

SINGLING OUT ONE GROUP

Rep. Peter King was recently lambasted for starting congressional hearings on radical Islam. Robert Kolker, writing in *New York* magazine, said the congressman's "opponents say that by singling out Muslims, King is promoting anti-Islam hatred and could actually trigger a domestic terror attack," adding that "America is a tinderbox of prejudice and fear."

Kolker, like most pundits, never objects to singling out priests. For example, in a 2009 article, he wrote that although New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan condemned sex abuse, "he also fully supported the work of the archdiocese's lobbying arm to sideline two bills in Albany that would have rolled back the statute of limitations and allowed more alleged abuse victims to make their claims in court." Kolker failed to note that these bills didn't apply to public school teachers and singled out those who work in private institutions.

Here's another example. In 2005, a Philadelphia grand jury investigation into sexual abuse singled out priests. Dissatisfied with the results, another was convened. What no one can explain is why no other group has been investigated. This kind of selective probe is also being carried out in other cities. Priests are being singled out, absent any public outcry.

A recent Associated Press column raised the question of why miscreant clergy who have left the priesthood were not being monitored by the authorities. But why were ex-priests singled out?

It's not just Muslims who benefit from elite opinion when singled out; it's true of many other communities, as well. The bias against priests is striking.

