

“DEEPLY RELIGIOUS DEMOCRAT” GARNERS ATTENTION

[Bill Donohue](#)

Every survey over the past few decades shows that the Democratic Party is overrepresented by secularists, many of whom are anti-religion, especially anti-Christian. That is why its leaders are attracted to someone who might be able to resonate with Christians, yet appeal to their base. They think they have found one in James Talarico.

Rep. Talarico serves in the Texas legislature, and after a lengthy interview with podcast superstar Joe Rogan, he is the talk of the town in Democratic circles. “You need to run for president,” [Rogan said](#). The 36-year-old might just do that, but now he is contemplating a run for the U.S. Senate.

Two years ago, Talarico caught the eye of Politico, the influential news website. The [title](#) of the article tells why: “James Talarico is a Deeply Religious Democrat Who Just Might Be the Next Big Thing in Texas.”

It is not every day that Politico finds someone who is “uniquely positioned to actually be the Democrat who wins statewide.” An “aspiring preacher,” he has been attending the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary; he is in the Masters of Divinity program.

All of this is music to the ears of Democrats looking for someone other than a socialist to save them. But the more we know about him, the more the music sounds discordant.

As it turns out, Talarico is a die-hard secularist dressed in religious garb. In many ways, he is just like that “devout Catholic,” Joe Biden, only worse—he is a preacher man.

Talarico's mentor is Rev. Jim Rigby. His pastor not only supports the whole panoply of gay rights, he loves [ordaining](#) gay and lesbian clergy. When Talarico was invited to give his first sermon in Rigby's church in 2023, he chose to discuss abortion. He [asked](#) the parishioners, "Did they teach you in Sunday school that Jesus Christ himself was a radical feminist?"

In 2022, Talarico [wrote](#) to Biden asking him to issue three executive orders: 1) lease federal property to abortion clinics on federal lands or in federal offices 2) prohibit states from imposing restrictions on abortion medication through the Food and Drug Administration, and 3) hire abortion providers as federal employees. It is for reasons like this that in 2019 Texas Right to Life awarded him [a score of 0%](#).

To an increasing number of Americans, allowing minors to undergo sex-reassignment surgery is child abuse. Allowing boys and men to compete against girls and women, and to shower together, is considered unjust. But not to Talarico—he's all in. Indeed, he [tells his fans](#) that those who oppose genital mutilation, chemical castration and puberty blockers are "pushing us to waste time on these culture war issues." He accuses his critics of wanting to "hurt trans kids."

Talarico is so far gone that he actually believes there are sexes beyond male and female. He [told](#) one of his colleagues, "In fact, there are six." He did not have a name for these creatures or share pictures of them. He should also be asked to explain why he chose six and not seven.

The "aspiring preacher" wants to ban the display of the Ten Commandments in the schools, but not "[sexually explicit materials](#)."

When a bill to mandate the display of the Ten Commandments surfaced in the Texas legislature, Talarico, who [explicitly called himself](#) a "devout Christian," said it was "deeply un-

Christian.” He even branded it “idolatrous” and “un-American.” But some were ecstatic about what he said. Barack Obama advisor David Axelrod and California Governor Gavin Newsom [were blown away](#), casting him as their new savior.

Talarico says he wants to help the poor, but his policies suggest he wants to keep them in their place. He strongly opposes school choice measures, calling them “[welfare for the wealthy](#).” But it is the poor, not the wealthy, who cannot afford to place their children in a private or parochial school. No matter, he wants to consign them to failing public schools.

Perversely, Talarico is actually an advocate of “welfare for the wealthy.” He places no income limit on giving away a [whole range of services](#). He supports medical debt forgiveness, baby bonds, subsidized marriage counseling, and what he calls “Medicaid for Y’All.”

Given his passion for radical transgenderism and abortion, it is hardly surprising to learn that he has won the endorsement of the [Human Rights Campaign](#) and [Planned Parenthood](#). He’s their kind of guy.

Obama and Biden both said they believed in religious liberty. Obama declared war on the Little Sisters of the Poor and Biden’s FBI spied on Catholics. Talaricio is cut from the same cloth.

If he is regarded as a “deeply religious Democrat,” we’d hate to meet those who aren’t.

Contact: james.talarico@house.texas.gov

WHY GEORGETOWN HAS A MUSLIM PROBLEM

[Bill Donohue](#)

On July 17, we issued a [news release](#), “Georgetown’s Muslim Problem,” that addressed the legacy of one of its professors, Jonathan Brown. To say he has an animus against Jews and Israel would be a gross understatement: he exhibits a greater affinity to Hamas than to Catholicism.

Our response came two days after Brown drew the ire of a congressional committee. The interim president, Robert Groves, took the heat. He told the panel that after it was revealed last month that Brown expressed hope that Iran would bomb U.S. military bases in the Middle East, he was relieved from his post as chairman of the university’s department of Arabic and Islamic studies; he is currently on leave, pending an investigation.

Brown may be the most conspicuous anti-Jewish professor at Georgetown, but he is hardly alone. Mobashra Tazamal also teaches there and his specialty is “Islamophobia.” He is known for comparing Israel to Nazi Germany. Nothing phobic about that—it’s simply a malicious lie.

To understand why Georgetown has a Muslim problem, all we need do is follow the money.

In 1977, Libya bought an endowed chair for \$750,000. This was done under the auspices of Muammar Gaddafi, the brutal dictator and ally of the Soviet Union. In 2005, Saudi Arabia gave \$20 million to establish a Center for Muslim-Christian Understanding. It is known for banning Christianity and oppressing women, two issues that are a flagrant violation of the mission of this Jesuit-run institution. But this is chicken feed compared to what Qatar has given.

The Institute for the Study of Global Antisemitism and Policy recently issued a lengthy [report](#) that is eye-opening. “Foreign Infiltration: Georgetown University, Qatar, and the Muslim Brotherhood.” It documents the incestuous relationship between the government and the university. To be exact, “it lays bare how Qatari money is systematically used to buy influence, compromise academic integrity, and embed Islamist ideologies at the heart of American education.”

Qatar has greased Georgetown to the tune of *over \$1 billion*. These include funds to operate Georgetown’s Qatar campus. This has real-life consequences: everything from research to faculty hiring and curriculum development reflect the priorities of the Qatari regime. As a result, the report concludes that this is a campus where censorship is extant and academic freedom is severely compromised.

Georgetown professes to be a school that prizes liberty and equality, so why didn’t anyone object to the establishment of a Georgetown campus in Doha? Actually, some did. The *Georgetown Voice* registered a complaint in 2018. But this is a student newspaper and the administration and faculty simply ignored their plea to close the Qatar campus. Money talks.

It is not just at the Qatar campus where free speech is squashed. The Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) monitors free speech at American colleges and universities. In its 2025 report on 251 institutes of higher education, Georgetown ranked near the bottom; it was number 240. The majority of its students say they self-censor at least once or twice a month. This is no doubt due to many factors, but surely the Islamic connection is one of them.

At the D.C. campus, Brown was a beneficiary of Qatar generosity. The regime funded a post he occupied, the Alwaleed bin Talal Chair of Islamic Civilization in the School of Foreign Service. But the real damage done by the Qatar-Georgetown nexus is not Brown’s chairmanship—it is the damage

done by those who graduate from the university's School of Foreign Service.

The report does not exaggerate when it says that this school "has produced more U.S. diplomats and ambassadors than any other institute. Many alumni have been shaped by ideologically slanted curricula and faculty with close ties to foreign leaders. These graduates go on to shape policy—often in ways aligned with the worldview of their financial backers."

In short, Georgetown's Muslim problem is a direct result of being bought by those whose values are about as anti-American and anti-Catholic as it gets. We will have more to say about this subject in due course.

GEORGETOWN'S MUSLIM PROBLEM

[Bill Donohue](#)

July 17, 2025

Georgetown University, which identifies as Catholic, has a Muslim problem. There is nothing new about this, but now that it is front and center, it can no longer be ignored.

On July 15, Robert Groves, the interim president of Georgetown, testified before the House Committee on Education and Workplace. He told the panel that one of his tenured professors, Jonathan Brown, is no longer chairman of the university's department of Arabic and Islamic studies.

Brown, who is a convert to Islam, is stridently anti-Jewish, and he is quite open about it. He also defends slavery and rape. I wrote about this in my 2019 book, *Common Sense Catholicism*. I will address his enthusiasm for slavery

shortly, but the reason why Groves was grilled by the congressional committee has to do with an X post that Brown made last month.

Iran is the primary source of terrorism in the Middle East, and a potential nuclear threat to Israel and the U.S. It was due to the escalating attacks on Israel that the U.S. bombed Iranian nuclear facilities in June. Brown, who holds an endowed chair at Georgetown, [responded](#) by saying Iran should attack U.S. military bases in the Middle East. "I am not an expert, but I assume Iran could still get a bomb easily. I hope Iran does some symbolic strike on a base, then everyone stops."

The Georgetown interim president [told](#) federal lawmakers that "Within minutes of our learning of that tweet, the dean contacted Professor Brown. The tweet was removed. We issued a statement condemning the tweet. Professor Brown is no longer chair of his department. He's on leave, and we're beginning a process of reviewing the case."

Brown's hatred of the Jewish state was made plain after Hamas attacked Israel on October 7, 2023. In an unprovoked barrage, the Iranian-backed terrorists killed 1,200 men, women and children, leaving 3,000 injured. Brown, the son-in-law of convicted terrorist supporter Sami Al-Arian, defended Hamas. More than that, he [said](#), "Israel has been engaged in a genocidal project for decades."

This is vintage Brown. He is such an extremist that he [claims](#) Israel has a Nazi-like history. "Israel will go down in history as a country whose main claims to fame are genocide, racial fanaticism on the level of the Third Reich and religious fanaticism that makes ISIS look mellow."

Similarly, Brown [wonders](#) why so many Jews have "embraced genocide as a core tenet." Indeed, he contends that this is "an inalienable part of their faith." Just as obscene, he

portrays the Israeli army as evil, saying it is “objectively the most effective child-killing machine in modern history.”

That any professor would tell such an outrageous lie is mindboggling. That it is said by a professor at one of the nation’s most prestigious Catholic universities is all the more astounding.

Georgetown has known for years that Brown is a radical activist, not a scholar. As I previously [documented](#), he has publicly maintained that slavery is okay, provided it is grounded in Islam. In 2017, he spoke at the Institute for Islamic Thought. He informed the crowd that “there is no such thing as slavery in Islam until you realize that there is no such thing as slavery.” This was not a throw-away line.

In a classic expression of moral relativism, Brown contended that “Slavery cannot just be treated as a moral evil in and of itself.” In fact, he flatly said, “I don’t think it’s morally evil to own somebody because we own lots of people all around us.” As I said when I first read this, “He did not say whom he owns, though if he does, he should be reported to the police.”

Perhaps Brown feels guilty about the fact that his hero, Muhammad, was a slaveowner. During the Q&A that followed his talk, he [said](#) the following about the Islamic prophet: “He had slaves, there is no denying that.” But so what? Brown quickly berated the audience, saying, “Are you more morally mature than the prophet of God? No, you’re not.”

It should not come as a surprise that the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) is standing by their man, even after Brown’s admission that he *hopes* Iran strikes U.S. military installations. In 2014, the United Arab Emirates (UAE) designated CAIR a [terrorist organization](#). And on July 15, Rep. Elise Stefanik said that CAIR was a [co-conspirator](#) in a terrorist-financing case and has ties to Hamas.

In a [letter](#) to Groves, CAIR pleaded its case for Brown.

“We urge Georgetown University to immediately cease any investigation or disciplinary action related to Dr. Brown’s tweet. Instead, the university should affirm its commitment to protecting academic freedom, resisting political intimidation, and standing with faculty members who have dedicated their careers to the pursuit of knowledge, justice, and dialogue. Dr. Brown should be fully reinstated as chair and no further action should be taken against him.”

I [wrote](#) to Groves as well, but my recommendation is very different from the one CAIR made.

Contact Robert Groves: presidentsoffice@georgetown.edu

POPE LEO XIV SCORES; WELL RECEIVED WORLDWIDE

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

On May 8, Cardinal Robert Francis Prevost was elected by the voting Cardinals of the College of Cardinals to be the new pontiff. The Augustinian priest chose the name Pope Leo XIV.

He is the first American pope— he was born in Chicago—though he is not well known to most American Catholics. That is partly because the 69-year old spent many years as a missionary in Peru; he is a Peruvian citizen, as well as an American.

What helped him enormously with his fellow cardinals was his previous assignment as prefect of the Dicastery for Bishops. In that role he advised Pope Francis on the appointment of bishops around the world; he also dealt with the resignation of bishops.

Apparently, there was not enough support for Cardinal Pietro Parolin, the Secretary of State under Pope Francis, to obtain the 89 votes that were necessary to win. He was the choice cardinal of the more progressive voting members. Cardinal Prevost cleared 100 votes.

Cardinal Wilton Gregory, former Archbishop of Washington, D.C. said of the future pope that it wasn't some "convincing speech that just wowed" the cardinals. It was in small group gatherings that he impressed many of his colleagues. Also, his international experience and pastoral approach proved attractive.

It is said that New York Archbishop Timothy Cardinal Dolan played a key role in advancing Cardinal Prevost's nomination. Some say he was the "kingmaker" who elevated his status. Dolan pitched him as a "bridge builder" and a "citizen of the world." Many look to Dolan to be the bridge between our new pope and our new president.

Pope Leo XIV will have his hands full trying to navigate Catholic waters. The Church is divided and needs someone to mend fences. Catholics are also looking for someone to bring clarity to Church teachings, especially on moral issues. The Holy Father not only commands the "bully pulpit," he has the authority to make decisive rulings.

When he was introduced to the crowd at St. Peter's Square, the new pope dressed in traditional papal garb, including a short red cape with a hood and a white cassock. In doing so, he reverted back to the stylistic choices of popes before Pope Francis broke ranks; he chose to wear simpler clothing.

Another sign of his more traditional approach came when Pope Leo XIV indicated that he would take up residence in the Apostolic Palace, left vacant by Pope Francis for more than 12 years. It will require renovations.

We are very happy and proud of Pope Leo XIV. We stand ready to defend him against those whose agenda is not Catholic friendly.

FIDELITY MONTH

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

To some, June is Gay Pride Month, but to Catholics, and to traditionalists who belong to other religions, it is Fidelity Month. Bill Donohue was very pleased that he was invited to participate in this event.

Begun two years ago by Princeton Professor Robert George, Fidelity Month is a time to celebrate why we are proud to dedicate June to God, our family and our country. Working with him is Christopher Parr of The Witherspoon Institute.

George, who is a member of the Catholic League's board of advisors, has received the support for this effort by the likes of San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone and former Kansas City Archbishop Joseph Naumann, two stellar Church leaders.

Donohue was asked to tape a video recognizing Fidelity Month. He chose to speak to Flag Day and Father's Day, on June 14 and 15, respectively. A veteran and a father, Donohue defended

patriotism and fatherhood from its elite critics, emphasizing why both are central to American society.

Donohue pointed out that the most patriotic Americans, as revealed by survey data, are the working class and the poor. How ironic it is, he noted, that those at the top of the socio-economic scale tend to be the least patriotic. Not surprisingly, they are the same people who devalue fatherhood. It only goes to show what is being taught in the schools.

It is time to reclaim June as a month where traditional moral values are honored.

POPE LEO XIV IS NOT FRANCIS II

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

Lots of people are wondering whether Pope Leo XIV is a reformer in the same vein as Pope Francis, or more of a traditionalist like Francis' two predecessors. It depends on the issue, but to those who think he is a clone of Francis, they are wrong.

No sooner had Cardinal Robert Prevost been elected when some so-called progressives started celebrating what they claimed was a "woke" pope. Ironically, some right-wing firebrands were bemoaning that he is one. Neither was right—all the alarms that went off were false.

An article published on Alternet started cheering "Our New

Woke Pope.” Why? Because our new pope had criticized Vice President J.D. Vance for saying love should begin with loving your family, and then spread outwards to others.

Then Cardinal Prevost said on X that “J.D. Vance is wrong: Jesus doesn’t ask us to rank our love for others.”

It is absurd to conclude from this that the new pontiff is a “woke” pope. Vance was saying love must be set in proper order. Some Catholic theologians agree with him, and others do not. No matter, theological disputes are common in all religious circles, but standing alone they do not make anyone “woke.” This is simply a childish way to politicize matters.

Then we have far-right commentator Laura Loomer. She branded our new pope “woke” and a “Marxist.” She is badly educated.

To show how crazy those on the extreme left and right are, consider what *The Nation* said. It is a left-wing publication that championed Stalin, the genocidal maniac. They began raising the flag for Pope Leo XIV because they saw in him what Pope Leo XIII stood for during his pontificate.

The Nation was right to say our new pope identifies with Leo XIII, but they were wrong to say that the late nineteenth and early twentieth century pope was a social justice warrior in the left-wing tradition. They heralded him for his “sharp critiques of capitalism.” Maybe if they actually read the 1891 encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, they wouldn’t have sounded so silly.

Pope Leo XIII wrote this encyclical eight years after Marx’s death in 1883. He foresaw the horrors that Marx’s ideology would deliver. He said that “ideal equality about which they entertain pleasant dreams would be in reality the leveling down of all to a like condition of misery and degradation.” He also made the case for private property, which is hardly an expression of socialism.

Orthodox Catholics will be happy to learn that Pope Leo XIV is strongly pro-life. He is opposed to abortion, euthanasia and assisted suicide. He is also pro-marriage and the family, properly understood.

He has criticized in no uncertain terms the “homosexual lifestyle” and “alternative families comprised of same-sex partners and their adopted children.” This is great news for practicing Catholics—the ones in the pews who actually pay the bills—but not for dissidents. He has also condemned gender ideology being taught in the schools of Peru. As such, he opposes the exploitation of sexually confused young people.

On immigration, Leo is much more in the liberal camp. He is opposed to the Trump policies and has even criticized the president of El Salvador for his crackdown on illegal immigration. How the heads of state are supposed to deal with those who are crashing their borders, causing misery for its citizens, is something he may have to address.

Is Pope Leo XIV a Republican, a Democrat or an independent? He’s a Republican. A registered Republican in Illinois, he pulled the GOP lever in the 2012, 2014 and 2016 elections. But apparently he did not vote in the 2016 general election and chose to vote by absentee ballot in 2024. It appears he is more of a Bush Republican than a Trump Republican. But he is certainly not a “woke” or “Marxist” activist.

Stylistically, Pope XIV is more measured and more traditional than Pope Francis. He is nowhere near as prolific a writer as Pope Benedict XVI, nor does he have the charisma of Saint John Paul II. But he is a thoughtful man who commands the respect of virtually everyone who has come to know him, and his missionary experience makes him a very special man. He is definitely not an ideologue.

Pope Leo XIV has expressed his gratitude to Pope Francis and will no doubt mimic parts of his legacy. But he is not going

to be a rubber stamp for either progressives or traditionalists. He will carve his own legacy.

No one thought that an American cardinal would be elected the next pope. From everything we have learned, he did not lobby for this post. Maybe that's the way the Holy Spirit works.

It looks like practicing Catholics will have in Pope Leo XIV someone they can rally around. As for the dissidents, they are by nature an unhappy bunch, so now they can look forward to more days of glum. That's their natural step.

Congratulations to Pope Leo XIV.

PAM BONDI TARGETS MEDICAL PROFESSION

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

U.S. Attorney General Pam Bondi is zeroing in on the medical profession's role in providing services to sexually confused minors. She will focus on "the medical community's fraud and exploitation of parents and children who have fallen prey to radical gender ideology." She said the Department of Justice (DOJ) will not sit back and allow doctors who are "motivated by ideology, profits, or both [to] exploit and mutilate our children."

Bondi is not making a talking point—she means business. She is putting "medical practitioners, hospitals, and clinics on notice" that they will be held accountable for engaging in

sex-reassignment surgeries of children. She is also instructing her lawyers to draft legislation that will allow “children and the parents of children whose healthy body parts have been damaged by medical professionals through chemical and surgical mutilation” to take action against them.

What motivated Bondi to act were reports that the Biden-Harris administration aided and abetted the suffering of children by the medical profession, all in the name of providing “gender affirming care.” There is nothing noble about sexually reconstructing children. It is a monstrous act done for politics or cash.

The American Medical Association (AMA) is a disgrace. The elites who run it know that sex is binary yet they pretend it is not. It is so far gone that it opposes designating sex on birth certificates as male or female, as if there is some legitimate third choice.

The American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP) is just as irresponsible. It not only agrees with the AMA, it does not allow doctors to set up a booth at its annual conference challenging its flawed transgender position.

According to the medical watchdog, Do No Harm, between 2019-2023, approximately 14,000 children underwent sex-change operations. This was supported by both the AMA and the AAP.

Attorney General Bondi is right to go after the medical schools as well. Here’s a quick look at the elite ones.

Harvard Medical School houses Mass General, the oldest and largest medical school in the country. It specializes in gender-affirming care. It is so specialized that it even offers vocal feminization and masculinization services. They just don’t get it: If there is no such thing as a biological man or woman, why are they tinkering with kids’ vocal cords to make them sound like a man or a woman? Are they that ideologically drunk that they don’t see how this undercuts

their position?

Boston Children's Hospital is also affiliated with Harvard Medical School. It is the first pediatric and adolescent transgender health program in the nation, providing "Gender Multispecialty Services" such as "menstrual suppression" and "dilation therapy and care of neovaginas." This is really sick. They are boasting about manipulating the bodies of women to stop their normal cycle of menstruation, and they are also bragging about creating new vaginas for men who hate their bodies.

Johns Hopkins Medicine runs the Emerge Gender and Sexuality Clinic for Children, Adolescents and Young Adults. It starts playing with the bodies of individuals "between the ages of 5 and 25 years." In other words, when Johnny is still on his tricycle, he is a prime candidate for these exploitative doctors. They even provide "penile construction" for little girls who want to become a boy.

Stanford Medicine not only makes new vaginas for the guys, it removes the ovaries from the gals. In doing so, it works "hand-in-hand" with the Stanford LGBTQ+ Health Program. Did they forget the "I"? At least they didn't forget the +, which covers them.

The Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania offers "facial feminization and facial masculinization surgeries." Again, these savants are giving away the store—every time they say one's sex is subjective, they offer proof that it isn't. Do they teach logic at any of these schools? They sure don't teach ethics.

Attorney General Pam Bondi should hold all of these predators responsible. They are preying on individuals who suffer from serious mental issues. They are not only injurious to their health, they are anti-science. Bondi should declare a mental health emergency and shut these Frankenstein facilities down

ASAP.

JESUIT COLLEGES HAVE A FREE SPEECH PROBLEM

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

The Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression periodically does a study of some colleges and universities, rating them on their tolerance for free speech. The 2025 report on 251 schools found that the University of Virginia ranked #1 and Harvard ranked #251.

Jesuit schools generally do poorly, and the latest study is no exception. Fordham ranked 234, Marquette was 235 and Georgetown came in at 240. Other Jesuit institutions did better: Creighton was 144, Boston College placed 189 and Loyola of Chicago ranked 209.

Other Catholic institutions of higher education did not fare very well. The University of Notre Dame placed 167, Villanova was 185, the University of Dayton registered 192, DePaul was 201, and Duquesne placed 222.

It is striking that Georgetown, year in and year out, is the least tolerant of free speech of any Catholic college or university. It is also home to two pro-abortion clubs, one at the undergraduate level and one in the law school.

NEW YORK TIMES MALIGNS IRISH NUNS AGAIN

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

In 2013, Bill Donohue published a monograph, "Myths of the Magdalene Laundries," that debunked the myths about the rotten living conditions in homes for unwed mothers run by Irish nuns from the mid-eighteenth to the late nineteenth century.

In 2014, Donohue published another monograph, "Ireland's 'Mass Grave' Hysteria," that debunked the myths about a mass grave containing the remains of nearly 800 children that were alleged to have been found outside a former home run by nuns in Tuam [pronounced Chewum] near Galway.

On May 6, 2025, the *New York Times* published a front-page story that repeats all the falsehoods that were previously told about the homes and the "mass grave." Ironically, one of the persons who showed the mass grave story to be a hoax was a *New York Times* reporter. They really ought to read their own newspaper before publishing another story on the same subject.

Even the title of Ali Watkins' article, "75 Years of Longing for a Child Taken From Her," is bunk. The baby was dead on arrival. Furthermore, no one "took" the baby from Chrissie Tully—she was in a jam and had to give the baby up.

When Tully was a teenager, she got pregnant out-of-wedlock and her "family disowned her." A priest took her to St. Mary's Mother and Baby Home in Tuam. As Watkins says, "for some like Ms. Tully, there was nowhere else to go." Not exactly. There

was always the street. She made the right choice.

Watkins bemoans the fact that Tully's boy, whom she named Michael, "was taken away" from her and "never held him or saw his face." But she went to the home because she could not care for her baby—that's why the homes exist—and because he died at birth, she never had a chance to see him. At the time, she thought the nuns were lying, but she doggedly pursued this issue for decades, and finally obtained the hospital paperwork. It read, "Stillborn." This settles it. She was never lied to.

Right on cue, Watkins tells readers about the homes being "one of Ireland's enduring moral stains," where "forced labor for young mothers, high infant mortality rates, pervasive shame and emotional abuse" occurred. The facilities, known as the "Magdalene Homes," were established in England in 1758 and in Ireland in 1765. Similar homes existed until the 1960s.

Unlike today, where there is no shame for girls who get pregnant out-of-wedlock, there was back then. Of course, the young girls were required to work—it would have been unethical not to demand that they contribute to their livelihood. Infant mortality rates were common all over Europe during those days—the homes had no monopoly on that.

Watkins just doesn't get it. She contends that the homes were horrid, yet she admits that Tully returned to the same Tuam home after she got pregnant again! Why would she do that? Was she a masochist? Or was she being prudent? It was obviously the latter—she admitted that the father was "not the marrying type."

Moreover, Watkins is apparently unaware that the McAleese Report on the Magdalene Laundries, a government study published in 2013, found that the women were not abused and that the conditions were not "prison like," as critics have contended. In fact, they were relatively good.

Regarding the mass graves hoax, Watkins writes, "In 2017, a mass unmarked grave was discovered in a septic tank at St. Mary's, which was shut down in 1961. Within it were the bodies of at least 796 children."

This is simply wrong. The allegation that a "mass grave" was found was first made in 2014, not three years later. That is when a "local historian," Catherine Corless, made this claim (she is actually a typist who has no academic credentials). What Watkins is referring to is the 2017 statement on this subject made by the Mother and Baby Commission. What she failed to say is that it *made no mention of a mass grave*.

There never was a "mass grave." As Donohue previously detailed, Douglas Dalby, a *New York Times* reporter, quoted what Barry Sweeney said (he is one of the sources who testified about what he found when he was 10 years old). "People are making out we saw a mass grave. But we can only say what we seen [sic]: maybe 15 to 20 small skeletons."

The septic tank story is also bogus. Dr. Finbar McCormick, who teaches at the School of Geography, Archeology and Palaeoecology at Queens University in Belfast, said the so-called septic tank was "more likely to be a shaft burial vault." He said 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 a hospital."

It does not speak well for the *New York Times* to peddle such trash.

GERMAN BISHOPS DISPUTE THERE ARE TWO SEXES

This is the article that appeared in the June 2025 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).

“In creating men ‘male and female,’ God gives man and woman an equal personal dignity.” That is what the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* teaches. Pope Francis not only agreed with this fundamental Catholic tenet, he said that those who deny there are only two sexes, male and female, are fostering a false anthropology.

Evidently, the German bishops disagree. Indeed, they also disagree with Pope Francis’ proclamations on gender ideology, which he called “demonic.”

In a special handout prepared by the German Bishops’ Conference that was recently published, the bishops made clear their vision of humanity. Indeed, the title of their document, “Blessings for Couples Who Love Each Other,” says it all.

“Couples who love each other” obviously applies to samesex couples. Indeed, it also applies to father-daughter and mother-son couples. That may not be their intent, but this is what happens when being “inclusive” becomes an obsession.

It gets worse. The handout speaks to extending blessings to “couples in all the diversity of sexual orientations and gender identities [that] are part of our society.”

This means there is a sexual orientation that extends beyond heterosexual and homosexual. The German bishops should tell us what it is. It also means there are more than two gender identities. They should name them. In both instances, it would be helpful if they provided us with pictures of these people

so we know what they look like.

In all seriousness, the dissemination of this handout comes at a critical juncture in the Church's history. We have elected a new pontiff, Pope Leo XIV, and Catholics everywhere are anxious to know what direction he wants to take us.

Will he ratify the African Catholic vision of sexuality, which emphasizes fidelity to the Church's teachings? Or will he opt to ratify the German Catholic vision, which rejects those teachings?

There is a reason why Catholic attendance in Germany is abysmal. In a vain attempt to be "inclusive," the bishops' conference has unwittingly alienated orthodox Catholics, making them feel *excluded*. By contrast, Catholic attendance in most parts of Africa is surging, and that is due in no small way to its embrace of traditionalism.

Bishops who are prepared to believe there are a multiplicity of sexual orientations and gender identities are not only rejecting the teachings of the Catholic Church, they are rejecting what science affirms. Moreover, they are driving the faithful to exit the Catholic Church. Strike three.