

# IRISH CENTRAL ATTACKS “MASS GRAVE” SKEPTIC

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Irish Central vilifying a speaker who questions the Tuam “mass grave” hoax:

John Waters is an Irish author and journalist. He has been invited to speak this weekend at the University of Notre Dame’s annual fall conference. His topic involves the dangers of false stories going viral in cyberspace. And his focus, “the Hoax of the ‘Holocaust of Tuam’” has Irish Central going ballistic.

Waters is not new to this subject. In a lecture in Spain last April, he pointed out that there is no conclusive evidence of a mass grave containing 800 babies on the grounds of the Mother and Baby Home in Tuam, Ireland—as repeatedly claimed, without any such evidence, by Irish Central among others.

“No news, no facts, no change in the evidence and yet this story has gone around the world for the second time in three years as though it were true, as though it were proven,” Waters accurately observed.

Irish Central quotes an “orphan survivor” who is a graduate of Notre Dame to raise the question of why the conference is not “offering a balanced presentation on this.” That is rich coming from Irish Central. Its head, Niall O’Dowd, has made it his mission—through overwhelmingly one-sided stories and commentary—to perpetrate the “mass grave” hoax. We have repeatedly challenged him to produce the pictures that surely would have been taken of a mass grave, had one been found. He has never done so.

Instead, he and his staff resort to personal attacks against anyone who dares to question their false assertions. O’Dowd

has called me “The head of the Catholic League for bigoted Catholics.” Now his reporter dismisses Waters as a “right-wing journalist,” and David Quinn, chair of the Waters’ session at the conference, as “head of the right-wing Catholic think tank the Iona Institute in Dublin.”

Such childish name-calling is a poor substitute for the facts they do not have.

---

## POLITICS OF SEXUAL ABUSE IN PENNSYLVANIA

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on legislation aimed at curbing sexual abuse in Pennsylvania:

The sexual abuse of minors is not taken seriously by many of the critics of the Catholic Church, unless, of course, the offenders are members of the clergy. This certainly includes the editorial board of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. Proof: It spares no criticism of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia in dealing with this issue, yet remains silent on demanding much needed legislative reforms governing the public sector.

In a recent editorial, the newspaper said, “The Archdiocese of Philadelphia and the insurance industry have long fought efforts to hold abusers accountable for past crimes.” Philadelphia Archbishop Charles Chaput answered that charge saying, this is “flatly, *demonstrably* false.” (His italic.) He then showed why it is untrue.

My interest is somewhat different.

The time has come for the *Philadelphia Inquirer* to push for

legislation that treats the Catholic Church the same way as the public sector. In practice, this would mean that those who are abused by someone employed by the archdiocese would have six months to press charges. That's it. It would also mean there would be a cap of \$500,000 on the maximum amount of damages paid by the archdiocese. That's it.

There is an alternative. Pennsylvania lawmakers, at the behest of the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, could eliminate the doctrine of sovereign immunity, thus ending preferential treatment for the public sector. That would mean, of course, that the lifting of the statute of limitations for the sexual abuse of minors would apply to public school employees.

Either way is fine by the Catholic League. What say the newspaper? To reject both proposals would suggest a bias, even an animus, against the Catholic Church.

Contact the *Inquirer's* editorial page editor: [hjackson@phillynews.com](mailto:hjackson@phillynews.com)

---

## **MEDIA      LOWBALL      KILLER'S ATHEISM**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the media have covered the news that Texas shooter Devin Kelley was a rabid atheist.

The media have had plenty of time to discuss Devin Kelley's atheism and the role it may have played in gunning down the faithful during a religious service in a Texas church. But few have shown much interest in doing so.

This carries even more weight when we consider what was reported on “Good Morning Washington.” The story said, “a family member says he was an atheist who doesn’t like the church and hated religious people.” Kelley didn’t dislike religious people—he hated them.

The following media outlets cited Kelley’s atheism:

ABC (“Good Morning America”)

*Boston Globe*

CNN

CNN Wire

Fox News

*Los Angeles Times*

*New York Times*

TMZ

*Washington Times*

The following did a profile of Kelley’s background but said nothing about his hateful brand of atheism:

Associated Press

CBS

cbsnews.com

NBC

PBS

*USA Today*

Time.com

*Washington Post*

The following left-wing Internet sites covered Kelley’s background but did not report his militant atheism:

Alternet

Daily Beast

Daily Kos

Huffington Post

Mother Jones

Salon

Kelley's murderous acts were clearly due to a range of variables, but not to mention that he "hated religious people" is irresponsible.

Had he been an ex-altar boy who attended a Catholic college, it would have been the subject of extensive coverage and unyielding analysis, complete with cheap shots at Catholicism. But because he shared the same animus harbored by many in the media, it wasn't worth noting.

---

## PAUL RYAN'S LAME CRITICS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on critics of Rep. Paul Ryan's remarks on the Texas killings:

The secular left is more terrified of religion than it is STDs, and indeed it treats people of faith as if they harbored some deadly infectious disease. Witness the hyperventilating over Rep. Paul Ryan's statement of faith following the Texas killings.

When asked by Laura Ingraham to comment on what happened at the Texas church on Sunday, Ryan said, "The right thing to do is pray in moments like this because you know what? Prayer works!" He also said the "secular left" doesn't get it. "People who don't have faith, don't understand faith."

Everything Ryan said is true and none of it is controversial,

unless, of course, it is interpreted through the lens of the secular left.

Huffington Post got so excited that it condemned Ryan for doing nothing, “especially after reportedly receiving more than \$170,000 in contributions from gun rights groups in 2016.” (Its emphasis.)

Atheist blogger Hemant Mehta made another one of his middle-school observations, saying, “That’s what Paul Ryan has to offer the nation. A giant, steaming bowl of jack s\*\*\*. And he wants credit for that meal because he says grace before gulping it down.”

Think Progress showed how theologically astute it is by exclaiming, “Ryan’s sentiment is also at odds with the teachings of Jesus.”

Ryan, of course, was simply noting the necessity of prayer “in moments like this.” He never said, or implied, that it was a necessary *and* sufficient response to this tragedy.

One quibble with Ryan. He is too generous in his comment that “People who don’t have faith, don’t understand faith.” There are lots of people who don’t have faith, and don’t understand the faithful, but they are respectful of us nonetheless. The ones condemning him are haters, pure and simple.

---

# WEEKEND ASSAULTS ARE TELLING

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how the media are reacting to this weekend's assaults:

- A practicing conservative Catholic goes on a killing spree in a neighborhood church, killing many innocent people.
- A conservative activist assaults a liberal senator.
- Conservative protesters, who profess a belief in violence, take to the streets in 20 cities, tying up traffic.

None of this happened. Here's what did happen.

- A professed atheist killed 26 people, injuring 24 others, in a church in Texas.
- A socialist activist assaulted Sen. Rand Paul.
- Antifa, which believes "violence is necessary," took to the streets with Refuse Fascism in at least 20 cities, tying up traffic, burning the American flag, chanting anti-American slogans.

The media, of course, will never connect the dots on what actually happened. But if the hypothetical scenario had happened, is there anyone who doubts that we would now be treated to long harangues on the danger that conservative Catholics and conservative activists pose to law-abiding Americans?

---

# NEW RELEASE OF DYLAN'S CHRISTIAN MUSIC

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the release of a boxed set of Bob Dylan's Christian-era music.

"Trouble No More—The Bootleg Series Vol. 13, 1979-1981," is now available. It contains eight CDs and a DVD of Dylan's recordings during the years when he was a Christian; never before released songs are also included.

Dylan was raised Jewish, converted to Christianity, and eventually separated himself from all organized religions, though he remains a "true believer." His religious migration mattered not a whit to practicing Jews or Christians, but it did matter to left-wing secular Jews and left-wing ex-Christians—they hated him for his embrace of Christianity.

It is worth recalling how these "open-minded" liberals greeted Dylan's Christianity. The tolerant ones, such as music critic Greil Marcus, called him "intolerant" for singing about Jesus.

Music reviewer Geoffrey Himes of the *Washington Post* was deeply offended in 1979 when Dylan sang, "It may be the devil/Or it may be the Lord/But you're gonna have to serve somebody." He said this was an example of Dylan's "pushy righteousness," accusing him of offering "reactionary lyrics."

Two years later Himes almost had a nervous breakdown. He charged Dylan with "righteously divid[ing] the whole world between the evil of nonbelievers and the wonders of the Lord." Yes, he actually said that.

Why were these liberals so angry? In 1980, Canadian reporter Paul McGrath summarized Dylan's music at that time by saying the singer focused on such Christian themes as "abandonment and redemption, confusion and clarity, sin and salvation."



Sin. That's scary stuff.

How did his old fans react when confronted with Christian lyrics? Like good liberals, they shunned him. In November 1979 the Associated Press put it this way: "When Bob Dylan made his debut as a born-again Christian, angry San Francisco fans stalked out of the concert." Yes, they no doubt felt more at home at a swinger's bar or in a gay bathhouse.

A month later *Newsweek* wrote that "500 of the faithful marched out during the intermission in San Diego" because of his Christian lyrics. They would have stayed and cheered had he used a string of "F-words."

Richard Harrington of the *Washington Post* explained in 1981 why liberal fans of Dylan were so despondent. He said that music critics "tend to professional agnosticism" and therefore "quickly forsook him." In other words, narcissists whose only god is themselves have nothing but hatred in their heart for believers. Nice people.

Steve Turner, writing in the *Guardian* in 2012, wrote about Dylan and his Christian years, saying, "Nothing guarantees more scorn in rock 'n' roll circles than a man who gets religion." True. If he get AIDS, that is forgivable, but not if he gets religion.

Fast forward to this week. Randy Lewis of the *Los Angeles Times* was quite blunt commenting on the release of Dylan's boxed set of Christian songs. "On the one hand," he said, "it's no great mystery that when Bob Dylan seemed to find new faith around 1979, a lot of fans and Dylanologists lost theirs—in him."

That's exactly right. The liberal gurus can stomach just about every perversity in the world—indeed many of them revel in it—just don't push the God button.

I have a suggestion. Since the ISIS murderer is not likely to

be fried in New York City, it would be great if they treated him to Dylan's new releases, blasting them 24/7 in his cell. That, of course, would trigger a lawsuit claiming it constituted "cruel and unusual punishment." But wouldn't it be fun to watch?

---

## NEW YORK TIMES' FLAWED REPORT ON IRISH HOMES

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a *New York Times* report, "The Lost Children of Tuam," about an Irish Mother and Baby Home; it was published online October 28:

*New York Times* reporter Dan Barry tries desperately to affirm the unsubstantiated claims made by Catherine Corless, a secretary with no academic or research credentials, about the Mother and Baby Home in Tuam, Ireland. He fails. His account is more anecdotal than anything else, breaking no new ground.

Barry has not unearthed one iota of evidence to dispute the charge that I have repeatedly made: There never was a mass grave containing the remains of nearly 800 children. It is a hoax. Perpetrated by Corless, the Irish media, and the American media—especially Irish Central—Barry has now added his name to this discredited list.

In fairness to Barry, he does not take the fatal leap that Niall O'Dowd of Irish Central has. Barry writes of "the deaths of nearly 800 'illegitimate' children at the since-demolished Mother and Baby Home in Tuam, County Galway, from 1925 to 1961." Notice he says nothing about a "mass grave."

Thus does Barry depart from O'Dowd's false accusations. To be

specific, Irish Central ran a bogus article earlier this year, "Tuam Mass Infant Grave is Confirmed, Now What Are We Going to Do?" In fact, no mass grave was ever confirmed. Even a government report never confirmed the existence of a mass grave. Does this not count for anything?

I will repeat my challenge to O'Dowd: Where are the pictures? Where are the pictures of the bodies of 800 children? Irish Central has a moral obligation to provide pictures of the bodies found in an unmarked grave.

Barry may not have taken O'Dowd's bait, but he is guilty of saying that Corless has exposed "this property's appalling truths." So what are those truths? Anecdotal musings are not a substitute for evidence. Moreover, the more serious the charge, the more credible the evidence must be.

The closest Barry comes to providing evidence is his discussion of Mary Moriarty, a woman who called Corless about her story.

Moriarty said that in 1975, when she was a young married mother living in subsidized housing on the grounds of the former Mother and Baby Home, she and several neighbors encountered a young boy running around with a skull on a stick. He told them there were many more, and they followed him to the site. When they got there, Moriarty said the ground under her gave way, and she fell into a cave or tunnel.

Barry writes, "As far as she could see were little bundles stacked one on top of another, like packets in a grocery, each about the size of a large soda bottle and wrapped tight in graying cloth." What were in those bundles? Barry does not say because Moriarty never bothered to find out.

Moriarty then reached out to Julia Carver Devaney, who once lived in the Mother and Baby Home, and later worked there. Speaking about the same site, she said, "Ah, yeah, that's where the little babies is. Many a little one I carried out in

the nighttime.”

Did Moriarty contact the authorities? No. Did she ask anyone to investigate? No. She offered her story in 2014, almost 40 years after her alleged findings. Barry never bothers to question why, or to question those who worked alongside Moriarty to validate her story.

As it turns out, 1975 was the same year when Barry Sweeney, and a friend of his, stumbled on a hole on the grounds of the Mother and Baby Home and found skeletons. In 2014, he was asked by the *Irish Times* to comment on Corless’ claim that there are “800 skeletons down that hole.”

Sweeney said, “Nothing like that.” How many were there? “About 20.” He later told a reporter for the *New York Times* there were “maybe 15 to 20 small skeletons.” This eyewitness account contradicts the Corless story, yet is apparently of no interest to Barry.

When the Corless account made a media splash in 2014, Ireland’s Minister for Education, Ruairi Quinn, said her story was “simply not true.” The local police said at that time that “*there is no confirmation from any source that there are between 750 and 800 bodies present.*” (My italics.)

Why didn’t Barry mention any of this? Why is he so willing to give the benefit of the doubt to the unsubstantiated claims made by a local secretary? Why did he not question Corless about how her story continued to evolve, in a more dramatic fashion, as she became a media sensation? I have written about this before and am awaiting someone to answer me.

The willingness to believe the worst about the Catholic Church in Ireland is what Irish Central is known for—it loves the Irish, but is not exactly friendly to the Church. The *New York Times*, which has shown it is capable of rendering an honest account of this issue, should know better than to get ensnared in this trap.

The Irish are gifted storytellers. But there is a difference between telling stories and providing empirical evidence about a serious issue.

---

## POLANSKI HONORED BY HIS OWN—AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an event in Paris this week that paid homage to Roman Polanski:

Roman Polanski is a child rapist beloved by Hollywood and the entertainment industry worldwide. On October 30, he was honored at an extravaganza in Paris for his wonderful work.

Polanski is accused of molesting four women—the latest of which is an actress who last month said he raped her when she was 15. Even he acknowledges that he drugged and raped a 13-year-old in the 1970s.

Does it matter to Polanski's colleagues that he is a molester? Not many. According to the *New York Times*, at Monday's event film director Costa-Gavras rushed to defend Polanski: He said it was not the business of his organization, Cinémathèque, to act as an "arbiter of morality"; his group sponsored the event.

Costa-Gavras, however, has a record of being an "arbiter of morality." He took it upon himself in 2003 to make a movie, "Amen," that told out-and-out lies about the Catholic Church's role during the Holocaust. He blamed the Church for being "silent" about the Nazi genocide—a position that has been widely and authoritatively discredited—and even created a fictional character, a Jesuit priest, to promote his

propaganda.

No one can blame Costa-Gavras for being silent about his rapist buddy. No, he has long been on Polanski's side. In 2009, he was one of more than 100 prominent filmmakers, actors, producers, and technicians who signed a petition defending the rights of the child rapist. The petition was organized by serial sexual abuser Harvey Weinstein.

Child abuser Woody Allen signed the petition in defense of Polanski, as did Pedro Almodovar and Martin Scorsese, all of whom have made movies attacking the Catholic Church.

Polanski was arrested in September 2009 for what he did in 1977. He got a 13-year-old girl drunk, forced her to take a Quaalude with champagne, and then tried to rape her in a Jacuzzi. She resisted. Then he followed her into a bedroom, kissed her, and performed oral sex on her. Then he had intercourse with her. Then he had anal sex with her.

And what did the Hollywood crowd and their European counterparts do when Polanski was arrested? They signed a petition in his defense. Weinstein said, "We are calling upon every filmmaker we can to help fix this terrible situation." The "terrible situation" was not sodomizing a girl; it was restrictions on Polanski's travel plans.

Weinstein garnered plenty of support for his fellow molester. "Obviously, my sympathies are with Roman," said Robert Towne, winner of an Oscar for his role in "Chinatown." He added, "I have great respect and affection for him."

Debra Winger, the Zurich Film Festival Jury President, said of Polanski at the time, "We stand by and await his release and his next masterwork." Her organization even blasted Switzerland for arresting Polanski, accusing it of "philistine collusion." In other words, those who object to a Hollywood mogul molesting a child have no respect for the arts.

Weinstein gave cover to these stars by writing an op-ed at the time referring to what Polanski did as a “so-called crime.” What he was saying is that it is a “so-called crime” to ply a child with alcohol and drugs, and then rape her orally, vaginally, and anally. Whoopi Goldberg agreed, saying “I don’t believe it was ‘rape-rape.’”

This is a window into the mind of Hollywood. They all criticized molesting priests, but unlike virtually all Catholics who also condemned the offending clergymen, the celebrities continue to be quite at home defending sexual abusers in their own ranks.

No one at the time of Polanski’s arrest explained the Hollywood mind better than Weinstein. Referring to the outpouring of support for his beleaguered friend, he said, “Hollywood has the best moral compass, because it has compassion.” It sure does—for the rapist, that is.

---

## **FEMINIST OPPOSITION TO WOMAN JUDGE FAILS**

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the triumph of Amy Coney Barrett:

Seventeen “women’s rights” organizations, all of which complain there aren’t enough women in public office, tried to stop the appointment of a woman, Amy Coney Barrett, to the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. They failed. She was confirmed by a vote of 55-43.

This was also a victory for those who oppose anti-Catholicism, the one prejudice still tolerated, and indeed promoted, by

those who say they are opposed to bigotry.

Here is a list of the “women’s rights” groups opposed to Notre Dame law professor Barrett:

Advocates for Youth  
Catholics for Choice  
NARAL Pro-Choice America  
National Abortion Federation  
National Asian Pacific American Women’s Forum  
National Center for Lesbian Rights  
National Council for Jewish Women  
National Health Law Program  
National Institute for Reproductive Health  
National LGBTQ Task Force Action Fund  
National Network of Abortion Funds  
National Organization for Women  
National Partnership for Women and Families  
National Women’s Health Network  
People for the American Way  
Planned Parenthood Federation of America  
Secular Coalition for America

What do these “women’s groups” have in common? They hate women who disagree with them, they hate the Catholic Church, and they love abortion. And now the three-time losers have lost again.

Maybe if they spent more time trying to defend women and children raped by their Hollywood pro-abortion and anti-Catholic male friends, they would finally win one.