

NEW YORK TIMES GETS MALICIOUS

The decision for the *New York Times* to publish the op-ed by Daniel A. Olivas in early February was malicious. Here's why.

Olivas says he once knew a priest in California who was a molester (the priest, who is dead, was suspended from ministry in the 1990s). Point taken: Olivas is angry. But what was the purpose of publishing this article? And why the decision by the *Times* to run the obscene drawing of a priest whose head resembles a creature from Hell?

There is almost no sexual abuse being committed by priests in the U.S. today: when reports surface, they're almost always about old cases. But now, given the latest documents gathered by the authorities involving the Archdiocese of Los Angeles under Cardinal Roger Mahony, we are being treated to more stories.

The Orthodox Jewish community in Brooklyn is ablaze with stories of rabbis who rape minors. Even more pernicious is the way those who cooperate with the authorities are treated. Indeed, the punitive actions taken against innocent persons are shocking—there is no Catholic analogue.

So what has the *Times* said about all of this? *In the year before Olivas' op-ed*, the *Times* ran 11 news stories and one editorial on sex abuse by Orthodox Jewish rabbis; there were no op-eds. *Over two weeks in January and February*, the *Times* ran 7 news stories, one editorial and three op-eds on the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. Most of the cases in the Jewish community involve current or recent instances; none of the cases in Los Angeles did.

Moreover, there has never been a depiction of a rabbi with his head resembling a creature from Hell.