

NEW YORK TIMES HAS NO MORAL AUTHORITY

A week after the *New York Times* tried to tag the pope again, it ran an editorial taking Pope Benedict XVI to task for being too lenient in dealing with priestly sexual abuse. Within no time, we hit right back at the paper.

When New York State was considering two bills dealing with the sexual abuse of minors, the *New York Times* endorsed the one that *did not apply* to the public schools. And in its editorial, the *Times* had the nerve to lecture the pope for not having a universal policy on this issue. Too bad the pope didn't hold a news conference saying he is taking his cues from the *New York Times* and has chosen to adopt the weakest of all measures.

When Family Planning Advocates, the lobbying arm of Planned Parenthood, and the New York Civil Liberties Union, blocked a bill in New York State mandating that all cases involving the sexual abuse of minors be reported, the *New York Times* said nothing! It appears that it saves its condemnatory language for the Catholic Church. By the way, the two liberal groups did so because they know that Planned Parenthood learns of cases involving statutory rape on a regular basis.

Does the *New York Times* want to compare the record of the Catholic Church to all other religious and secular institutions on this issue? Not for a moment. Indeed, when it was reported earlier this year that there were exactly six credible allegations made against over 40,000 priests between 2008 and 2009, the newspaper gave it a whopping 92 words.

The *Times* wonders why the Catholic Church doesn't have the same policy everywhere. Does the *Boston Globe*, which the *Times* owns, have the same policies on misconduct as

the *Times*? What about all the other companies the Times owns? Does it have even a clue as to how incredibly *decentralized* the Catholic Church is?

Finally, let's get it straight, one more time. There is no "pedophilia scandal" as the *Times* has ceaselessly indicated. It's always been a "homosexual scandal," but the gay-happy *New York Times* doesn't have the guts to tell the truth. In short, its moral authority is spent.