

# TONY ALAMO IS DEAD

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the death of Tony Alamo:

Tony Alamo was a pedophile, a child porn king, a pathological liar, a tyrant, an abusive misogynist, a tax cheat, and a rabid anti-Catholic. He died in a North Carolina federal prison last week.

Most of his marriages were not recognized by law, but that didn't stop him from claiming five wives at the same time, one of whom was an 8-year-old. He told his wives what clothes they should wear and what they were permitted to eat. He also ran a huge child porn ring.

Alamo was convicted in 2009 of taking girls across state lines—one was 9-years-old—and of multiple “marriages.” He had previously been convicted of tax evasion: In 1994 he was sent to prison while heading a multimillion-dollar business.

Born Bernie Lazar Hoffman, Alamo was a Jew who converted to a fringe Pentecostal group. He was most famous for founding Tony Alamo Christian Ministries, drawing on “Jesus freaks.”

Alamo's ministries were known for their vicious Catholic bashing. Here is a sample of his work:

- “The Vatican is posing as Snow White, but the Bible says that she is a prostitute, ‘the great whore,’ a cult.”
- “The cult (the Vatican) is very close to replacing the U.S. Constitution with her one-world, satanic canon laws of death to the ‘heretic’ (anyone who is not Roman Catholic).”
- “His [President John F. Kennedy's] assassination was ordered by Rome, then planned and carried out by Jesuits, just as President Lincoln's was. Anyone who knew too much about Mr. Kennedy's assassination was

taken care of too.”

Alamo had a credible following at one time, but after he was sent to the slammer, it fizzled. Still, his legacy of anti-Catholicism cannot be ignored—he poisoned many minds. And what he did to women and girls was obscene. Whether he ever repented, God only knows. Hopefully, he did.

---

## **SOROS-FUNDED CATHOLICS RIPPING MAD**

Bill Donohue comments on two groups funded by George Soros:

This has not been a good week for two dummy Catholic groups funded by atheist billionaire George Soros.

Catholics in Alliance for the Common Good, which unloaded its staff in 2010 and almost went under, is furious at the Republican-sponsored healthcare bill. Instead of offering a detailed critical assessment of the bill, its director, Christopher Hale, offered a rant, branding it “immoral.”

It is a wonder why Soros continues to fund a guy who produces so little. Does he even have an office anymore? I just called Hale’s office and no one answered. Just leave a message, I was told.

Catholics for Choice, a rabidly pro-abortion letterhead funded by Soros, is also going ballistic. On May 3, Jon O’Brien, its president, blew up at Rep. Nancy Pelosi for having the temerity to say that pro-life Democrats were welcome in the Party. He has nothing to worry about: Pelosi and the other leaders in the Democratic Party will never offer a seat at the table to pro-life Democrats—they just want to stop them from

bolting.

On May 4, O'Brien said President Trump's executive order on religious liberty was designed to "destroy the First Amendment." If critics want to make a mature case explaining why this initiative is a threat to liberty, then they should do so. But to make unsupported indictments is the work of an amateur.

We've known for a long time that these two groups dishonestly assume the name "Catholic," but now it's evident that they are incapable of sustaining reasoned discourse, choosing instead to resort to bomb- throwing invective.

Hey, George, are you getting any bang for your buck these days?

---

## **EXECUTIVE ORDER ON RELIGIOUS LIBERTY WELCOMED**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Trump's executive order on religious liberty:

President Trump is to be commended for extending his support to religious liberty as the preeminent constitutional right. Regrettably, the executive order is lacking in the kind of teeth that we expected; the leaked draft that became available in February offered greater detail.

The most specific part of the executive order deals with the Johnson Amendment. This provision allows the IRS to challenge the tax-exempt status of churches and religious non-profit organizations if they endorse candidates for public office, or

become directly involved in the political process. Evangelical leaders pushed to have this ban repealed.

Some observers note that the IRS rarely strips a religious organization of its tax-exempt status, so this issue is overblown. That misses the point—it seeks to intimidate these groups, often rather selectively. I know.

In 2008, right after Barack Obama was elected, the IRS sought to bully me: I was accused of violating its code on political activity. In fact, I did nothing of the sort, which is why its effort was a monumental failure. I stood my ground and nothing of any substance came of it. But the fact that the IRS tried to silence me (and others like me) cannot be dismissed as inconsequential.

It is up to the Congress to overturn the Johnson Amendment, though what Trump did is hardly meaningless. His initiative makes it clear that his Cabinet will not enforce this IRS code, thus vitiating its essence.

Moreover, he nicely teed this issue up for repeal by the Congress. In short, Trump did what he could, and for that we are grateful.

On the other hand, there is an underside to the repeal of the Johnson Amendment. Many of the faithful do not want to turn their churches into a venue for political theater, nor do religious leaders like myself want to be lobbied by Republicans and Democrats to get on board. Church should be about worship, not politics.

On the issues most important to Catholics—ensuring conscience rights, and allowing Catholic non-profit organizations to exercise their doctrinal prerogatives with impunity—the executive order does not provide the kind of detail that is needed. In comparison to the leaked draft version, it is considerably watered down. Nevertheless, it sends the right signal to executive agencies: religious liberty must be given

a priority status when implementing legislation.

We certainly expect that the Trump administration will ensure that Catholic non-profits, such as the Little Sisters of the Poor, will finally be free of the pernicious pressures brought to bear on them by attorneys out to sunder their mission. The nuns should not have to comply with any mandate that forces them to be complicit in immoral acts.

At the heart of this controversy is something that transcends an executive order. To be exact, no government agency should have the right to strip Catholic organizations of their religious exemption merely because they hire and serve large segments of the population that are not Catholic. Catholic schools and social service agencies should be congratulated for not discriminating in their services, not condemned for doing so.

Much more is needed to guarantee religious liberty: the Congress must act, and the federal courts must uphold the First Amendment rights of religious individuals and entities. But we can at least thank President Trump for pointing these branches of government in the right direction. His leadership is very much appreciated.

---

## **TRUMP      SET      TO      ADVANCE RELIGIOUS   LIBERTY**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Trump's executive order on religious liberty, scheduled for release May 4:

If the final version of the executive order on religious

liberty is anything like the draft that was leaked a few weeks into President Trump's term, there will be much to celebrate. Foes of religious liberty—gay rights activists and secular militants—are attempting to frame this vital First Amendment right as a legal excuse to discriminate. They are distorting the issue.

The *Advocate*, a radical gay publication, claims the executive order would allow “a broad license to discriminate against LGBT people and others.” The left-wing website, the Daily Kos, refers to it as an “anti-LGBTQ ‘religious liberty’ order.” The ACLU, a determined enemy of religious liberty, declares it will file a lawsuit before the ink is dry.

The Center for Inquiry, a militant secularist organization, ratchets up the threats by arguing the order is “really about discriminating against LGBTQ folks and controlling the bodies of women.” Americans United for Separation of Church and State, which is rooted in anti-Catholicism, screams that this statement “could be the most sweeping attack on LGBTQ and women's rights in the name of religion that we have ever seen.” Atheist Hemant Mehta frets it will allow “faith-based discrimination in public places.”

If they were all merely crazy, they could be dismissed. But they carry clout in the culture, and deserve a rejoinder.

The primary purpose of the executive order is to secure for religious organizations the kinds of exemptions from law and public policy that have traditionally been afforded, but are now under attack, thereby protecting conscience rights. That's it.

There are always instances when two rights conflict: a reporter's First Amendment right to cover a trial may conflict with the defendant's Fourth Amendment right to a fair trial. How do we reconcile these competing rights? We can't, not completely. It is part of American jurisprudence that we

protect the rights of the accused by disallowing television coverage in some courtrooms.

Does this mean we discriminate against reporters? Technically speaking, the *effect* of the courtroom ban is to discriminate against them. But would it be fair to say that the purpose of the prohibition is to discriminate against reporters? Would it not be more fair to say that it is done to protect the rights of the accused?

Similarly, when a Catholic social service agency does not allow children to be adopted by two homosexual men, the *effect* of this ruling, technically speaking, is to discriminate against the gay men. But would it be fair to conclude that the purpose of this policy is to discriminate against gays? Would it not be more fair to say that it is done to protect the religious liberty interests of the Catholic organization?

When rights compete, compromises often appear elusive. Choices must be made. When it comes to guaranteeing the First Amendment right to religious liberty, there should be a presumptive right to honor it. That is what President Trump is seeking to do, and we pray he has not backed off from his pledge.

---

## **IRELAND'S SHIFTY "MASS GRAVE"**

### **AUTHOR**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue wants to know why Catherine Corless shifts her account of her "mass grave" story so often:

The pushback against false accusations made about priests and

nuns in Ireland has begun, but to really have an effect, those who have made sensationalistic charges must be held accountable. This would certainly include Catherine Corless, the Galway typist behind the “mass grave” hoax. She needs to explain herself. Just consider three inconsistent comments she made in June 2014.

On June 1, 2014, Irish Central ran a news story by Cahir O’Doherty, “Galway Historian Reveals Truth Behind 800 Orphans in Mass Grave.” Corless is quoted about her discovery saying, “There’s nothing on the ground there to mark the grave [in Tuam, outside the Mother and Baby Home], there’s nothing to say it’s a massive children’s graveyard. It’s laid abandoned like that since it was closed in 1961.”

On June 13, 2014, the Guardian published a story that conflicts with the Irish Central account. Gone is the certainty about “800 Orphans in [a] Mass Grave.” Amelia Gentleman’s interview with Corless reveals much speculation. We learn, for example, that Corless “suggested that many of the bodies may have been put in a disused septic tank.” She *suggested* that *many* of the bodies *may have* been put there. Why the tentativeness? That’s not what she told O’Doherty.

Gentleman’s story offers more unresolved issues. “The facts of the case remain uncertain.” This is accurate, which calls into question Corless’ cocksure comments about a “mass grave.” Also, the reporter says, “Corless’s theory is untested.” Precisely. It was never more than a theory.

There’s more. Gentleman says that only an excavation can settle this issue, because “no one knows if this really is where the bodies lie.” So true. So why are Corless and Irish Central so sure they are right?

“The scale of the belated outcry probably has something to do with the way her research was reported,” Gentleman writes, “with much coverage glossing over the uncertainty and



presenting the 796-bodies-in-a-septic-tank theory as proven fact, which Corless never claimed." Corless is quoted as saying, " I can't prove it."

Then why did she tell Irish Central, and many other media outlets, a different story? As recently as March 4, 2017, Irish Central wrote a story based on her research that contradicts what Corless told Gentleman. The headline read, "Tuam Mass Infant Grave Confirmed." The government report on this subject (it appeared March 3rd) did not even mention anything about a "mass grave," so what was the basis of this accusation? On March 8, an Irish Central story said, "Just last week 800 babies were found buried, abandoned in an unmarked grave in Tuam."

*Neither Corless nor Irish Central has ever offered proof of this remarkable claim. Where are the pictures?*

The third story from June 2014 that raises more questions about Corless' shifting account was a YouTube interview that was posted on June 26 of that year. She said she was told by locals from Tuam that before the Home was demolished in the 1970s, there was a graveyard outside the Home, one with "tiny markers there." There were "bits of stones left to indicate graves." The area subsequently evolved into "an absolute wilderness."

Those "tiny markers" suggest there was a cillin graveyard there—a graveyard for children. If that is the case, then there is no "mass grave." More important, why did Corless on June 1 tell Irish Central that "there's nothing in the ground there to mark the grave"?

Corless has been allowed to get away with her inconsistent renderings precisely because her most damning yarn about a "mass grave" is music to the ears of Catholic bashers. Her story only feeds more Catholic bashing. It's time Corless was asked to explain herself.

---

# CATHOLIC BASHING IN IRELAND PEAKS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Catholic bashing in Ireland:

Finally, Catholic bashing in Ireland may have peaked: a pushback is evident.

Leading the charge is Dublin Archbishop Diarmuid Martin. He is not counseling Catholics not to admit real instances of wrongdoing, only that the assaults on the Church have gone too far. He noted that embedded in the culture is a relentless drumming up of "the sins of [the Church's] members, painting every individual and every moment in the history of the Church with the same condemnation."

The Catholic bashing has been going on for far too long, so it is a relief to see this kind of pushback.

Martin spoke up for the clergy and the religious. "I notice a certain justified resentment among priests and religious [orders] and committed Catholics at somehow being unfairly under attack as they live out their faith and their ministry generously and with dedication. There is a sense in which they feel the time has come to stand up and respond."

The Dublin archbishop is right: The piling on has gotten ugly. If Martin, the clergy, and the laity don't stand up for themselves, they will only whet the appetite of their enemies to seek more vengeance.

Irish Central, which flagged this story, also cited an opinion piece in Irish Times by a history professor at University

College Dublin, Diarmaid Ferriter.

He raised objections to the “cartoon history of the nuns” that has become such a sport in Ireland. “It is unfair and unhistorical to imply that nuns involved in this area [hospital care for women and children] were devoid of humanity and motivated by greed.” He added that the “‘bad nun’ version of Irish history needs to be challenged...”

These statements by Archbishop Martin and Ferriter are encouraging, but more needs to be done about challenging the many false accusations made against Irish nuns. There is a sick cause-and-effect scenario being played out. Bogus stories about “evil Irish nuns” feed the appetite of bigots, making certain that the next round of alleged horror stories will be swallowed whole.

One of those persons feeding the sharks is Catherine Corless, the Galway typist behind the “mass grave” hoax. More on her soon.