

NEW YORK TIMES ERECTS CEMENT CEILING

Bill Donohue comments on the incestuous hiring at the *New York Times*:

Pleas for more diversity and inclusion are a mantra at the *New York Times*. For example, it demands more inclusion in the Catholic Church's clergy—women must be ordained—and rails against the glass ceiling in the corporate world that keeps women from reaching the top.

There is one exception: when it comes to hiring a new publisher at the *New York Times*, it throws diversity and inclusion to the wind. Not only does it confine its search to white boys, it only considers blood relatives. The *New York Times* is not only a patriarchy, its affection for hiring along patrilineal descent lines is boundless.

Mark Thompson, who heads the New York Times Company, announced today that Arthur Gregg Sulzberger is the new deputy publisher of the newspaper. Thompson is perhaps best known for allegedly covering up the deeds of BBC child rapist Jimmy Savile.

This appointment is critical because it signals the continuation of the *Times* monarchy: Arthur Gregg's father, Arthur Sulzberger Jr., is the current publisher, and his son is next in line to succeed him on the throne. Sulzberger Jr. got his job because his predecessor, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger, was his father.

A.G., as Arthur Gregg is now known (it was confusing at the newspaper so they settled on his initials), would represent the fifth generation of his family since the Grand Patriarch, Adolph S. Ochs, bought the newspaper in 1896.

To elect Arthur Gregg Sulzberger, the *Times* erected a cement

ceiling: the only other two candidates for the job were Sam Dolnick and David Perpich. All three are cousins.

No women were interviewed. No blacks were interviewed. No Latinos (including the undocumented) were interviewed. No Native Americans were interviewed. No Asians were interviewed. No Catholics were interviewed. No Protestants were interviewed. No Muslims were interviewed. No Mormons were interviewed. And to the best of my knowledge, no transgender persons were interviewed.

This triumph of patriarchy was not, however, equally distributed along descent lines: no one from the Ochs family, or any of the other branches of the family, was considered. This is a cement ceiling that even ISIS couldn't crack.

In keeping with its incestuous tradition, the selection committee included senior executive Michael Golden and his sister-in-law, Trudy Golden. Carolyn Greenspon was on the committee: she is a family trustee and board member of the New York Times Company. Thompson, chief executive of the Company, was also on the committee. No one not from the inner circle of the board, newspaper, or the family, was included.

Who needs affirmative action? Who needs to advertise? Who needs a head hunter? This is an old-boys club *par excellence*.

Thompson said the selection "was done in an extraordinarily careful, systematic way." On that, everyone can agree.

It would be instructive to learn what Maureen Dowd thinks about this nativistic, misogynistic, racist, non-inclusive, diversity-be-damned, rigged hiring system at the *New York Times*. But this is not likely: she has long settled in, and knows exactly what her place is.

AMAZON AND WALMART INSULT CATHOLICS

Bill Donohue comments on the way Amazon and Walmart are handling offensive Halloween costumes this year:

Amazon and Walmart have one standard for transgender persons and one for Catholics: they will not tolerate the slightest insults to the former, but they have no problem offending the latter.

Recently, Amazon, Target, and Walmart pulled a “Tranny Granny” Halloween costume, saying it was offensive. It is not certain how many cross-dressers complained, but at least one activist said that it was “humiliating, dehumanizing, and degrading.” Walmart was particularly contrite, telling LGBTQNation that “it clearly violates our policy.”

We have no problem with Target: it does not carry costumes that clearly insult Catholics. But Amazon and Walmart do.

Amazon is carrying an outfit called, “Keep Up the Faith Priest Men’s Costume.” The priest is wearing a black cassock that features him sporting an erection; the nun, dressed in full habit, is depicted as pregnant. It is also selling, “Foreplay Women’s Sinful Sister Catsuit and Headpiece,” a black scantily-clad costume with black stockings.

Walmart has a “Pregnant Nun Costume” that lives up to its name. “Heavenly Hottie Costume Foreplay” is also available in black: the nun outfit is a one-piece body suit that features white high boots; it is adorned with a large cross in the chest area.

There are no excuses for what Amazon is doing, but Walmart is worse. It likes to tout itself as a “Christian-friendly” store, yet when it comes to Catholics, it drops its guard.

It is not a good cultural sign when corporate elites are more sensitive to cross-dressers than they are to Catholics.

Contact Doug McMillon, president and CEO, Walmart: dmcmillon@walmart.com

EXCUSING ANTI-CATHOLICISM

Bill Donohue comments on how some are treating the Podesta-Wikileaks scandal:

There was a time, not too long ago, when Catholics on the left could be expected to at least feign outrage over anti-Catholicism. But no more. Some find excuses for it, while others cheer it on. Few are principled in their discourse, so thoroughly politicized have they become.

Such has been the reaction to the Podesta-Wikileaks scandal coming from many on the Catholic left. A popular refrain to the anti-Catholic comments by Hillary Clinton’s communications director, Jennifer Palmieri, and the deeds of her anti-Catholic campaign chairman, John Podesta, is that they cannot be bigots because they are both Catholic.

This is the position of Father Edward Beck, Peter Weber, Michael Sean Winters, E.J. Dionne, and Sen. Tim Kaine. So exercised are they about this issue that some have resorted to attacking those bishops who have criticized this scandal.

Bigotry is determined by what is said and done, and does not turn on biographical data. For example, putting a swastika on

a synagogue is no less anti-Semitic if done by a Jew. Similarly, making anti-Catholic statements, or engaging in anti-Catholic conduct, is no less anti-Catholic if done by a Catholic.

Father Beck discusses the Podesta-Wikileaks scandal, noting that those associated with it are “all Catholics themselves.” Wrong. Sandy Newman, the left-winger who wants Podesta’s advice on how to “plant the seeds of the revolution” within the Catholic Church, is Jewish. He told Podesta he needed some coaching in this area—it was a little out of his league—and Hillary’s top aide said he was happy to oblige.

Weber, writing for *The Week*, talks about this issue using quotation marks to assess charges of “anti-Catholicism.” Winters at the *National Catholic Reporter* speaks about the “supposed ‘bigotry’” of Hillary’s top staff and their associates. Dionne, writing in the *Washington Post*, says he can vouch for his good buddy John Podesta.

Podesta told Dionne that he takes “very seriously the social and moral teachings of the church.” Which ones? Abortion? Euthanasia? Marriage? Conscience rights? Stem cell research? Gender ideology? Perhaps Dionne can explain in another column.

The apologists also try to divert attention from the bigotry by saying that the guilty were “just talking.” Sen. Kaine wrote it off by saying the email exchanges amounted to nothing more than “opinions and mouthing off a little bit here and there.” Weber said it was just “grousing in public.” For Winters, it was “talking about the intersection of religion and politics.”

They make it sound as if the Podesta-Wikileaks discussions were about Saturday Night Bingo. Instead, the conversations centered on sabotage. That’s what it means when political agents discuss how to “plant the seeds of a revolution” within an institution. Podesta’s reply to Newman—he had already set

up Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United to do just that—was sincere bravado. Mission accomplished.

Both of these organizations, along with Faith in Public Life and Catholics for Choice, are front groups: they were founded to manipulate public opinion into thinking that one can be a Catholic in good standing and still publicly oppose the core teachings of the Catholic Church. All four of these entities are funded by George Soros, the atheist billionaire known for his self-hating Jewish status.

These are not “concerned Catholics attempting to align [their] faith with [their] political ideals and principles,” as Father Beck would have it. No, these are skilled operatives, not all of whom are even nominally Catholic.

Their objective, which is right out of the playbook of Saul Alinsky (Hillary’s hero), is to sow the seeds of division within the Catholic Church. There is nothing noble about their campaign, and there is nothing meritorious about defending them. Anti-Catholicism needs to be condemned, not excused, whether the bigots are on the right or the left.

NEW YORK TIMES WRONG ON CARDINAL DOLAN

Bill Donohue comments on an editorial in today’s *New York Times*:

The editorial in today’s *New York Times*, “Victims of Priests’ Abuse Face a Choice,” must be challenged on several counts. Its principal focus is the new initiative by the Archdiocese

of New York, the Independent Reconciliation and Compensation Program. This program is designed to deal fairly with claims of clergy sexual abuse.

The editorial says "the program is confidential." It is important to emphasize that if someone requests confidentiality, the archdiocese will respect it, but it is also true that under the provisions of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, it has no authority to require it. Of course, the archdiocese is not going to publicize information on these matters on its website, but that is not the same as requiring claimants to sign a confidentiality agreement. That will not happen.

The editorial is unhappy with the provision that claimants are given only a few months to file. Naturally, the *Times* wants no deadline. Should they be given years? Decades? Is this its idea of justice?

The editorial falsely refers to "pedophile priests" as the problem: 8 in 10 cases involve homosexual priests and less than 5 percent involve pedophilia. The gay cover-up is a constant feature with the *Times*.

The editorial slights the sincerity of Cardinal Timothy Dolan, saying he is launching this program to avoid bigger problems if the Child Victims Act is passed in Albany; it faults him for working against the bill. It also argues that when he directed the Milwaukee Archdiocese "he tried to shield millions of dollars of church assets from abuse survivors," and is doing the same now in New York.

The Child Victims Act was not written to protect most minors from being molested. If it were, it would apply to the public schools. But it didn't—the fix was in. Would the *New York Times* support a bill to lift the statute of limitations on the sexual abuse of minors if it excluded Catholic schools?

It should be noted that when the public schools were included

in a bill in 2009, the school superintendents and the teachers' union went bonkers, working successfully to kill the bill. Cardinal Dolan is to be commended for fighting this unjust piece of legislation, and the Catholic League is proud to stand with him.

The editorial reference to Milwaukee is another unfair swipe at Cardinal Dolan. Under his tutelage there, he moved the perpetual care fund into a trust to be used solely for the purpose of caring for the cemeteries. He did this at the beckon call of the Finance Committee (the same provision has long been a staple at the New York archdiocese). It must also be noted that when this transfer was contested in the courts, the Archdiocese of Milwaukee won.

The editorial wants to know how this program will "help to prevent future abuses." It is designed to address past instances of abuse, so the question isn't relevant. What is relevant is the fact that between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015 (the last year data are available), .01 percent of the priests and deacons in the United States had a credible accusation made against him. In short, this is not our problem anymore, and it hasn't been since the mid-1980s.

The *New York Times* does itself a disservice when it does not deal fairly with the Catholic Church. Yet it continues to do so, misrepresenting the record in the process.

Contact: editorial@nytimes.com

CLINTON'S BIGOTS INVOKE

CATHOLIC STATUS

Bill Donohue comments on the latest development in the Podesta-Wikileaks scandal:

Hillary Clinton's anti-Catholic campaign chairman, John Podesta, and her anti-Catholic communications director, Jennifer Palmieri, both claim Catholic status. Some are defending them from the accusation that they are anti-Catholic, arguing that Catholics cannot be anti-Catholic.

Now we have John Halpin, Podesta's left-wing associate, expressing umbrage at the mere suggestion that he, a Catholic, is anti-Catholic.

Invoking one's religious credentials to deflect charges of bigotry is a failed strategy. Bigotry is defined by one's words and deeds, having nothing to do with the demographic characteristics of the bigot.

In an email Halpin sent to Podesta and Palmieri, Halpin criticized Fox News Corp CEO Rupert Murdoch, and *Wall Street Journal* managing editor Robert Thomson, for raising their children Catholic. "Friggin' Murdoch baptized his kids in Jordan where John the Baptist baptized Jesus," he said. "It's an amazing bastardization of the faith. They must be attracted to the systematic thought and severely backwards gender relations and must be totally unaware of Christian democracy," he added.

After making these incredibly disparaging remarks, Halpin justifies his bigotry by trotting out his Catholic credentials. "I'm Catholic. My parents are Catholic. I went to a Catholic university. My kids were baptized by their Jesuit uncle and went to Catholic school when they were young."

How pathetic. Halpin is to be excused for his rank anti-Catholic remarks because he calls himself a Catholic! Has he

ever heard the term “self-hating Catholic” or “self-hating Jew”? Instead of owning up to his bigotry, he takes cover under his Catholic tent. It doesn’t wash.

Halpin is a small fry. The big fish is Podesta, the one who brags how he has orchestrated a “revolution” within the Catholic Church. He is not a Clinton volunteer or low-ranking staff member—he is the architect of her campaign.

Hillary Clinton’s right-hand man is an admitted saboteur seeking to create mutiny in the Catholic Church, and she does nothing about it. *She’s the real problem.* The only way she can get this monkey off her back is to fire Podesta immediately.

Contact: press@hillaryclinton.com

HILLARY IS NOW THE ISSUE—NOT PODESTA

Bill Donohue comments on Hillary Clinton and John Podesta:

On October 11, following revelations that Hillary Clinton’s top aides were implicated in an anti-Catholic email exchange, I condemned the remarks. But I also said that she was “not responsible for this Catholic bashing.” [See our website for previous news releases on this subject.]

Given the latest revelations—her campaign chairman, John Podesta, admits to being actively engaged in sabotaging the Catholic Church—she cannot escape culpability any longer. She now owns this issue.

We know that left-wing activist Sandy Newman asked Podesta for advice on how to “plant the seeds of the revolution [within

the Catholic Church].” Podesta replied that he is on it. To wit: He confessed to creating two phony Catholic entities, Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good and Catholics United, both launched for the express purpose of upending the Catholic Church.

What Podesta admits to doing is far more serious than any disparaging comments made by the Clinton team about Catholicism. Jennifer Palmieri, Hillary’s communications director, has been incredibly insulting, but Podesta’s role is downright pernicious: He is seeking to foment a “revolution” within the Catholic Church.

If conservative Christians were plotting to sow divisions within the ranks of Judaism or Islam—setting up faux Jewish and Muslim organizations—there would be holy hell to pay. But when left-wing secularists seek to crash the Catholic Church, the media yawn.

Hillary Clinton is now the story: She has done absolutely nothing about Podesta’s vile anti-Catholic campaign. She is an utter disgrace.

Contact: press@hillaryclinton.com

PODESTA MUST NOW BE FIRED

Bill Donohue comments on why the Clinton campaign must fire John Podesta:

[Yesterday](#), I stopped short of asking Hillary Clinton to fire John Podesta, her campaign chairman. In light of the latest Wikileaks revelations, she has no choice but to cut all ties with this man. The man is hell bent on creating mutiny in the

Catholic Church and must therefore be fired.

We have long known that [George Soros](#) is the single most influential donor to dissident, and anti-Catholic, organizations. Now we know from Wikileaks what I long have suspected: John Podesta has been the most influential point man running offense for Soros. Together, they have sought to manipulate public opinion against the Catholic Church.

[In 2012](#), Sandy Newman, founder of the left-wing group, Voices for Progress, asked Podesta for advice on how best to “plant the seeds of the revolution.” The revolution he sought was an attempt to sunder the Catholic Church. Newman, who is Jewish, confessed that he was a rookie at trying to subvert the Catholic Church. But he was determined to do so.

“There needs to be a Catholic Spring,” Newman told Podesta, “in which Catholics themselves demand the end of a middle ages dictatorship and the beginning of a little democracy and respect for gender equality in the Catholic Church.”

Podesta not only endorsed the plan to create a revolution within the Catholic Church—he boasted that he had been working on this for years. “We created Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good to organize for a moment like this,” he said. “Likewise Catholics United. Like most Spring movements, I think this one will have be bottom up.” [He recommended](#) that Kathleen Kennedy Townsend be consulted on this effort.

The evidence is indisputable: Both of these groups, Catholics in Alliance and Catholics United, were created by Podesta, and funded by Soros, for the express purpose of staging a revolt within the Catholic Church. In 2008, [Archbishop Charles Chaput](#), then of Denver and now of Philadelphia, accused both entities of doing a “disservice” to the Catholic Church.

Catholics in Alliance is known for sponsoring dissident Catholics, including priests, to give talks around the nation. Catholics United was the force behind a contrived effort by

the [IRS to go after me in 2008](#).

The latter story is illuminating.

On October 23, 2008, I appeared on CNN to discuss the George Soros connection to Catholics United. Before I went on, Chris Korzen of Catholics United contacted CNN in an effort to have me booted. Fortunately, he was so stupid as to share with a producer a lengthy document (it was leaked to me) detailing how unfair I had been to Barack Obama, especially noting his rabid support for abortion.

I say Korzen was stupid because when the IRS contacted me the next month, right around Thanksgiving, I recognized the complaint: it was basically the same as the one that Korzen's lawyers had sent to CNN.

(The IRS probe finally ended without penalties.)

See the connection: Podesta creates Catholics United; Soros funds Catholics United; and Catholics United sponsors an IRS complaint against me (after trying to get me kicked off CNN). Their attempt to intimidate me was a monumental failure, but the fact that they tried is what counts.

Podesta's recommendation that Kathleen Kennedy Townsend be consulted as a source to create havoc in the Catholic Church was a good one. On [March 29, 2012](#), I quoted her saying that the Catholic Church's teachings "encourage bigotry and harm."

Any Catholic who thinks that the Podesta-Soros connection is just another activist alliance is kidding himself. They are creating and funding a campaign to promote a revolution in the Catholic Church.

Contact: press@hillaryclinton.com

CLINTON STAFF BIGOTRY MOSTLY IGNORED

Bill Donohue comments on how the mainstream media are covering the Wikileaks story on anti-Catholicism in the Clinton campaign:

Most of the media have been delinquent in reporting on the latest Wikileaks story involving Hillary Clinton's campaign chairman John Podesta, communications director Jennifer Palmieri, and Center for American Progress senior fellow John Halpin. [In a series of email exchanges](#), Palmieri and Halpin made patently disparaging remarks about Catholics, and showed disdain for evangelicals as well. They shared their vitriol with Podesta, who did not respond (the source we quoted from yesterday mistakenly attributed a remark by Halpin to Podesta).

Fox News was the most responsible media outlet reporting on the Catholic bashing: Fox News Website, Megyn Kelly, Sean Hannity, and Fox and Friends all cited the bigotry. CNN's Anderson Cooper also did a good job.

CBS, NBC, PBS, and MSNBC all reported on the Podesta Wikileaks story, but failed to mention the anti-Catholic remarks; ABC News didn't report the story at all, though its affiliates mentioned the controversy without citing the Catholic bashing.

Among the most prominent newspapers and wire services that ran the story without reporting on the anti-Catholic comments were the following: Associated Press; CNN Wire; *Baltimore Sun*; *Boston Globe*; *Boston Herald*; *Hartford Courant*; *Miami Herald*; *New York Daily News*; *New York Post*; *New York Observer*; *New York Times*; *Newsday*; *San Diego Union Tribune*; *Spokesman Review*; UPI; *USA Today*; *Washington Post*; *Washington Times*. It comes as no surprise that The White House Bulletin also

covered up the bigotry.

I have been doing this job for over 23 years, so it is no mystery why the mainstream media are hyper-sensitive about “micro aggressions,” and other slights, when they are made about many protected groups, yet there is enormous tolerance for intolerance when it is exhibited against Catholics and evangelicals. It’s called bigotry, plain and simple.

It would be a grave mistake to conclude, however, that an anti-religious impulse explains this phenomenon. No, when it comes to Muslims, the media will bend over backwards to show how sensitive they are to any perceived intolerance.

CLINTON MUST SANCTION HER BIGOTED CHIEFS

Bill Donohue comments on remarks released by WikiLeaks that reveal anti-Catholicism on the part of the Clinton campaign:

Three persons tied to the Clinton campaign—two of them integrally—have been caught making bigoted comments about Catholics and Catholicism.

John Podesta is Hillary Clinton’s campaign chairman, and Jennifer Palmieri is Hillary’s communications director. Their contempt for Catholicism is palpable. Documents have surfaced showing that they ridiculed News Corp CEO Rupert Murdoch, and Wall Street Journal managing editor Robert Thomson, for raising their children Catholic.

One of Podesta’s colleagues at the Center for American Progress, John Halpin, agreed with Palmieri that the two men

chose Catholicism over evangelical Protestantism for bogus reasons. Halpin explained, "They can throw around 'Thomistic' thought and 'subsidiarity' and sound sophisticated because no one knows what the hell they're talking about." Palmieri also impugned their integrity, while also slighting evangelicals: "Their rich friends wouldn't understand if they became evangelicals."

Halpin was particularly scornful: "Friggin' Murdoch baptized his kids in Jordan where John the Baptist baptized Jesus." For Halpin, the only legitimate Catholics are liberals. Here is what he said about conservative Catholics. "It's an amazing bastardization of the faith. They must be attracted to the systematic thought and severely backwards gender relations and must be totally unaware of Christian democracy."

These anti-Catholic remarks are bad enough, but it makes one wonder what else Clinton's chiefs, and others associated with the campaign, are saying about Catholics and Catholicism. If Trump's inner circle spoke with derision about transgender persons, the sirens would be sounded by the mainstream media and his operatives would be hung out to dry.

Hillary Clinton is not responsible for this Catholic bashing, but she has a moral obligation to sanction Podesta and Palmieri immediately.

Contact: press@hillaryclinton.com

STOP MACY'S THOUGHT POLICE

To read the Catholic League's ad on the op ed page of the Tuesday, October 11 *New York Times*, click [here](#).