

L.A. TIMES LACKS MORAL STANDING

The day following the *Washington Post's* editorial lecturing Donald Cardinal Wuerl, the *Los Angeles Times* decided to chime in.

The editorial accused Cardinal Wuerl of “censorship” for speaking out against Georgetown’s embrace of abortion champion Kathleen Sebelius; the paper said the students should be exposed to “a variety of viewpoints.”

Ironically, the last thing the *Los Angeles Times* is known for is exposing its readers to “a variety of viewpoints.” In 2003, its editor, John Carroll, sent a memo to his editors complaining about the one-sided liberal stories the paper runs. In 2005, a UCLA study of media bias listed the paper as one of the most biased in the nation. In 2009, veteran *Washington Post* reporter Tom Edsall said the paper was composed in large part of the “liberal elite.”

Nor does the paper have any moral standing to lecture anyone about “censorship.” Two years ago, it pulled a patently *inoffensive* cartoon, “Where’s Muhammad?” Were they being respectful of Muslims? Or were they fearful? Either way, they engaged in censorship (as they define it). Ten years earlier they showed their respect—or was it fear?—of Muslims when they dropped a promotional ad that featured images of Muslim women in chadors mixed in with bikini-clad women. To show how deeply respectful—or fearful—those at the paper were, over 200 editors and reporters signed a petition calling for the ad to be censored.

In other words, the *Los Angeles Times* shuns diversity of opinion, loathes equal treatment of religion, and likes censorship. Which is why it is such a beacon of liberal

thought.