue was abortion, not contraception. All four of the procedures that plaintiffs for Hobby Lobby cited in their brief involved at least the possibility that a pregnancy might be terminated; prevention and termination are not identical. Moreover, this company does not object to providing contraceptives. Ergo, attempts to override the high court's decision has nothing to do with contraception.

The lust for abortion is sickening, and the war on religion is equally contemptuous. Outside the Capitol a few weeks ago there were anti-Catholic protesters flagging their signs, "KEEP YOUR ROSARIES OFF MY OVARIES." The bigots were from Code Pink, the far left-wing band of activists. But the Catholic League won't look for Nancy Pelosi to condemn them, even though she loves to tout what a "devout Catholic" she is.

---



# TOO MANY CATHOLICS ON THE BENCH?

“Once again an all-Catholic, all-male, all-ultra-conservative majority of five has voted en bloc to eviscerate fundamental rights,” said Annie Laurie Gaylor of the atheist Freedom From Religion Foundation. Yup. Catholics always conspire to do things “en bloc” (save for Sonia).

“Court’s Catholic Justices Attack Women’s Rights” was the headline of Margery Eagan’s *Boston Herald* article (it’s those Catholics again). The American Humanist Association issued a statement with a picture of a rosary next to birth control pills. Cute.

In the Huffington Post, Ryan Grim noted that “these men [the five judges who voted for religious liberty] are Christians.” He also said, “The Supreme Court ruled Monday that Christian business owners are special.” Bill Donohue guesses the ruling does not apply to Mormons.

Also in the Huffington Post, Ronald A. Lindsay, a militant atheist, asked, “Is it appropriate to have six Catholic justices on the Supreme Court?” His hero is JFK, who famously threw his religion overboard to win votes. “Unfortunately,” he wrote, “a majority of the Supreme Court may now be resurrecting concerns about the compatibility between being a Catholic and being a good citizen....” He was not resurrecting the old canard—the Justices are.

Philip F. Cardarella, writing in the *Kansas City Star*, said that when JFK ran, the question was, “How could someone who owed his religious obedience to the Pope in Rome and the doctrines of the Catholic Church truly be trusted?” Just recently, he opined, “Five men on the Supreme Court—all Catholics—may well just have proven him [JFK] wrong.” Got it.

Catholics are 25 percent of the population and comprise two-thirds of the high court. Jews are 1.8 percent of the population and comprise one-third of the high court. Note: only the former is a problem.

---

## ATHEIST BIGOTS SLAM CATHOLICS

Recently, the Freedom From Religion Foundation placed a full-page ad in the *New York Times*. Most atheists are not bigots, but many atheists who are activists most definitely are. Among them are the anti-Catholics who work at the Freedom From Religion Foundation (FFRF). A few weeks ago in the *New York Times*, FFRF took out its vengeance on Catholics by trotting out the old canard that Catholics are not independent thinkers (unless they disagree with the teachings of the Church). The occasion for the outburst was the United States Supreme Court's decision in the *Hobby Lobby* case affirming religious liberty. Here is a sample of its invective:

"DOGMA SHOULD NOT TRUMP OUR CIVIL LIBERTIES. ALL-MALE ALL-ROMAN CATHOLIC MAJORITY ON SUPREME COURT PUTS RELIGIOUS WRONGS OVER WOMEN'S RIGHTS."

All the Jewish judges on the high court voted in the minority, but only an anti-Semite would conclude that their Jewishness determined their vote. Similarly, only an anti-Catholic would conclude that those who voted in the majority did so because of their Catholicity.

From the middle of the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, Catholics had to deal with the Ku Klux Klan. Now they must deal with more sophisticated bigots. What unites the Klan and FFRF is their maliciousness. Unfortunately, as we have recently seen, anti-Catholic bigotry

has erupted in many quarters, all of them urbane.

All men and women of goodwill should condemn the hate speech of FFRF.