NEW YORK TIMES SHOWS ITS BIAS

There is no newspaper in the United States that is more extreme in its defense of abortion-on-demand and homosexual rights than the *New York Times*. It regards the defense of partial-birth abortion to be a "moderate" position, and its reporters have openly bragged about the record number of homosexuals who write feature stories. The January 23, 2014 edition offered more support to the accusation that it is biased in its coverage on these issues.

There was a front-page story about a homosexual vice principal in Seattle who was asked to step down when it was learned that he was married to a man. The 1,351-word story did not focus on the man's violation of a contract he voluntarily signed (Catholic employees are expected to abide by Catholic teachings); rather, it focused on students who were rallying to his side. The story featured four photos: the one on the front page was in color, and one of the three pictures on p. A16 was quite big $(9^{\prime\prime}x6^{\prime\prime})$.

On the opposite page, p. A17, there was an average-size picture of the March for Life that was held in January in Washington, D.C. There was no story. Yet there could have been a great one: hundreds of thousands of marchers, overwhelmingly young, braved the bitter cold; many had traveled through a snow storm the day before to get there (the federal government was shut down because of the bad conditions).

A handful of young people from Seattle who supported their fired vice principal merits big coverage, but a massive prolife march in a winter storm is all but ignored. And the motto of the *New York Times* is, "All the News That's Fit to Print." I guess pro-life news is not fit to print.