

BAR FOR SCREENING NOMINEES DIPS LOWER

[Bill Donohue](#)

Now that Donald Trump is announcing his choices for various posts, some of the nominees are bound to have their personal lives held under a microscope. Assuming something tawdry turns up, the question is whether it will matter. Probably not, even if it should.

This may anger Democrats, many of whom have already complained that Christians are phonies for supporting someone with such a checkered moral record as Trump, but their anger needs to be directed inward. After all, since the 1960s, liberals have been lecturing the public on the need to be non-judgmental, promoting the novelty of situation ethics, the result of which was to effectively lower the bar. They can't now demand that the bar be instantly raised.

Think of all the politicians who have been accused of one sexual impropriety after another. We have the Kennedys: John, Robert and Ted—all of whom learned a thing or two from their philandering father, Joe. More recently we learned about the alleged sexual escapades of Dennis Hastert, Al Franken, Elliot Spitzer and Andrew Cuomo. Homosexual congressmen such as Gerry Studds and Barney Frank were accused of sexual misconduct.

Bill Clinton, of Monica fame, was accused of rape, as was Joe Biden and Donald Trump. Biden's daughter, in fact, wrote that her sexual troubles began early on. To wit: She wrote in her diary about "having sex with friends @ a young age; showering w/my dad (probably not appropriate)...."

When did it become acceptable to live a life of sexual recklessness?

In the 1970s, the libertine ideas that took root in the 1960s began to manifest themselves behaviorally (Plato's Retreat for straights and the bathhouses for gays). The sexual revolution gave us a spike in out-of-wedlock birth, babies being killed in the womb, broken lives, AIDS and premature deaths. It continues today though it is not as dramatic as it was then.

From the 1970s to today, TV talk shows, Hollywood, the media, women's magazines (e.g., *Cosmopolitan*), psychologists and sociologists have been bombarding us with the need to be tolerant of what previously was considered intolerant speech and behavior. When vulgar singers and dancers strut their stuff at presidential events, and drag queens get their jollies by sexualizing little kids at public libraries, is it any wonder why so many men and women have become inured to moral degradation?

Our Judeo-Christian heritage was based on a sexual ethics of reticence. Restraint was seen as a virtue. Today it is seen as outdated, if not a problem.

Having polluted our culture with obscene toxins, it is a little late in the game to invoke Christian standards for government posts. So if there is a Trump appointee who has a record of moral turpitude, who among the Democrats is going to throw the first stone?

Our choice would be Dr. Richard Levine. He is the Assistant Secretary for Health who goes by the name Rachel and falsely claims to be a woman.