

# AIR FORCE AND NAVY TAKE AIM AT CATHOLICS

The Catholic League is now engaged in a struggle with the U.S. Air Force and the U.S. Navy over the constitutional rights of Catholics. Both branches of the armed forces, the league charges, are guilty of promoting a politically-correct agenda at the expense of Catholic rights.

Lt. Ryan Berry is a 26 year-old Catholic Air Force officer who objects, as a matter of conscience, to serving with a woman in an underground missile silo duty.

From May 1997 to December 1998, Lt. Berry, who is married, received a religious exemption from the U.S. Air Force from working in such close quarters with a woman; Berry said that such an assignment would create "an occasion of sin" and therefore he could not in good conscience accept it. But now the Air Force has changed its mind—after being pressured by a few female and male officers—and is punishing Berry for not accepting this assignment.

When the Catholic League learned of this case, it immediately issued a news release in support of Lt. Berry, citing the religious nature of his request. The league also emphasized that given the problem of sexual harassment in the armed forces, what Lt. Berry is asking for should easily be accepted.

In the case of U.S. Navy, the Catholic League has come down strongly on the side of the Knights of Columbus in a battle with the Naval Security Group Northwest, a base located in Chesapeake, Virginia. The commander of that base, Captain R.W. Jerome, has barred the Knights from meeting in the naval chapel; it is located just outside the base. The reason: the Knights discriminate against women.

The Catholic League pointed out to the Navy, and to the media, that "The operative directive from the Department of Defense bars 'unlawful discrimination,' making plain its willingness to countenance reasonably-grounded distinctions (by the way of analogy, the Fourth Amendment bars searches and seizures that are 'unreasonable,' thus allowing for reasonable ones)."

The media attention that these related issues garnered was impressive. On August 4, the Catholic League sponsored a press conference on the matter of Lt. Berry; it was held on Capitol Hill. And in the instance of the K of C, the league promised that if the Knights decide to sue the Navy, the league would do likewise.

In neither case is there any national security imperative at work.

---

## **"DOGMA" PROTEST SWELLS**

The protest over the movie "Dogma" gained force over the summer as the Catholic League commenced its petition drive and issued a booklet on the movie; more steps are planned for the fall.

At press time, league had received approximately 100,000 signatures supporting our petition drive to get Disney to dump Miramax; thousands more are coming in every day. Sometime before the movie opens, now scheduled for November 12, the petitions will be sent directly to Michael Eisner of Disney.

Lions Gate has been named the distributor of "Dogma." An independent film company, Lions Gate has a reputation for distributing "edgy" movies. Jeff Sackman, president of the company, admits that ethics are not a driving force behind his

decision-making: "People ask what kind of films and budgets we are looking for. We follow no specific rules. We do what makes sense and we do what makes money." This explains why an anti-Catholic movie fits well at Lions Gate.

On Sunday, September 12, the Catholic League will run an ad on the op-ed page of the *New York Times* that addresses the issue of who the real censors are in the debate over "Dogma." Members are urged to buy a copy of the newspaper that day.

To participate in the protest, see page 2 for the particulars on obtaining a copy of the league's booklet on "Dogma."

---

## **OPEN MINDS" CAN BE A VACUUM PIT**

**William A. Donohue**

When recently asked by a reporter why there is such tolerance for anti-Catholicism, I offered that nothing is worse in our society today than the thought of being branded close-minded, and this is especially true of the educated classes. That is why so many Catholics can't summon the moral courage to defend their faith—they are deathly afraid of being seen as close-minded. So in the face of Catholic bashing, they demur.

But an open mind can be a vacuum pit. A mind that tolerates everything, one that is forever non-judgmental, is utterly mindless. Even the smallest of social relations, a dyad, is based on two people being sufficiently discerning to draw boundaries on what is acceptable and what is unacceptable behavior.

Being close-minded is not analogous to espousing the virtue of bourgeois values. Those values, the values of the middle class, are what makes western civilization tick. Responsibility, duty, civility, sustained effort, punctuality, etc.—these bourgeois values have nothing to do with fostering close-mindedness and everything to do with fostering self-mastery.

All bourgeois values are based on some element of constraint. Unfortunately, large segments of our society today reflect a disdain for such values, and hold in contempt those who insist on the application of traditional norms. Quite simply, upholding the legitimacy of the Judeo-Christian ethos is automatic grounds for being labeled close-minded.

In August, *USA Today* did a survey on the causes of moral decline. Nearly 60 percent of adults said that declining moral values is the most serious problem facing the country. Explaining the decline, 80 percent blamed “Society too tolerant of bad behavior” and 62 percent cited “Reduced influence of religion.”

One of the reasons why we tolerate so much bad behavior is because religion has lost much of its influence: we live in a society where the mere mention of “Thou Shalt Not” is likely to be greeted with cat-calls. The passion for self-indulgence, which began in the 1960s as a cultural celebration and is now *de rigueur* among the kids of the baby boomers, finds problematic the very conception of self-denial. Those who denounce liberty-as-license are, of course, condemned for being close-minded.

Tolerating bad behavior is exactly what our cultural elites did when confronted with the savagery of Woodstock '99. Here is what an AP story said of the rock-concert extravaganza: “The toll for Woodstock '99 now stands at two deaths; four reported rapes on the festival grounds; the sexual assault of a 15-year-old girl outside the grounds; and, according to

doctors who worked at the three-day music festival, between 7,500 and 10,000 people treated for some sort of medical problem." The death figure was actually three—a young girl was killed in a traffic accident as she left the event. And a fifth rape victim has now come forward.

What was so touching about the cannibalism that marked the festival was the use of "peace candles" to burn the place down. Letta Taylor, a staff writer for *Newsday*, gave the details. Describing what happened the last night of the fest, Taylor said "hundreds of concertgoers went on a rampage that began when they set small fires that quickly turned into bonfires. Within minutes, youths were gleefully setting fire to truck containers and vehicles, overturning giant sound and light towers, pillaging vending vents and throwing bottles and rocks at police."

When the smoke cleared, Taylor observed, the grounds "looked like a war zone. Piles of twisted steel and charred rubble smoldered on the tarmac [of a former Air Force base], filling the air with noxious fumes. Overturned portable toilets lay in pools of sewage. The camping area was a ghost town, littered with tents and sleeping bags abandoned by terrified concertgoers who'd fled the melee."

Not surprisingly, the rapes and killings took place amidst plenty of drugs and booze. The men and women went naked, with 125 of them posing nude for pictures. Rock bands sang lyrics like, "I'm gonna kill you," and when the group, Limp Bizkit, started singing "Break Stuff," the savages dutifully complied.

But it was all worth it. "There are no rules here, everybody can just let loose and have a good time," said a 21 year-old woman from New Jersey. Perhaps she can now apply for a White House internship.

These kids came to Woodstock via college and were thus completely programmed to worship the environment, respect

women's rights and promote the cause of peace. Yet they destroyed the earth, raped the women and killed their fellow man. For this they got off scot-free: the cultural elite refused to be judgmental, knowing full-well that nothing is worse than being called close-minded. And that is why this will happen again. They just don't get it.

---

# **DISHONESTY MARKS ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY**

**by William Donohue**

Over the summer, Hollywood treated us to some pretty slimy stuff, much of it aimed at kids. Austin Powers was back, this time drinking diarrhea daiquiris in "The Spy Who Shagged Me" (in England, the term "shagged" is an obscene word for sex). Newspaper advertisements for "Big Daddy" showed a father and son urinating in public and a film version of "South Park" featured Saddam Hussein's penis and a giant clitoris. And let's not forget the adolescent boy who was shown masturbating into a hot apple pie in "American Pie."

When I express my opposition to such trash—or to anti-Catholic movies like "Dogma"—a reporter invariably asks me why I get so exercised. After all, it's only a movie—it's not real. Besides, no one has to see it anyway.

My answer generally goes like this: if nothing that is shown matters, then why isn't everyone smoking on TV and in the movies? Why don't we bring back the reruns of "Amos 'n Andy"? Why don't we reintroduce Tonto as a role model for Native Americans? Why don't we make a movie that pokes fun at the Holocaust? After all, it's not real and no one has to watch.

That shuts them up every time. And so it should: those who voice this line are either singularly stupid or downright dishonest. Either way, their selective indignation is disgusting.

If what we see on TV and in the movies has no effect, then why did everyone go into a panic after the shootings at Columbine High School? Here's what happened.

The Bravo cable network said that following Columbine it would not air a satire about a "teen sniper school." CBS cited the high school massacre as the reason why it pulled an episode of "Promised Land" (the show featured a shooting in front of a Denver school). Similarly, CBS has delayed the debut of "Falcone" (a Mafia-themed drama), this despite the fact that it was touted as one of the network's new hits. "It's not the right time to have people being whacked on the streets of New York," said CBS Television President Leslie Moonves. His decision to release the show later in the season suggests that there is a right time to continue the whacking.

Over at WB, it postponed the two-part season finale of "Buffy the Vampire Slayer" because it depicted heavily armed high-school kids at a graduation ceremony. WB chief Jamie Kellner confessed that "Given the current climate, depicting acts of violence at a high school graduation ceremony, even fantasy acts, we believe is inappropriate..." Maybe when the climate changes Jamie will bring back the violence. But in the meantime, it's only fantasy. So why is Jamie so uptight?

Fox announced that it was toning down the violence in a new drama, "Harsh Realm," and even Vince McMahon, head honcho of professional wrestling, said he would pare back the violence and vulgarity for UPN. And believe it or not, Studios USA, the owner of "The Jerry Springer Show," promised it was going to edit out violence, profanity and physical confrontation from future shows. But I'm skeptical: what exactly do they expect Jerry's going to do now—sing?

The TV and Hollywood gang got so sensitive about violence following Columbine that even jokes about the shooting were deemed to be off-limits. That's why the producers of the "MTV 1999 Movie Awards" didn't laugh when they heard film director Bobby Farrelly ("There's Something About Mary") make a joking reference to the Colorado high school shootings at the show's taping on June 5. When the show aired on June 10, the joke was cut. It was deemed "inappropriate" by MTV executives.

Now anyone who has watched more than three minutes of MTV knows that it likes to push the envelope. Indeed, it is the foremost carrier of sexually-explicit videos on TV. Complain to them about this and they will tell you to lighten up. So why didn't they air that joke about Columbine if nothing matters?

All this is to prove that it is dishonesty, not stupidity, that drives the entertainment industry. Dishonesty also marks many TV and film critics, those tube and screen mavens who sanction filth and anti-Catholicism while writhing in pain over smoking and violence. Take, for example, their reaction to "Eyes Wide Shut."

Stanley Kubrick last's movie, "Eyes Wide Shut," opened with mostly raving reviews and a less-than enthusiastic box office reception. Starring Tom Cruise and Nicole Kidman, the film features lots of full-frontal female nudity, as well as an orgy scene. The movie had to be digitally altered (to cover the genitals of the orgy participants) so that the dreaded NC-17 rating could be avoided. It was this that drove the critics mad.

To be more exact, it was the fact that it was a Kubrick movie that had to be altered that drove them mad. Kubrick is held up as some kind of god by many in the film industry, with movies like "Dr. Strangelove," "A Clockwork Orange" and "2001: A Space Odyssey" to his credit. That the famed director was also a self-hating Jew (he once remarked that "Hitler was right



about almost everything") seemed not to matter.

In July, 35 members of the Los Angeles Film Critics Association took aim at the movie rating system of the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA). Upset that Kubrick's last movie had to be digitally altered to get an R rating, the group argued that the time had come to reconsider the entire MPAA rating system. This group was quickly followed by their friends on the east coast when the 28 members of the New York Film Critics Circle issued a statement declaring the MPAA "out of control."

The New York group claimed that the ratings board had "become a punitive and restrictive force, effectively trampling the freedom of American filmmakers." It even said that the board "had created its own zone of kneejerk Puritanism." All this was said about a ratings system that is entirely voluntary and is appreciated by almost every parent in the nation.

The critics, of course, want no limits on anything. What they desperately want—and make no mistake about this—is to demolish all ratings systems so that children can be subjected to adult entertainment. Shamelessly elitist, they seriously believe that there is a fundamental difference between a Stanley Kubrick-scripted orgy and a teen-age boy who masturbates into an apple pie.

Janet Maslin of the *New York Times* wrote that "As the R is allowed to disintegrate into an outright goal for teen-agers, the system has left itself no way to differentiate between crude frat-boy jokes about having sex with dessert and this intricately nuanced exploration of the nature of sexual bonds." In other words, Janet objects that the MPAA treats all skin movies alike. She also complains that "The NC-17 rating has degenerated into a sigma," which, of course, is the purpose of having such a rating (I still prefer the more stigmatized X designation).

If Maslin is unhappy with the MPAA, film critic Roger Ebert is livid. He likes his skin flicks without digital alteration, especially when the skin-maker is someone like Kubrick. "Why couldn't the studio have distributed this movie NC-17," Ebert screamed at producer Jan Harlan, "instead of sending out this 'Austin Powers' version?!"

Ebert even let Tom Cruise have it. Ebert pressed the actor to explain why a Kubrick picture with him in it wouldn't have been the grand opportunity to overturn the ratings system. Take the NC-17 rating, Ebert urged, and then when the public isn't deterred from seeing the movie, the system will self-destruct. Cruise answered, "You're preaching to the converted here. But Stanley made the decision [to accept digital alteration], you know."

It is amazing that the very same gang of film critics in L.A. and New York who oppose any restraint on what the public can see, throw themselves prostrate on the floor when tyrants like Cruise tell them what they can and cannot say about him as a condition for granting an interview. To be specific, before the movie was released, Cruise's public relations firm required reporters to sign a contract giving it the right to view—and veto—any TV segments on the actor before it aired.

Cruise's publicist, PMK, got what it wanted, thus assuring "Eyes Wide Shut" nothing but good press before it hit the screen. The PMK contract actually stipulated that "the interview and the program will not show the artist in a negative or derogatory manner." That this gag rule wasn't protested by the opponents of the ratings system tells us what they're made of. Just imagine, for one moment, what the reaction would be if I insisted on such a speech code as a condition for an interview.

What these people refuse to recognize is that every free society is governed by limits. Limits on our appetites, limits on our behavior, limits on what we do to ourselves, limits on

what we do to others. A society without limits is no society at all—it is an aggregation of individuals who exist in a state of moral chaos. The end result of such a state is not more liberty, but less.

Yet this is what many seem to want—a free-for-all. Accessing the internet these days, viewers can gawk at college girls who have, quite intentionally, developed their own web page that allows voyeurs to watch them through strategically-placed cameras: they can be seen going to the bathroom, showering, having sex, etc. The fee is \$30 per month.

This fall Fox will air “Manchester Prep,” a show that, according to one reviewer, features “sex-and-power games that include intimations of brother-sister incest.” Joey Buttafuoco, of Amy Fisher fame (the Long Island Lolita), is not in the porn movie business. He described his new film this way: “There’s a scene in the movie...with a woman in a wheelchair coming down one of the hills in California and there’s a guy with a baseball bat and he wacks her, knocks the head off. It goes a hundred feet and some dogs eat the head.” Buttafuoco told a stunned Howard Stern that he would like to do this to Fisher.

But none of this really bothers the entertainment industry. Smoking bothers them. Violence bothers some of them, especially when suburban high school kids go on a killing spree. But filth, that’s okay. Catholic bashing, that’s perfectly fine.

Once the rules to this game are learned, it isn’t too hard to figure it out. But just remember that the rules are grounded in deceit and thus can be changed, without notice, at any time. So if Willy is slick, what do we call these people?

---

# **“DOGMA” BOOKLET NOW AVAILABLE**

In August, the Catholic League released a booklet on “Dogma” that provides hard evidence of the anti-Catholic nature of the movie. It contains actual statements made by those associated with the movie, as well as remarks made by film critics, all of which unwittingly make our case: while these persons are obviously not offended by the bigotry, the fact that they admit to it is worth quoting.

Please send for a copy today and then put the booklet to work: it can be used as a basis for conversation on call-in talk radio, letters-to-the-editor, distribution to church groups, classroom discussion, etc. The movie is now scheduled to open November 12.

We will send copies for free, but it would help a great deal if everyone slipped in \$1 to cover the cost of the printing and mailing. Send to the following address:

Catholic League

“Dogma” Booklet

1011 First Avenue

New York, New York 10022

---

## **PUSHING THE ENVELOPE**

The fall lineup of TV shows promises to be the most vulgar in network history. This is no accident: as the following comments testify, many in this industry want to destroy all standards.

The August 4 edition of "Entertainment Tonight" featured comments by William Donohue that stood in stark contrast to the remarks made by those in the entertainment industry. Here is what he said:

"We're in the post-Monica Lewinsky era. Everybody thinks that everything goes...What we're talking about here is soft core porn which is about ready to go over the limit into hard core porn."

Here is what the TV actors said:

—

Sarah Jessica Parker – Star of the HBO series "Sex and the City":

"People have felt compelled to voice all their opinions of outrage and glee and pleasure and secret joy and if we provoke that sort of reaction, that's fantastic."

—

Michael Boatman – Actor who plays a gay character on the ABC sitcom "Spin City":

"I don't think that there's actually enough pushing of the envelope, and I would love to see the networks follow the cable networks."

—

Greg Germann – Actor on "Ally McBeal":

(Regarding adult subject matter on television) "It's where we should be headed. It's the Millennium. C'mon, let's get with it."

—

Jay Mohr – Actor in the upcoming Fox series "Action," which

features sexual humor and profanity:

“As far as pushing the envelope, the line is gonna move every year. It’s gonna get lower every year.”

Couple these remarks with the statements quoted in the essay by William Donohue, “Dishonesty Marks the Entertainment Industry,” and there is only one conclusion that can be drawn: there is a deliberate attempt by those in the television and film industries to lower standards of morality. Their goal is to eroticize our culture and sexually engineer our children. Unfortunately, they could not get away with this without the cooperation of many Americans.

---

## **“DETROIT ROCK CITY” IS A LOW-CLASS ACT**

On August 13, New Line Cinema released “Detroit Rock City,” a movie set in 1978 about four teenagers who go on a wild spree on their way to a KISS concert. KISS star Gene Simmons is featured in the movie and is a co-producer. It is a farcical comedy in which nearly all the characters are caricatures. It is also one that contains two scenes that are explicitly designed to offend Catholics. Catholic League research analyst Tamara Collins previewed the movie before it debuted and offered the following account:

In the first offensive segment, viewers meet a drunken, foul-mouthed priest who steals money from the collection box to pay for pizza. In the second offensive segment, we meet a Catholic woman who is portrayed as a fanatic because she carries her rosary beads with her and has a bumper sticker that says, “Smile, Jesus Loves You.” Coarse and hypocritical, she drags

her son to confession when she discovers his interest in attending a KISS concert.

The priest, who is the subject of an advance by the boy's mother, asks the boy in the confessional whether he doesn't have something to confess like "carnal knowledge with a neighborhood girl" or "finding a box of magazines under Dad's bed." When the priest exits the confessional, the boy is joined by one of his girlfriends and quickly loses his virginity there. When the priest returns, he asks the boy about "crotchless panties," etc.

Here's what our press statement said about the film:

"It's always the Catholic religion that today's 'humorists' in Hollywood target. That's because they like us so much.

"The interplay between sex and religion has long made for good copy, and in the right hands, it can prove to be fascinating. In the hands of charlatans, it doesn't work. That Gene Simmons fits the latter category will be argued by no one. 'Detroit Rock City' is a low-class act that is consistent with the work of Mr. Simmons."

---

## **NEVILLE PUBLIC MUSEUM OFFENDS CATHOLICS**

On July 2, the Neville Public Museum in Green Bay, Wisconsin, began displaying an art exhibit of paintings and sculpture by Norbert Kox entitled, "To Hell and Back." It features the following: a) the Virgin Mary depicted as the "Great Harlot" b) Christ labeled the "Son of Perdition" c) God the Father represented as a monster d) Our Lady of Guadalupe with cross-

shaped knife, cutting the heart of a baby e) Christ wearing a necklace with the Satanic symbol "666" f) A headless statue of Mary with black filth running out of her Immaculate Heart g) A rewritten, blasphemous version of "Our Father." In addition, there is blasphemous misuse of Catholic sacramentals, such as rosary beads, medals, crucifixes, scapulars and votive candles. The exhibit is scheduled to run through October 10.

On July 27, we sent a letter to Frederick K. Baer, Chairman of the Neville Public Museum's Board of Directors, and all the members of the board, requesting that a resolution be passed that would "formally express its misgivings about this exhibit." We added that "there is no other way in which Catholic sensibilities, already damaged, can be mollified."

On August 10, we issued the following comment to the press:

"Two weeks have passed since we sent a letter—overnight express—to the board of directors of the Neville Public Museum stating our concerns. There has been no reply.

"We never asked for the art to be censored in any way. All we asked for was some reassurance from the board that it did not personally condone anti-Catholic bigotry. That such reassurance has not been forthcoming speaks loudly and clearly about the board's sense of fairness. Accordingly, we will now contact the officials of Brown County, who run and fund the museum, to consider defunding the establishment; we will also take our case to appropriate state officials."

In a letter to Wisconsin public officials, we maintained that "Bigoted art is bigotry, and while such expressions are constitutionally protected, no museum has a constitutional right to the public's purse." The Catholic League has asked these officials to stop all funding of the Neville Public Museum.

We especially urge our Wisconsin members to write to Hon. Tommy G. Thompson, Office of the Governor, State Capitol, 125



South State Capitol, Madison, WI 53702 and Hon. Nancy Nusbaum, Executive of Brown County, P.O. Box 23600, Green Bay, WI 54305 and at least some of the following state officials (we wrote to all of them):

Sen. Brian Burke, Sen. Russell Decker, Sen. Robert Jauch, Sen. Gwendolynne Moore, Sen. Kevin Shibilski, Sen. Kimberly Plache, Sen. Robert Crowles and Sen. Mary Panzer. Also contact Rep. John Gard, Rep. Cloyd Porter, Rep. Dean Kaufert, Rep. Sherly Albers, Rep. Marc Duff, Rep. David Ward, Rep. Gregory Huber and Rep. Antonio Riley.

All the above serve on the Joint Committee on Finance. Letters can be addressed to State Capitol, Madison, WI 53702. Remember, we are not asking for the art to be removed, only that the funding of the museum be discontinued.

---

## YOU DECIDE

Maybe some day we will have a staff commensurate to the volume of work we have to investigate. But for right now, we can only do our best. Here's an example.

We got an anonymous letter from two admitted Protestants about a play they saw that struck them as profoundly anti-Catholic. "Confessional" is a one-act play by a professor at William Paterson University in Wayne, New Jersey. His work, which was performed over the summer at the Chatham Playhouse in Chatham, New Jersey, was branded by the offend couple as "Catholic bashing" and "disgusting."

According to the couple, "there's an older, alcoholic, homosexual ex-communicated former priest" who begs a younger priest for more booze. He is told he'll get his drink on

condition that he delivers the neighborhood whore to his doorstep. This is followed by lewd comments, crotch-grabbing, etc.

We called the good professor and asked him if this was an accurate rendition of his work. Of course he said no, and insisted that his *intent* was to depict two priests—one of them admittedly a “fallen priest”—still struggling to do good and overcome temptation.

It is our position that intent doesn't empty the issue: what matters is whether a reasonable practicing Catholic might be rightly be offended. Since few who offend will own up, our job is to make determinations based on effect.

When we asked for a copy of the script, we hit a brick wall. “No,” said the English professor, that might “violate my civil rights.” He did not explain how this would be possible and simply invited us to see the play.

As we said, we can't keep up with everything, so we never did make it to the play (there were only four performances anyway). But given his touchy reaction when asked to see the script, you decide whether he had something to hide.

---

## SOFT-CORE BIAS

Some expressions of bias are of the flagrant, in-your-face type, what can be called the hard-core version. Others are not so noticeable—they are more of the soft-core variety. But both are a problem, and while the latter may not be as offensive, in many ways it is more insidious. It certainly is more difficult to combat. Take, for instance, two recent examples, both served up by the *New York Times*.

Whenever there is a march in urban areas, the police give an estimate of the size of the crowd. They may not be correct, but whatever figure they offer, it is accepted as the official count. The march's organizers will frequently provide their own figure, which, not surprisingly, is always higher than the official one.

At this year's Gay Pride Parade in New York City, the *Times* never cited the police estimate. But it did say that "by the thousands—700,000 according to parade organizers—participants marched joyously." Some also marched without their pants. More to the point, we can never remember the *Times* asking the organizers of a pro-life march how many showed up. That they show up with their pants on really isn't newsworthy, which is why this omission is understandable.

The World Church of the Creator is what attracted Benjamin Nathaniel Smith, the young man who went on a killing spree over Fourth of July weekend, killing two and injuring twelve in Indiana and Illinois. "Promulgating an anti-Jewish, anti-black, anti-Christian doctrine," the *Times* wrote, "the group [World Church of the Creator] has increased chapters from 13 to 41 in 17 states in the last year, experts on hate groups and the group's leader say."

That was fine, but what caught our eye was the omission of any reference to Christians in the break-out heading that appeared within the text of the story. What was printed was, "Pushing an anti-black and anti-Jewish doctrine, a burst of growth."

This was done intentionally. The damage? Lots of people don't have time to read an entire story so they scan as best they can. The result in this case is that they never would know that the World Church of the Creator is anti-Christian.

Soft-core bias may be hard to root out, but it is no more tolerable than the more egregious examples we spend most of our time fighting.