

NEW YORK TIMES FINDS GOOD NUNS



Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today's *New York Times*:

The editorial, "Speaking the Truth to the Vatican," sounds so macho, especially coming from the unmanly *New York Times*. This time the editorial board is informing us that they have found some nuns they actually admire. Naturally, they are the dissident ones.

Though the internal affairs of the Catholic Church are no more the business of the *New York Times* than it is the business of the Vatican to police the newspaper's personnel matters (the Vatican would never show such chutzpah), if they are going to stick their nose in, they should at least be accurate.

It is not true that there are no "serious doctrinal problems" or "radical feminist" issues in the ranks of some orders of nuns. Want proof? Just pick up a copy of the *National Catholic Reporter* where they are celebrated.

It is not true that the Leadership Conference of Women Religious represents most of the 57,000 nuns—only 1,700 pay dues.

It is not true that "much of the Roman Catholic laity has registered outrage" about Vatican inquiries into rogue nuns; most could care less.

It is not true that there is a "pedophilia scandal" in the Catholic Church: there was a homosexual scandal, but its

heyday, the mid-60s to the mid-80s, is long gone.

If the *Times* wants to meet nuns who have never been the subject of Vatican concerns, it should do a story on any one of the orders that comprise the Council of Major Superiors of Women Religious; all are loyal daughters of the Church. For that reason alone, though, they are not likely to attract the applause of the *Times*.