

GOOD NEWS IS NO NEWS

In 2002, the bishops assembled in Dallas amidst a media frenzy to consider reforms to combat the sexual abuse of minors. But when the bishops met this June, there was no frenzy this time around. That's because the reforms worked.

Leading up to the meeting, not a single media outlet provided an in-depth assessment of the anniversary of the reforms, and the few that mentioned it at all were mostly flawed. The *Boston Globe* won a Pulitzer Prize for its work exposing the scandal in the Archdiocese of Boston in 2002, but on the day the meeting began in Atlanta, the newspaper's entire coverage amounted to one sentence. And even that was factually inaccurate: it mentioned the problem of "pedophile priests." Ten years ago the *Globe* correctly noted that nearly 8 in 10 victims were "post-pubescent" males. That is homosexuality, not pedophilia.

Similarly, Susan Hogan of the Minneapolis *Star Tribune*'s editorial board recently wrote of "Catholic priests raping children." This was also factually incorrect: most of the victims were not children—they were adolescents—and the most common infraction was "inappropriate touching," not rape. A CBS affiliate in Chicago uncritically cited an Illinois judge, Ann Burke, to the effect that the scandal continues to this day: not only is Burke factually wrong, she is on record opposing civil liberties for accused priests.

We don't expect the media to cheer whenever the Catholic Church, or any organization, does good. But when an institution is put under the microscope for wrongdoing, and subsequently makes yeoman reforms, it smacks of bias not to report it. And it smacks of politics to ignore the fact that while *most gay priests are not molesters, most of the molesters have been gay.*

NEW YORK TIMES FEIGNS INTEREST IN CHILD ABUSE

The June 17 editorial in the *New York Times* on the sexual abuse of minors was aptly titled, "The Children Deserve Justice." Too bad the editorial board doesn't really believe it.

The editorial gave half-baked kudos to New York Governor Andrew Cuomo for pressing a new measure that would require college coaches to report child sex abuse (the *Times* said he could have done more). It also praised New York State Assemblywoman Margaret Markey for proposing a bill that would allow an accuser 10 years after turning 18 to press charges (instead of the current five-year period); it would also allow a one-year window for alleged victims to file suit in civil claims in cases where they were previously barred from doing so.

The *Times* was right to say that Cuomo could be doing more: he could support mandatory reporting of suspected child abuse to apply to all professionals, including counselors. It's not the bishops who are holding back this needed change: it's Family Planning Advocates, the lobbying arm of Planned Parenthood, and the New York Civil Liberties Union. Why? Because Planned Parenthood counselors learn of cases of statutory rape all the time, and don't want to be blanketed with mandatory reporting. But don't look for the *Times* to press for this change.

And don't expect the *Times* to tell the truth about the Markey bill: her bill doesn't cover public schools (under state law, public school victims have only 90 days to press charges, and the Markey bill does nothing to change it).

Protecting Planned Parenthood and public school employees is obviously more important to the *Times* than the justice kids deserve.

PHONY ATTACK ON CARDINAL DOLAN

Timothy Cardinal Dolan has recently been criticized for inducing suspected miscreant priests to exit the priesthood during his time as the Archbishop of Milwaukee. The attack is phony: if the issue were how to handle sex abusers, his critics would have previously commented on the following:

- In California, all government employees convicted of any crime receive a full pension
- A Los Angeles teacher charged with 23 counts of lewd acts with children aged 6-10 was paid \$40,000 this year to drop his appeal
- In Washington State, a teacher accused of sexual misconduct was given \$55,000 to withdraw his termination appeal this year
- A teacher in New York State (NYS) convicted this year of downloading child porn was awarded nearly \$22,000 a year
- A convicted sex abuser in NYS serving up to 50 years is receiving a pension of more than \$52,000
- Another sex offender in NYS convicted of child porn possession is receiving \$49,210 in a pension
- In 2012, a New York City teacher convicted of a sex offense was paid over \$100,000 a year while sitting for ten years in a rubber room; he is entitled to \$85,400 a year in a pension; and he will also receive \$55,000 for unused sick days

- A Queens guidance counselor accused of molesting a learning-disabled student has been receiving \$102,852 a year since 2003
- A Queens teacher who allegedly molested and then married a girl (after he impregnated her) has been receiving \$94,145 a year since 2003 (he was previously accused of molesting two 12 year-olds)

None of these incidents—and there are hundreds like them—will ever get the goat of those taking cheap shots at Cardinal Dolan. He inherited a big problem from the disgraced Milwaukee Archbishop Rembert Weakland, and did what he could to correct matters. Moreover, unlike public school employers, he didn't grant lifetime salaries and benefits to suspected offenders. He should be commended not condemned.

NPR REPORTER SLAMS PRIESTS

On May 27, a reporter for National Public Radio (NPR) published a piece that was posted on the NPR website titled, "Just Doing His Job Is Catholic Official's Defense." The following is the opening of the story:

"A clergy sex-abuse trial in is [sic] reaching a crescendo in a Philadelphia courtroom. One defendant is James Brennan, a priest accused of trying to rape a minor, *which is not that unusual.*" [Emphasis added.]

We responded by saying in this day and age when it is considered taboo to make sweeping generalizations of a negative sort about so many demographic groups, it is astonishing that NPR allowed this bigoted swipe at priests. What made this offensive characterization so doubly despicable is that Brennan was initially charged with anally raping his

alleged victim, yet before the trial the charge was amended to *attempted* rape.

Within a couple of weeks, NPR responded to our complaint and removed the phrase from the reporter's story. She explained that the phrase was "inartfully written" and what she meant was that "trials of priests for alleged sexual abuse that are not so unusual."

In a June 5 column, NPR ombudsman Edward Schumacher-Matos addressed the situation and agreed that the article contained a "clumsy phrase." He then explained that because the piece came in on a weekend when the editing staff is stretched thin, it got by.

For the record, almost all priests in the nation—now as well as before—have never had a single charge of sexual molestation made against them. Of those who have, a large share of the accusations have been proven false. Of the guilty, the most common form of abuse was "inappropriate touching"—not rape—and the most common victim was an adolescent. So to feed the perception that it is not unusual to find rapist priests was unconscionable. We are glad they removed the misleading language.

OPEN LETTER TO MAUREEN DOWD

The following was written by Bill Donohue to Maureen Dowd in response to her May 23 column:

My Dearest Maureen, in today's *New York Times*, you write the following: "The church insists it's an argument about religious freedom, not birth control. But, really, it's about birth control, and women's lower caste in the church. It's

about conservative bishops targeting Democratic candidates who support contraception and abortion rights as a matter of public policy. And it's about a church that is obsessed with sex in ways it shouldn't be, and not obsessed with sex in ways it should be. The bishops and the Vatican care passionately about putting women in chastity belts."

I have a confession to make. While some may think you sound like a delusional weepy woman, don't listen to them. You see, I was in on those meetings with the bishops when we hatched plans to stick it to women and sabotage the Democrats.

We met over drinks. Plenty of them. Except for one bishop who said over time women could become our equal, all of us agreed that you gals need to be kept in your place. As you properly note, this means being subjugated to the lower caste, just the way we snookered Mother Teresa.

You are only partly right about the Democrats. In fact, starting last year our goal was to rig the Republican primary so that Romney would win. Why? Because then we could pull his Mormon strings without being accused of running the government. So far, so good. Just don't tell Mitt.

We are obsessed with sex. Indeed, when I meet with the bishops, it's the only thing we talk about. Admittedly, it sometimes feels like I'm at a frat party, but boys will be boys. There is one difference: at frat parties, chastity belts for women are never discussed, but with the bishops, nothing is more important. The goal is to make a "one size fits all" belt, one that is not removable. Velcro works for all sizes, but it comes off. Not to worry, we won't give up. That's because, unlike the *Times*, we're obsessed with sex.

FARLEY, FOUCAULT AND MAUREEN

The Vatican recently issued a statement criticizing the book, *Just Love: A Framework for Christian Sexual Ethics*, by Sister Margaret Farley. After this broke, we decided to shed some light on the nun.

No one who ever heard of Farley and stumbled across *Just Love* in a bookstore would consider her a nun. Nor would anyone think she was a nun by viewing her official Yale biography. That's because she does not identify herself as a nun. But Maureen Dowd called Farley a nun, and, alas, she was right. More than that, Farley was in the news for writing a book that contradicts Catholic teachings on sexuality. She was also in the news in 1984: she signed a statement paid for by the anti-Catholic organization, Catholics for a Free Choice, that said it was okay to be Catholic and pro-abortion.

In *Just Love*, Farley makes it clear that she thinks very highly of Michel Foucault. She likes the way he taught that sexuality was nothing but a social construct, having no roots in nature. Foucault also taught that AIDS was a social construct, not a disease. He died of this "social construct" in 1984 at the age of 57.

In Bill Donohue's new book, *Why Catholicism Matters*, he recounts Foucault's lifestyle as an example of what happens when the virtue of temperance is condemned. "The French Nietzsche," as he was called, declared God, and man, to be "dead." This drug-addicted philosopher had sex with males of all ages, cruised the San Francisco gay scene with abandon, indulged in sadomasochism, intentionally infected as many boys as he could, and even justified rape. This is Farley's hero.

It would be instructive to know if Foucault is also Maureen's hero.

EMBRACING MORAL DEPRAVITY

In June, Margaret Farley spoke to the Catholic Theological Society of America (CTSA): The CTSA responded to the Vatican's criticism of Farley's book, *Just Love*, by defending her. Lisa Miller of the *Washington Post* also defended her by saying Farley was acting in the grand tradition of the late Catholic feminist Mary Daly. Also speaking at the conference was retired Archbishop Rembert Weakland. Who are these people?

In the 70s, the CTSA sponsored a book by Rev. Anthony Kosnick, *Human Sexuality*, that took a radically nonjudgmental position on homosexuality, swinging, adultery, and bestiality; it was used to teach seminarians at a time when the sexual abuse scandal was in full swing (the book was censured by the Vatican). Mary Daly taught at Boston College for decades, maintaining that Christianity was a form of "phallicism" and oppression; she quit when she was told she could no longer ban men from her classes. Weakland resigned as Archbishop of Milwaukee after it was discovered that his male lover of 23 years was paid \$450,000 from church funds to keep quiet.

The fact is that some on the Catholic left are prepared to embrace virtually every expression of sexual deviance, no matter how perverse. Worse, after contributing to the root causes of the priestly sex abuse scandal, they have the audacity to blame the Vatican and the U.S. bishops. Moral depravity on a large scale does not spring from a social vacuum—it is driven by a milieu that invites it.

THE ARROGANCE OF THE WASHINGTON POST

In a May 17 editorial, the *Washington Post* said it was “shocking” that Donald Cardinal Wuerl would criticize Georgetown University for inviting Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius to speak at one of the university’s commencement exercises.

We found it shocking that the *Post* would involve itself in the internal affairs of the Catholic Church. If Cardinal Wuerl were to criticize the Washington Post for disciplining one of its miscreant reporters, we would never hear the end of it.

The editorial board looked positively foolish when it spoke about the importance of “the free exchange of ideas.” So are we to conclude that all ideas should freely be exchanged on campus, and that their proponents should be welcomed at a Catholic university? If so, this would include spokesmen ranging from the Flat Earth Society to the Ku Klux Klan.

The fact is that the editorial board of the *Washington Post* loves abortion rights, loves President Obama, and loves self-identified Catholics who love abortion rights, love Obama, and publicly reject the teachings of the Catholic Church on abortion. This is why they love Kathleen Sebelius.

Georgetown is home to two pro-abortion groups, so it is hardly surprising to learn that it would seek a confrontation by inviting Sebelius—next to Obama, she is the most pro-abortion person in public life today.

We are proud of Cardinal Wuerl for standing on principle: he stands in stark relief to the journalistic arrogance of the *Washington Post*.

L.A. TIMES LACKS MORAL STANDING

The day following the *Washington Post's* editorial lecturing Donald Cardinal Wuerl, the *Los Angeles Times* decided to chime in.

The editorial accused Cardinal Wuerl of “censorship” for speaking out against Georgetown’s embrace of abortion champion Kathleen Sebelius; the paper said the students should be exposed to “a variety of viewpoints.”

Ironically, the last thing the *Los Angeles Times* is known for is exposing its readers to “a variety of viewpoints.” In 2003, its editor, John Carroll, sent a memo to his editors complaining about the one-sided liberal stories the paper runs. In 2005, a UCLA study of media bias listed the paper as one of the most biased in the nation. In 2009, veteran *Washington Post* reporter Tom Edsall said the paper was composed in large part of the “liberal elite.”

Nor does the paper have any moral standing to lecture anyone about “censorship.” Two years ago, it pulled a patently *inoffensive* cartoon, “Where’s Muhammad?” Were they being respectful of Muslims? Or were they fearful? Either way, they engaged in censorship (as they define it). Ten years earlier they showed their respect—or was it fear?—of Muslims when they dropped a promotional ad that featured images of Muslim women in chadors mixed in with bikini-clad women. To show how deeply respectful—or fearful—those at the paper were, over 200 editors and reporters signed a petition calling for the ad to be censored.

In other words, the *Los Angeles Times* shuns diversity of

opinion, loathes equal treatment of religion, and likes censorship. Which is why it is such a beacon of liberal thought.

ROMNEY SCORES ON EDUCATION

Presidential hopeful Mitt Romney recently unveiled his “A Chance for Every Child” education policy that will do more to provide upward social mobility for the poor and disabled than any proposal on the table.

“As President,” he said, “I will give the parents of every low-income and special needs student the chance to choose where their child goes to school. For the first time in history, federal education funds will be linked to a student, so that parents can send their child to any public or charter school, or to a private school, where permitted.”

It is scandalous that those who rhetorically champion the interests of the poor also do the most to keep them in their place. Wedded to the teachers’ unions, the so-called advocates of the poor are scared to death of change. Which is why Romney was correct to say that we are faced with a “national education emergency.”

It is worse than scandalous—it is obscene—that the current administration has worked overtime to deny poor black parents in Washington, D.C. the same right to choose which school they want to send their children to as the rich have. At the end of 2008, President-elect Obama and his wife shopped around for the best school to send their children to, and they opted for an expensive private school. Yet in 2009 the president, and the Democrat-controlled Congress, killed a stunningly successful voucher program in D.C. In other words, the public

schools that weren't good enough for the Obama children were declared good enough for "them."

Kudos to Mitt Romney for advancing such an equitable education policy. Score one for social justice.