

IRELAND'S "MASS GRAVE" HYSTERIA

**Bill Donohue
President**

**Catholic League for
Religious and Civil Rights
450 Seventh Avenue
New York, NY 10123**



www.catholicleague.org

Mass hysteria has gripped Ireland, England, and the United States over reports that nearly 800 bodies of children have been found in a mass grave outside a former home run by nuns in Tuam, near Galway. The Catholic Church has been hammered incessantly, and shrill cries of maltreatment abound. Fresh off the heels of horror stories about the Magdalene Laundries, and the torment of Philomena Lee (as recorded in the film, "Philomena"), the public is reeling from the latest report of abuse at the hands of cruel nuns.

None of this is true. There is no mass grave. Women were not abused by nuns in the Magdalene Laundries. And Philomena's son was never taken from her and then sold to the highest bidder. The evidence that the public has been hosed is overwhelming. Truths, half-truths, and flat-out lies are driving all three stories. That's a bad stew, the result of which is to whip up anti-Catholic sentiment. This is no accident.

The McAleese Report on the Magdalene Laundries is the most authoritative account of what actually happened in these facilities for "fallen women." This government report, which was released in February 2013, does not even come close to indicting the nuns—not a single woman was ever sexually assaulted by one of the sisters, and the conditions in the laundries were not "prison like." We know this because of the records that were examined, the women who were interviewed, and the physicians who offered their testimonials.

Philomena Lee was not victimized by nuns. In fact, she voluntarily turned her out-of-wedlock baby over to them at the age of 22. After she signed a contract freely handing her child over to the nuns, the sisters helped her to find gainful employment. Contrary to what the movie says, Philomena never once set foot in the U.S. looking for her son. Indeed, she never set foot in the U.S. until it was time to hawk a movie that was allegedly based on her life.

For those who would like to question my rendering of these subjects, please see my report, "Myths of the Magdalene Laundries," and my

article, "Debunking Philomena"; they are both available online at www.catholicleague.org. I will now turn my attention to the latest hoax.

To say that the headlines of stories about the "mass graves" are incendiary would be a colossal understatement. Here is a sample:

- "Ireland's Holocaust: Special Report on the Tuam Killing Field" (Sundayworld.com, 6/9/14)
- "Catholic Church Tossed 800 Irish Orphans into Septic Tank Grave" (washingtontimes.com, 6/3/14)
- "800 Skeletons of Babies Found Inside Septic Tank at Former Irish Home for Unwed Mothers: Report" (nydailynews.com, 6/3/14)
- "An Irish Catholic Orphanage Hid the Bodies of 800 Children" (salon.com, 6/4/14)
- "Fr. Brian Says Mass Grave Discovery is Akin to Horror Story from Nazi Germany" (Sundayworld.com, 6/5/14)
- "800 Dead Babies Are Probably Just the Beginning" (washingtonpost.com, 6/6/14)
- "Mass Grave 'Is Our Holocaust'" (thesun.ie, 6/6/14)

The Nazi analogy belittles what happened to Jews under Hitler, and dishonors Irish nuns. The nuns never put kids into ovens; they did not starve them to death; and they did not torture anyone. Even if the most glaringly dishonest stories about children who died in Irish homes were true, they would not come close to approaching the monstrous atrocities that Jews endured under the Nazis. To make such a comparison is obscene.

Similarly, contrary to what English transplant Andrew Sullivan contends (thedish.com, 6/5/14), there was no "death camp" in Ireland run by the Catholic Church. Thus, his call for the Vatican to shut down the entire order of nuns who operated the Tuam home, the Bon Secours Sisters, is patently irresponsible. It is also grossly unfair to the nuns.

More than any media source, the Irish Daily Mail bears the lion's share of the responsibility for igniting this faux controversy. On May 25, 2014, this newspaper ran a story, "A Mass Grave of 800 Babies." However, the first sentence written by the reporter, Alison O'Reilly, undercuts this monolithic headline: She said that "a former home for unmarried mothers *may* contain the bodies of almost 800 babies." (My italic.) Well, either there is a grave containing the bodies of almost 800 babies, or there isn't. In fairness to O'Reilly, editors determine the headline, not the reporter. As it turns out, no such mass grave has been discovered.

The next day, May 26, the Irish Daily Mail published another story by O'Reilly. The headline read, "Mass Grave of 800 Babies Uncovered." But the story makes plain that no such mass grave was uncovered. Again, her first sentence states that the remains of hundreds of children "may" exist. Which means they may not.

On May 29, another writer for this paper, Laura Lynott, ran a story with the headline, "Mothers At Mass Grave Home 'Still Stigmatised.'" In her story, she says that Catherine Corless, a local historian, did research "suggest[ing] 796 babies were buried in a tank outside the former Tuam Mother and Baby Home, in Co. Galway, once run by the Bon Secours nuns in Galway." Research that suggests an outcome is hardly unimportant, but it is not dispositive. Furthermore, while it is entirely fair to surmise what happened, it is quite another thing to declare exactly what happened.

So what gives? To begin with, the mainstream media in the U.S. are already beginning to walk back their tales of woe. "In particular the Washington Post and the New York Times," writes Forbes contributor Eamonn Fingleton, "have tacitly admitted that the implied image of satanic depravity that turned the story into a global sensation—that of wicked-witch nuns shoveling countless tiny human forms into a maelstrom of excrement and urine—almost certainly never happened." The Associated Press even issued an apology for the many factual errors published in its stories of June 3 and June 8.

Ireland's Minister for Education, Ruairí Quinn, said about the initial banner headlines, "This has been known about and written about for quite some time." He labeled these accounts "sensationalism." He continued, "It's simply not true. The deaths are noted and recorded right from the 1920s right through until that home closed."

What is not in dispute is the fact that between 1925 and 1961, 796 children died at this home in Tuam. On June 2, O'Reilly wrote a story for the MailOnline discussing a probe of one boy from the home who died and is unaccounted for. "A source close to the investigation said: 'No one knows the total number of babies in the grave.'" On June 5, the New York Times said the local police discounted the raging story as myth. "These are historical burials going back to famine times," the police said. They added that "there is no confirmation from any source that there are between 750 and 800 bodies present." Yet that is precisely what many media outlets, and activists, have been saying, on both sides of the Atlantic.

On June 3, the Associated Press rightly noted that "It is well documented that throughout Ireland in the first half of the 20th century, church-run orphanages and workhouses often buried their dead in unmarked graves." This phenomenon has long been associated with the outsider status of "fallen women." Similarly, Fingleton, the Forbes writer, maintains that "experts believe that the babies were buried in unmarked graves within the grounds of the orphanage."

In many ways, the observations of Brendan O'Neill are the most impressive. He is an Irish atheist with no dog in this fight, save for telling the truth. O'Neill is anything but politically correct. He saw through the malarkey about the Magdalene Laundries, and he has been equally courageous in challenging tales of "mass graves."

"On almost every level," O'Neill said in his June 9 article in Spiked, "the news reports in respectable media outlets around the world were plain wrong. Most importantly, the constantly repeated line about the bodies of

800 babies having been found was pure mythmaking. The bodies of 800 babies had not been found, in the septic tank or anywhere else." The myth was the product of Corless' "speculation" that the children who died in the home were buried in a mass grave. Corless herself took umbrage at the media for misrepresenting her work: she never claimed that babies were "dumped" in a grave (this accusation was made by the Washington Post and the Guardian).

O'Neill is adamant in his conviction that "it's actually not possible that all 800 babies are in this tank-cum-crypt, as pretty much every media outlet has claimed." He cites a story in the Irish Times that says "the septic tank was still in use up to 1937, 12 years after the home opened, during which time 204 of the 796 deaths occurred—and it seems impossible that more than 200 bodies could have been put in a working sewage tank."

Tim Stanley is another reliable source from the U.K., and he is also convinced that the popular understanding of what happened is false. "It is highly unlikely, if not physically impossible," he wrote on June 7, "that 796 bodies would have been placed into one septic tank." He takes note of the fact that "the tank was only in use between 1926 and 1937," thus undercutting wild accusations that the vile nuns treated dead children like raw sewage for decades.

Fingleton draws on his own experience to question the veracity of the conventional wisdom. He does not mince words: "For anyone familiar with Ireland (I was brought up there in the 1950s and 1960s), the story of nuns consciously throwing babies into a septic tank never made much sense. Although many aforesaid nuns might have been holier-than-thou harridans, they were nothing if not God-fearing and therefore unlikely to treat human remains with the sort of outright blasphemy implied in the septic tank story."

Adding considerable weight to the observations of O'Neill, Stanley, and Fingleton is Dr. Finbar McCormick. He teaches at the School of Geography, Archeology and Palaeoecology at Queens University in

Belfast. He berates the media for using the term "septic tank" to describe the child burials at the home. "The structure as described is much more likely to be a shaft burial vault, a common method of burial used in the recent past and still used today in many parts of Europe." He specifically says that "Many maternal hospitals in Ireland had a communal burial place for stillborn children or those who died soon after birth. These were sometimes in a nearby graveyard but more often in a special area within the grounds of the hospital."

So if the public has been duped, how did this story begin? It began innocently enough in 2010, but it took on a strong ideological bent in early 2014. The key players are Catherine Corless and Martin Sixsmith.

In 2010, Corless read an article in the Tuam Herald that caught her eye. The piece, "Stolen Childhoods," recounted the fate of a former resident in the Mother and Baby home in Tuam that was run by the Bon Secours Sisters. She had already done research on this home, so she naturally followed up and contacted the man identified in the article. This provided her with other leads. Two years later, in November 2012, Corless published her findings in an article, "The Home," that was published in the *Journal of the Old Tuam Society*. The background information is useful in assessing what happened.

The Bon Secours Sisters who ran St. Mary's, locally called "The Home," were trained nurses who had come from Dublin to take charge of a workhouse for the poor, the elderly, the sick, orphaned children, and unmarried women. These workhouses were established by the Irish Poor Laws in the 1840s, but after the Irish Free State was created in 1921, the system was revised, putting orphans and unmarried women together in the same institution. All workhouses were closed at this time, save for the one in Tuam, which became a Mother/Baby Home. The building needed to be repaired, and in 1925, after much work, the sisters opened the home.

Before proceeding, it is important to note what the alternative was for these women and children: the street. The state at that time offered support to "The Home," but the Irish government did not operate a single facility for the destitute. So abandoned kids and mothers either sought refuge with Catholic institutions, or they were on their own. This is rarely acknowledged, for reasons that are increasingly evident.

In 1961, the building was falling apart and needed to be renovated. But no funds were available, so it closed. The nuns handed over all the records to the authorities, which today is called the Health Service Executive in Galway. In the early 1970s, the building was demolished to make way for a new housing complex.

Besides her historical overview of the home, and the foster provisions that were later established for the children, Corless' account says relatively little about the way the children were treated by the nuns. She mentions what she says was a "little graveyard," but notes that "There didn't seem to be much local knowledge of a graveyard in the Home, and it was presumed that this area was used to bury the famine victims, and later perhaps the Home stillborn."

What is most striking about Corless is not what she said in 2012, but what she is saying today. In her journal article, there is no professed anger at the nuns, or the Catholic Church. But today she is in rage. While she does not explain her change in tune, it is evident that her encounter with Martin Sixsmith earlier this year proved to be a game changer.

The Oscar-nominated movie, "Philomena," was based on the totally dishonest book by Sixsmith of that name. On p. 2 of his book, he tells us how "*Everything* that follows is true," except that it isn't: he completes this sentence with a critical "*or* reconstructed to the best of my ability." (Both my emphasis.) Or? Then everything that follows is not true—it is a reconstruction of events. Events, by the way, that occurred decades before he even learned of Philomena's yarn of what allegedly happened in 1955; he did not meet her until 2004.

It hardly surprises to learn, then, that the screen version, which failed to win an Oscar, is also a fable. "In fact," the New York Times said in November 2013, "much of the movie is a fictionalized version of events." That is the generous view. What was principally fictionalized was the cruel portrayal of the nuns, in particular, and Catholicism, in general.

Suffice it to say that Sixsmith is determined to discredit the Catholic Church in any way he can. He moves from tales about the Magdalene Laundries to fables about Philomena with alacrity, positioning himself nicely to be a key figure in the "mass grave" scam. It is simply not possible to understand this latest "scandal" without the contribution of this English atheist. He has a vested ideological, and financial, stake in smearing Catholicism. Predictably, he is welcomed with open arms in venues such as Hollywood, CNN, the Washington Post, and many media outlets in England and Ireland.

Sixsmith never heard of Corless, or the Tuam home, until January of this year. He was all revved up at the time, expecting that "Philomena" would win an Oscar, and was delighted to learn that he could weave her story into his BBC-TV documentary about babies adopted by the Catholic Church in Ireland. The Daily Mail in the U.K., the Washington Post and the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in the U.S., gave him room to vent. He did not miss the opportunity to promote his book about Philomena, or the DVD of the film that had just been released.

The rendering offered by Sixsmith about the Tuam home, in both the articles he wrote, and the interviews he granted, is partially responsible for the inaccurate portrait that has emerged. He not only floats the "mass grave" story—offering not a scintilla of evidence—he even says that it is "probably not unique." Again, without evidence, he indicts the home for its "unsanitary conditions, poor food and a lack of medical care." Predictably, he trots out Philomena: the "psychological trauma" that she allegedly endured was commonplace, he says. He also blames the Catholic Church for stigmatizing women who had children out-of-wedlock, as if illegitimacy was welcomed elsewhere.

We have pictures from some of the homes that the nuns ran in the first half of the 20th century. They show well-dressed children in playpens outside the facility; pictures of them playing; and photos of them eating in a dining hall. In every one of them, nuns are tending to them.

Let's say the photos were staged. So let's consider what was reported at the time.

In her 2012 journal article, Corless describes the conditions in the workhouse run by the Bon Secours Sisters in the 1920s. Bishop James Fergus wrote a pamphlet offering "a glowing account of their nursing skills." According to Corless, the bishop noted that the Galway Board of Health "decided to close all workhouses and Union hospitals in the county, but decided to keep the hospital wing open in Glenamaddy Workhouse for destitute and orphaned children, under the care of the Bon Secours Sisters." He concluded that "this was a great compliment to the Sisters and their work."

Let's say the bishop was biased. So let's consider what government agents said at the time.

Government reports of the Tuam home were mostly positive. There was criticism in a 1944 report about overcrowding and some sickly children, but it was followed two years later by a report that found "the care given to the infants in the Home is good, the Sisters are careful and attentive; diets are excellent." These are not exactly the conditions that Sixsmith claims existed.

Let's say the government officials put a positive spin on conditions. So let's consider the account by a travel writer in the 1950s, Halliday Sutherland.

Sutherland's reflections, offered by Corless, begin by describing the two-storied building that housed the children. (Her italics.)

"These were well kept and had many flower beds. The Home is run by the Sisters of Bon Secours of Paris and the Reverend Mother showed me around. Each of the Sisters is a fully trained nurse and midwife. Some are also trained children's nurses. An unmarried girl may come here to have her baby. She agrees to stay in the Home for one year. During this time she looks after her baby and assists the nuns in domestic work. She is unpaid. At the end of the year she may leave. She may take her baby with her or leave her baby at the Home in the hope that it will be adopted.

"The nuns keep the child until the age of seven, when it is sent to an Industrial School. There were 51 confinements in 1954 and the nuns now looked after 120 children. For each child or mother in the Home, the County Council pays £1 per week...Children of five and over attend the local school...The whole building was fresh and clean."

It is implausible to believe that the photos, the bishop's account, the reports by government officials, and the observations of a travel writer were all erroneous. This is not to suggest that everything was peachy-keen, or that serious problems did not exist. But it does make Sixsmith's description look like his usual propaganda.

Of all the raps on the nuns, the one that critics seize on the most is the high infant mortality rate at the Tuam home. There is no denying this was an issue, but there is much more to this story than Sixsmith, and others, will allow.

The death rate at the home, which averaged 22 a year, was higher than the national average in Ireland. "The death rate was appallingly high in Tuam," writes Tim Stanley, "but it was appallingly high across the entire country. The problem at Tuam was that rates of disease infection were increased by having so many vulnerable people housed close together." Fingleton came to the same conclusion. "Because they were so desperately underfunded," he writes, "Irish orphanages were disgracefully overcrowded, which meant that when one baby caught an

infection, they all caught it. Not the least of the hazards was tuberculosis, a then incurable disease that spread like wildfire in overcrowded conditions."

It now makes sense to read what a government report of the mortality rate in the Tuam home said in the mid-1940s. To those who would blame the nuns, it said, "It is not here that we must look for cause of the death rate." As a former Irish health care executive, Jacky Jones, recently put it, "high infant mortality rates were normal for certain groups of people in Ireland until the 1970s. This was not right, but it was not sinister."

To make a fair comparison, we need to consider the mortality rate of children born out-of-wedlock at the time: in the mid-1920s, one in three died, a figure which was five times the national average. Nothing that extreme existed in the home. Moreover, "The rate of infant mortality among Travellers was about five times the national average," writes Jones. "Children from poor families were four times more likely to die before their first birthday." Let's recall, too, that the nuns *acquired* a disproportionate number of unhealthy children—they did not *make* them unhealthy. So when Niall O'Dowd of Irish Central says that "Children died needlessly by the thousands" in the homes, he is callously distorting the record.

David Quinn in the Irish Independent corrects the popular mythology by reminding us that mother and baby homes were hardly unique to the Irish, or to the Catholic community. Britain, he notes, had such facilities from the 1890s until the 1960s, the first of which were operated by the Salvation Army. Other European nations also provided for such homes.

As for the stigma attached to unwed mothers, it was the norm virtually everywhere, making downright stupid claims that this was an Irish, or Catholic, phenomenon. There were exceptions, of course. As Quinn notes, in secular Sweden they took care of the unwed mother problem at this time by having women sterilized; some were forced to have an abortion. In any event, there can be no debating whether the stigma

worked. In Ireland, as recently as 1980, when unwed mothers were still stigmatized, the out-of-wedlock rate was 5 percent. Today, after a sharp decline in stigma, the rate is 35 percent, an all-time high. So how's that working out?

Now it may be that, in the interest of gender equality, society may no longer want to stigmatize unwed mothers; that is a legitimate point. But the hard reality is that stigma is a social sanction that has been employed by every known society. It exists as a corrective, as a means to discourage unwanted behavior. As society changes, the use of stigma may increase or decrease, or social definitions of what constitutes unwanted behavior may change. Today we are comfortable stigmatizing smokers, not those responsible for children born out-of-wedlock. Which is one very important reason why smoking has decreased, and kids brought up in one-parent families have increased.

It would be one thing if the moonshine promoted by Sixsmith was not swallowed by others, but this is not the case. He certainly had an impact on Corless. Once they teamed up, her rhetoric denouncing the Catholic Church, which heretofore was rare, became more common, and more inflammatory.

After Corless discovered a Dublin woman, Anna, who was seeking to trace her brother (he was born in the Tuam home in 1950), her work came to the attention of the BBC; it was also in contact with the woman. Sixsmith learned of this and met with Corless in February 2014. He interviewed her, and others, for a documentary. When Corless' 2012 journal article, "The Home," was reissued online this year by The Children's Home Graveyard Committee, established in 2013 to ensure that the children who died there were given due recognition, it featured a photo of Sixsmith, Corless, and two others.

At the memorial service for the children, held on June 1 at the site of the home, all those associated with the committee were there. So was Philomena Lee. How convenient. Those who orchestrated this event

made sure that Philomena made the trip from England to be there for the photo-op. This coordinated effort played a big role in hyping the "mass grave" hysteria.

Corless was now on a tear. Her previous comments on the possibility of a mass grave, which were tentative, gave way to absolute certainty. In the May 25 story by Alison O'Reilly, she is quoted saying, "I am certain there are 796 children in the mass grave." On what basis did she draw this conclusion? "There was just one child who was buried in a family plot in the graveyard in Tuam," she said. That was enough for her to conclude with certainty the existence of a mass grave. Indeed, she told the Washington Post a week later, "The bones are still there."

Corless was now convinced of the mendacity of the Catholic Church. "I do blame the Catholic Church," she said. "I blame the families as well but people were afraid of the parish priest. I think they were brainwashed." No longer a Catholic, she confesses, "I am very, very angry with the Catholic church. I lost respect for the Catholic church with the abuse scandal."

To be sure, the abuse scandal should never have happened, and there is much blame to go around. But Catholics strong in the faith know that it was not the teachings of the Catholic Church that failed us, it was the teachers; the molesting priests and their enabling bishops were to blame. Had these priests followed their vows instead of their id, they would have behaved differently. The scandal, however, in no way justifies talk about "brainwashing." Indeed, that tag could well be used to describe those who claim the nuns abused women in the laundries. But that would also be an unwarranted characterization.

One thing that is not in doubt is Corless' transformation. If the Church, and the nuns, were so bad, surely she would have noted specific examples in her 2012 journal article. Instead, most of her writing focuses on the bad experience that children had with their foster parents. We learn how many were "fostered out" in the 1950s to "uncaring families."

It cannot be said too strongly that the nuns, and the Catholic Church, had nothing to do with that outcome. In fact, to the extent that what Corless describes is true, it could be argued that the children would have been better off staying in the home.

Corless had ample opportunity in her article to nail the Church. But she didn't. She raises some questions about what may have happened to the children who died—they may have been buried elsewhere in family plots, or buried together—but she points no fingers at anyone. The closest she comes to a "mass grave" thesis is when she says, "Is it possible that a large number of those little children were buried in that little plot at the rear of the former Home? And if so, why is it not acknowledged as a proper cemetery?" Those are fair questions, but they are qualitatively different from the stridency of her comments today.

Corless' research findings explain why just two years ago she was not "certain" about the existence of a mass grave: she uncovered several advertisements in the Tuam Herald archives, placed by the Home for "Tenders for Coffins." Here is what an ad said in 1939:

"Tender for coffins for Children's Home, plain and mounted, in three sizes, must be 1" thick, made of seasoned white deal, clean and free from knots and slits, pitched and strained in large, medium, small sizes. Mounting must be similar make, but mounted with Electro Brassed Grips, Breast and Crucifix."

This doesn't read like the work of malicious nuns who didn't give a hoot about their kids. It also punches a hole in the "mass grave" theory.

The notion that a mass grave existed in the site of the Home is oddly enough credited to the same person who says there never was one. His name is Barry Sweeney. Here's what happened.

In 1975, when Sweeney was 10, he and a friend, Frannie Hopkins, 12, were playing on the grounds where the home was when they stumbled on

a hole with skeletons in it. Corless had heard about some boys who found skeletons there, but did not know their identity until this year. On St. Patrick's Day, Sweeney was drinking at Brownes bar, on the Square in Tuam, when he learned of Corless' research. The two subsequently met.

In her journal article, Corless makes mention of a "few local boys" who "came upon a sort of crypt in the ground, and on peering in they saw several small skulls." So how did she make the leap in 2014 that she is "certain" there are 796 bodies in a mass grave when just two years ago she wrote about "several small skulls"? The leap, it is clear, was not made on the basis of the evidence.

More important, Corless did not jump to the conclusion that "the bones are still there" because she learned from Sweeney about some new evidence. We know this because he contradicts her fantastic story. He is quoted in the Irish Times saying "there was no way there were 800 skeletons down that hole. Nothing like that number." How many were there? "About 20," he says.

It is a credit to Douglas Dalby of the New York Times that he did not bury this new information the way most other media outlets did. On June 10, he wrote that "some of the assumptions that led Ms. Corless to her conclusion [about the mass grave] have been challenged, not least by the man she cited, Barry Sweeney, now 48, who was questioned by detectives about what he saw when he was 10 years old. 'People are making out we saw a mass grave,' he said he had told the detectives. 'But we can only say what we seen [sic]: maybe 15 to 20 small skeletons.'"

It does not speak well for Corless that she is flatly contradicted by one of the few persons whose credibility no one questions. Any objective researcher would have adjusted his thesis after encountering a central figure such as Sweeney. Even more bizarre, her initial assessment was sober in analysis. But meeting Sweeney was too late to matter: Corless had already met Sixsmith, and she wasn't about to let the facts get in her

way. Ideology, as we have seen repeatedly in history, has a way of trumping the truth.

It is not just writers such as Fingleton who see an anti-Catholic bias at work (he calls the whole story a "hoax"). Dalby quotes a member of the committee that was organized to memorialize the dead children, Anne Collins, as saying she has had it with the ideologues. "Ms. Collins said the news media and 'church bashers' had hijacked the situation, and she disagreed with the widespread condemnation of the nuns."

Tim Stanley is right to finger a double standard that is present among elites. "Whenever a Muslim does something cruel or barbaric (such as female genital mutilation), politicians and the media are quick (rightly) to assert that this is a cultural practice rather than a religious one. But whenever a Catholic is guilty of a crime, it is either stated or implied that it is a direct consequence of dogma."

Finally, let's assume that a mass grave of dead babies on the grounds of the Tuam home were found. This would be cause for harsh criticism. But why is it that when aborted babies are taken to a "waste to energy" facility, and then incinerated as "clinical waste" by British hospitals, there is little outrage? This isn't a horror story out of the early 20th century: It was reported on March 14, 2014. The headline in The Telegraph read, "Aborted Babies Incinerated to Heat U.K. Hospitals."

The Sixsmiths of this world are not at all angry about the mass killings and the mass burnings of unborn babies going on today right before our eyes. No, they are too busy fabricating stories about nuns sexually assaulting young women, stealing their kids, and dumping their bodies in septic tanks. It tells us a great deal about the current state of anti-Catholicism that such bull is not only accepted, it is welcomed as affirmation of the venality of the Catholic Church.