

# SINGLING OUT ONE GROUP

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wants to know why it is wrong to single out Muslims, but not priests:

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

Kolker is just like most of the other pundits—they don't object to singling out priests. For example, in a 2009 *New York* magazine article, Kolker wrote that although New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan condemned sexual 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 did not apply to public school teachers. In other words, the bills singled out those who work in private institutions, and were transparently aimed at priests.

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 in several other cities. Priests are being singled out, absent any public outcry.

An Associated Press column today is instructive: it raises the question why miscreant clergy who have left the priesthood are not being monitored by the authorities. But why single out ex-priests? Are not all former abusers walking around unmonitored?

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.

---

## **ARCHBISHOP DOLAN IS A HERO; ANDERSON LIES**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Jeffrey Anderson's latest accusations against New York Archbishop Timothy Dolan:

Anderson is a liar and the media are giving him a free ride. Anderson says he possesses a "smoking gun" that shows that when Archbishop Dolan led the Milwaukee archdiocese before coming to New York, he and the Vatican worked in concert to "keep secrets and avoid scandal" in their handling of an abusive priest, Franklyn Becker. If lying were a crime, Anderson would be imprisoned.

Instead of focusing on Dolan's predecessor, Archbishop Rembert Weakland, the disgraced darling of dissident Catholics who left office after revelations of a homosexual affair and ripping off the Catholic Church of close to a half-million dollars, Anderson and his army of Catholic-bashing lawyers have deliberately twisted the meaning of the word "scandal," as understood in ecclesiastical parlance, to indict an innocent man, Archbishop Dolan.

Unlike Weakland, Dolan moved with dispatch to get Becker out of ministry. In his letter of May 27, 2003 to Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger (now the pope), he said that all efforts to rehabilitate Becker were a failure, and that "it is clear that he will never be able to assume public ministry" (Becker had just been arrested in California for crimes he allegedly committed in the 1970s). Furthermore, Dolan said that if the

California trial goes forward, it “makes the potential for true scandal very real.”

The term “scandal” in the Catholic lexicon is very specific: it is defined as “a word or action evil in itself, which occasions another spiritual ruin.” In other words, once the public finds out more about Becker, his misconduct will give scandal to the Church by causing the faithful to question their faith. For that reason, and for his past record, Dolan said he wanted him out of the priesthood. Anderson knows his way around Catholic circles and knows full well what Dolan meant, yet he chose the more conventional understanding of the word “scandal” to condemn him. To read what Dolan actually said, click [here](#). He even recommended against Becker slipping away on a technicality! Dolan is a hero—he’s the one who moved to get Becker kicked out of the priesthood. There is no “smoking gun,” but there is a stench coming from Anderson and his lackeys.

---

## **ABORTION INDUSTRY CRACK-UP**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the pro-abortion community:

The abortion industry is cracking up. Scared to death over the public backlash at Planned Parenthood, and a host of proposed bills at the state and federal level assuring civil rights for the unborn, the pro-abortion community is in a tizzy. Consider their incendiary language.

Pro-abort enthusiast Amanda Marcotte says pro-lifers want to force women back to the “sadistic punishments” of the pre-Roe days when they were somehow forced to mutilate their own babies. The Feminist Majority accuses pro-lifers of “domestic terrorism,” and a writer for religiondispatches.org says “state-endorsed terrorism” is at work. The National Organization for Women outdoes everyone by engaging in rank

anti-Catholic invective: it says it would be a “dream-come-true” for the bishops if women were to lose access to pap smears and testing for sexually transmitted diseases.

A pro-life billboard was recently taken down in New York City after pro-abortion government officials objected. The same censors in the New York City Council are now taking up a measure to punish crisis pregnancy centers for offering alternatives to abortion; deceptive advertising is the charge. I wrote to one of the censors, City Council Speaker Christine Quinn, asking her to consider legislation that would “require Planned Parenthood to advertise that they are primarily an abortion provider, and not an adoption-referral organization,” pointing out that it performed 324,008 abortions in 2008 as opposed to only 2,405 adoption referrals. I have not heard back.

Meanwhile, the *New York Times* has an editorial today condemning the crisis pregnancy centers, arguing that women considering an abortion are entitled to make “well-informed decisions about reproductive health.” Then why does it use the term “burdensome” to call requirements that women considering an abortion first see a sonogram of their baby? Wouldn’t that help her make a “well-informed decision”? Looks like the crack-up is profound.

---

## IF ONLY PRIESTS WERE TEACHERS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the media treat miscreant teachers:

If priests were teachers, they would be afforded special protections under state law, insulated from changes in the statute of limitations, never be fired (which means they would be kept in ministry indefinitely), treated with kid gloves by the media, and generally be held unaccountable for misconduct. Michael Goodwin, a columnist for the *New York Post*, is one of

the exceptions to the media cover-up of miscreant public school teachers. In today's paper [[click here](#)], he cites documents showing that 7,300 teachers in New York City have been found deficient to teach: the offenses range from incompetence to sexual assault. All are protected by unions, at a cost of well over \$100,000 each in salary and benefits. Moreover, *there are some 500 teachers who have been convicted of criminal offenses, "including assault, sex crimes, kidnapping, burglary, prostitution and lewdness."* [My emphasis.]

This is nothing new. We know from previous studies that approximately 10 percent of public school students nationwide have been sexually victimized by teachers and other staffers. Four years ago it was reported that the incidence of sexual abuse in New York State had tripled in recent years. Last year, we learned that New York City was laying out over \$40 million a year in salaries alone for teachers not to teach, many of whom were charged with sexual molestation. To top things off, New York City still has no background checks for new teachers (last year a former prostitute got tenure *after* her former status was disclosed).

Unlike the situation with priests accused of wrongdoing, these are not old accusations—they are happening right now. But don't look for Jay Leno, Bill Maher, "The View" panelists or the *New York Times* to weigh in on this issue. It is obviously not the offense that gets them exercised, it's the status of the offender. And we know why.

---

## IF ONLY PRIESTS WERE TERRORISTS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on two editorials in today's *New York Times*:

In the *New York Times* editorial, "A Right Without a Remedy," a strong plea is made for the U.S. government to respect the

constitutional rights of detainees at Guantánamo Bay. There is another editorial, "Acts of Contrition," that takes the Catholic Church in Ireland to task for cases of priestly sexual abuse. The former editorial says absolutely nothing about why suspected Muslim terrorists who want to blow up the U.S. are being held in custody, and the latter editorial says absolutely nothing about the rights of accused priests. If only priests were terrorists.

The *Times* says the Church in Ireland "has a long way to go to cleaning house," insisting that "reforms are lagging" and "some predator priests are still in ministry." It is thrice wrong.

In 2005, the Irish Bishops' Conference issued a comprehensive report on reforms underway, "Our Children, Our Church: Child Protection Policies and Procedures for the Catholic Church in Ireland." In 2008, another report was released, "Safeguarding Children: Standards and Guidance Document for the Catholic Church in Ireland." In 2010, the National Board for Safeguarding Children in the Catholic Church in Ireland published its 2009 Annual Report.

The latter document shows that 42 percent of the new allegations made in 2009 were about deceased priests. "None of the allegations reported to the National Office originated from children or young people. Some went back to events that took place in the 1950s and 1960s." Not a single priest who has had an accusation made against him is in full ministry, and those who are in limited ministry are there despite the fact that "the allegation that caused the removal from full ministry has not been confirmed through any civil or canonical court process." In other words, the *Times* got it wrong again. It should correct the record.

Contact the Public Editor, Arthur S. Brisbane:  
[public@nytimes.com](mailto:public@nytimes.com)