ARCHBISHOP NIENSTEDT'S NEW CRITICS

Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today's *St. Cloud Times* urging Catholics in Minnesota to press for the ouster of St. Paul and Minneapolis Archbishop John Nienstedt:

This editorial is based heavily on the uncontested testimony of a "church lawyer." Because Jennifer Haselberger's testimony was never challenged by a lawyer for the archdiocese, we have no way of knowing whether her version of events is correct. We do know, having gone through her affidavit, that even she admits to at least 17 occasions when her version was not shared by others with whom she worked.

The editorial accuses the archdiocese of a pattern of "deception, intimidation and silence." This is similar to Haselberger's position, stated at the beginning of her testimony, that she endured "months of harassment, threats, and intimidation—examples of which I will provide later in this affidavit." Except she doesn't: She provides not a single example of being threatened by anyone. Did the editorial board members even bother to read her account?

What about being harassed? Here's an example of what she means. On p. 53, she says a priest "constantly harassed us to conclude the investigation [into alleged wrongdoing]." Did her co-workers also feel harassed? Is it harassment when an employee is told to "get moving"? Apparently, Haselberger does have a problem with getting things done on time. After all, she was suspended precisely because of her inability to complete an assignment. It gets better.

Haselberger says her suspension was an example of

“intimidation.” In fact, she had her suspension vacated and was offered three options on how it should be handled. Once again, she failed to respond on time, which is why ten of her vacation days were used and not restored. This is what she says constitutes “intimidation.”

More to come on Haselberger.