



October 30, 2009

Dear Father Jenkins:

Thank you for your response to our inquiry about your membership on the Board of Millennium Trust.

We are encouraged to learn that you are reviewing all of your and Notre Dame's associations to "ensure that they accord with [Notre Dame's] Catholic mission." This, together with what you have told us about the precaution you took when joining the Millennium Promise Board, prompts us to add a few observations to our initial letter.

With respect, we are frank to say that we do not understand how advising the Millennium Promise Board that you would not participate in matters relating to abortion or artificial contraception solves, or even mitigates, the problem. The organization's fund-raising projects surely do not mention your disclaimer, and accordingly your membership amounts to a Notre Dame stamp of approval for the organization's extensive fund-raising efforts. The abortion and contraception programs are among the beneficiaries. Thus the Board has the advantages of your membership without the disadvantage of your unsympathetic participation in matters relating to abortion and contraception.

Moreover, now that Millennium Promise's abortion and contraception policies are becoming well known in connection with your board membership, especially in the pro-life Catholic community, Notre Dame's reputation on life issues specifically, and as a robustly Catholic institution more generally, is suffering.

Since your review is to be broad-gauged, we draw your attention again to Mr. Nanni's and Mr. Swarbrick's serving as Co-Corporate Chairmen of a major fundraising event for the Junior Diabetes Research Foundation International.

You received a copy of our e-mail to Mr. Nanni of September 12, 2009. As we wrote: "This organization is a leading proponent of embryonic stem cell research – one of its 'key issues' – and has waged determined campaigns to relax restrictions on such research."

Neither Mr. Nanni nor Mr. Swarbrick replied to our inquiry, but Mr. Brown was good enough to respond.

He noted, first, that Notre Dame "did not institutionally participate" and that Messrs. Nanni and Swarbrick acted "as individuals, not as representatives of the University." To be sure. But they are high-ranking University officials, with Mr. Swarbrick in particular regularly in the public eye; their participation was as "corporate co-chairmen"; and that



*Alumni Protecting Notre Dame's Catholic Identity*

participation was prized because of their Notre Dame identification. Surely the University has an important interest in their public associations.

The second justification advanced by Mr. Brown is analogous to what you have said about your acceptance of the offer to serve on the Millennium Promise board. He advised us that Messrs. Nanni and Swarbrick "received written assurance that no funds raised by or through their participation will be directed toward human embryonic stem cell research, but instead will be directed to the foundation's donor-designated non-stem cell fund."

Again, there is no suggestion that this pledge was open. The organization would not want the public to know that its co-chairmen objected to one of its "key" goals. The pernicious effects follow. Those contributors who did not know of the organization's stem cell program and would not have given if they had known were misled. And for those who did, or do now, know of the that program, Notre Dame's reputation has suffered a blow. Finally, the accounting entries are simply artifices. When money raised is used in support of other programs, it releases money to be used in support the embryonic stem cell program.

I thank you again for your response. We look forward to the results of your review. Be sure of our prayerful best wishes for success in your efforts to keep the University, in your fitting phrase, "true to Catholic principles."

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "William H. Dempsey".

William H. Dempsey  
President  
Sycamore Trust