

TONY ALAMO IS DEAD

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.

POPE-TRUMP FEUD PURE HYPE

Prior to the meeting of Pope Francis and President Trump, the spin masters in the mainstream media were in high gear promoting the message that there is a real divide between the two men.

There is no denying that on climate change, refugees, and immigration, there are differences between Pope Francis and President Trump.

Regarding climate change, it is important to note that there is no Catholic teaching on this subject. To be sure, the Church is committed to protecting the environment, but, as with many other issues, there is no defined position on how best to achieve it.

So if the pope thinks global warming is real, and is caused mostly by human activity, and the president is skeptical, believing that environmental regulations have become too rigid, this is simply a matter of opinion.

The pope and the president have each expressed their outrage at Christian persecution, particularly in the Middle East. The pope calls on all nations to resettle refugees; the president believes that those nations in the area which are receptive to resettling them are best suited to do so. Both positions are eminently defensible.

Their different approaches to immigration have been subjected to much media hype. In February 2016, news stories abounded

claiming that Pope Francis said, "Trump is Not Christian." This was a classic example of fake news. Here is what happened.

A reporter from Reuters told the pope aboard the papal plane that Trump "wants to deport 11 million illegal immigrants, thus separating families." This was not true. On August 16, 2015, when Chuck Todd explicitly asked Trump about this on "Meet the Press," the Republican candidate for president said, "Chuck—no, no. No, we're going to keep the families together. We have to keep the families together."

After misrepresenting what Trump said, the reporter asked the pope "if an American Catholic can vote for someone like this." The pope demurred, but that is not the real issue. Whatever happened to separation of church and state? More important, was it now acceptable for Catholics to vote the way the pope tells them to?

The pope handled himself well, and when asked about Trump's bid to build a wall, the Holy Father offered a more nuanced answer than the media reported. "A person who thinks *only* about building walls...is not Christian." (Our italic.) He added that "I say only that this man is not Christian if he has said things like that...and in this *I give the benefit of the doubt*." (Our emphasis.)

Vatican spokesman Father Federico Lombardi stressed that the pope's remark about "not a Christian" was based largely on "what he was told."

Trump's initial reaction to what the pope said was based on false media reports, which explains why he said it was "disgraceful" for a religious leader to question someone's faith.

After learning what the pope actually said, Trump commented, "I would say that I think he [the pope] was very much misinterpreted, and I also think he was given false

information.”

Predictably, the media are downplaying those issues where the pope and the president agree, namely on abortion and marriage. Unlike climate change, these issues are the subject of major Catholic teachings; they are not a matter of opinion. Both men are resolutely pro-life, and both believe that marriage is a union between a man and a woman, not two people of the same sex.

They also find common ground in their support for religious liberty. There is a great confluence of thought between the pope and the president on the right of churches and affiliated entities to conduct their business without the government meddling in their affairs.

OPPOSING ABORTION IS NOT ENOUGH

Abortion is the intentional killing of innocent human beings, and as such, opposition to it commands that we acknowledge this verity as the principal basis of our position.

No one knows this better than Amherst scholar Hadley Arkes. He articulates the right legal objections to abortion better than anyone, and that is because he does not skirt the basic biological, and moral, issues involved. His latest piece on this subject was published in the May edition of *First Things*.

Why is abortion wrong? It is wrong because it violates the natural law, the common sense ideas of right and wrong that are inscribed in the hearts of every human being.

Bill Donohue remembers reading an editorial in the *New Republic*, a prominent liberal magazine, many years ago that sided with the conclusion of *Roe v. Wade*—abortion should be legal—but nonetheless objected to the Supreme Court being the deciding agent. That decision, it said, should have been made by the Congress. Fine. But if lawmakers do not base their judgments on the natural law, there is little to cheer about. That is what Arkes is getting at.

Unfortunately, many conservatives have adopted the thinking of the *New Republic*—turn the issue back to the states. What would that resolve? That's the end of our moral obligations? If abortion is morally wrong, why should we be satisfied that some states will sanction it and others will not? Would we find it agreeable if some states allowed racial discrimination and others did not?

CATHOLIC BASHING IN IRELAND PEAKS

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.

IRELAND’S SHIFTY “MASS GRAVE” AUTHOR

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.

DOES EDUCATION ERODE RELIGIOUS BELIEFS?

Recently, a new survey by the Pew Research Center titled “In America, Does More Education Equal Less Religion?” was published.

“Overall, U.S. adults with college degrees are less religious than others, but this practice does not hold among Christians.” This is the central Pew finding, though there is much in the survey that reveals other important data.

For the adult population as a whole, college graduates are much less likely than those with no more than a high school diploma to say that religion is “very important” in their lives. Similarly, the more highly educated are also less likely to believe in God with absolute certainty. Yet when it comes to attending religious services, there is no discernible difference between these two segments of the population.

The survey does not attempt to explain these findings. But it would be shocking to learn the opposite: students are subjected to a highly secular orientation in college, and in many cases the milieu on campus is not religion-friendly. Regarding attendance at religious services, we know from other studies that church-goers are presented with significant opportunities for bonding with neighbors; this may be especially important to those at the top of the socio-economic scale.

When it comes to believing in God with absolute certainty, Catholics and Jews bring up the rear. Here are the data on this measure:

- Historically black Protestants (89%)
- Evangelical Protestants (88%)
- Mormons (86%)
- Mainline Protestants (66%)
- Catholics (64%)
- Jews (39%)

Catholics and Jews may be the least likely to believe in God with absolute certainty, but their reasons for doing so are very different.

Among Catholics with less than a high school education, only 50% say they are sure God exists, but for those with a post-graduate degree it is 66%. For Jews, the respective numbers show the opposite pattern—58% and 24%.

Pew doesn't offer an explanation, but it appears that the secularism that marks higher education has had a much greater effect on Jews than Catholics. This may be because Jews are much more likely to be raised in a non-observant family than are Catholics, thus making them more subject to the secular influences of graduate school. It may also be that poorly educated Catholics may be more cynical about life in general, spilling over into their belief in God.

This Pew survey should put to rest a bias that is commonplace among intellectuals: religion is not the opiate of the masses that Marx espoused. If it were, then all the non-believers would also be the most educated, and they are not—Christians threw a wrench in that idea.

If the deep thinkers were curious about this subject, they would ponder the observation of French sociologist Raymond Aaron: Marxism is the opiate of the intellectual.

ACLU SUES ANOTHER CATHOLIC HOSPITAL

The ACLU is suing another Catholic hospital—and this one really puts the lie to their professed motives of anti-discrimination and access to healthcare.

Evan Michael Minton, a former legislative aide in California, wants to change from being a woman to a man. As part of the process, Minton sought a hysterectomy at Mercy San Juan Medical Center, part of the Dignity Health Care chain.

As a Catholic institution, Mercy San Juan does not perform elective hysterectomies. A spokeswoman for the hospital explained that such procedures may only be performed to treat a serious medical problem, and when there is no alternative treatment available.

Mercy immediately referred Minton to another hospital within the Dignity chain—one that is not Catholic—and the procedure was performed within a few days.

So there was no discrimination. Minton was treated exactly the same as any other patient seeking an elective hysterectomy at a Catholic hospital. And there was no lack of access to the procedure. The very institution Minton and the ACLU are suing facilitated that access for Minton at another hospital.

But those inconvenient facts won't stop the ACLU's war on Catholic hospitals. Quite frankly, the ACLU is trying to use Catholic healthcare to undermine the moral integrity of the Catholic Church. They want to force Catholic hospitals to abort babies and provide contraception and sterilization, in direct violation of Catholic teaching.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD GALA IS SICK

Last month, a Planned Parenthood event honored Hillary Clinton and Shonda Rhimes in New York City.

They billed it as “a once in a lifetime Gala, 100 Years Strong: The Celebration of the Century.” Hillary Clinton received the Champion of the Century Award and Shonda Rhimes received the Champion of Change Award. They touted Clinton’s “service to women and girls,” and Rhimes’ effort at “revolutionizing” the way abortion is “portrayed on television.”

They chose the right people to honor: neither woman has ever found an abortion she couldn’t justify, and both have taken aim at people of faith who believe in the sanctity of innocent human life.

Though Planned Parenthood’s founder, Margaret Sanger, was anti-abortion, she was virulently anti-Catholic, as well as racist. In other words, the organization she founded is sicker today—it can’t get enough of abortion—than when it was started.

Clinton and Rhimes really earned their stripes in 2015.

In June 2015, Hillary spoke at the Women in the World Summit in New York City. She offered red meat to the audience, all of whom came to hear how she might promote abortion-on-demand once she became president. She didn’t disappoint (well, not entirely).

Speaking of abortion rights, Hillary said, “All the laws we’ve passed don’t count for much if they’re not enforced. Rights

have to exist in practice, not just on paper. Laws have to be backed up with resources, and political will and deep-seated cultural codes, *religious beliefs*, and structural biases have to be changed.” (Our emphasis.)

Practicing Catholics got the message: If Hillary becomes president, she will let the Catholic Church know that it had better get on board and change its “religious beliefs” about abortion. So much for diversity.

In November 2015, Rhimes intentionally insulted Catholics in an episode of one of her shows, “Scandal.” While Olivia Pope, played by Kerry Washington, was having an abortion, “Silent Night” was playing in the background. The show ended with a self-satisfied Olivia Pope listening to “Ave Maria.”

Rhimes sits on the board of directors of Planned Parenthood’s Los Angeles affiliate, is a champion of graphic gay sex on the tube, and has three children but no husband. The latter is not a mistake: “I do not want a husband in my house.” Self-absorbed, she never asked her kids if they might want a father in the house.

Children have a right to be born and Catholics have a right to promote that right. The reason why Hillary Clinton and Shonda Rhimes were honored by Planned Parenthood is because they oppose both rights. It proved to be a bloody good night for the tolerant ones.

GUNNING FOR THE CATHOLIC

CHURCH

An American man says that a half-century ago he was sexually abused by another adult man; the abuser was an adult at the time. The incident took place in a foreign country, and now the man who says he was abused is suing the American company the abuser once worked for, even though the abuser was subsequently fired by the organization.

This sounds like a fairy tale, except it is true. It is true because those gunning for the Catholic Church will stop at nothing to discredit it.

The alleged offender is a former Catholic priest who supposedly abused an 18-year-old man in Canada in 1969. Now the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, where the priest was stationed, is being sued for \$3 million in Ontario courts.

There are alleged sexual abuse victims in every part of the world, in every secular and religious institution, but there is no interest in hunting down the bad guys five decades later, unless, of course, the offender once worked for the Catholic Church.

SOROS - FUNDED RIPPING MAD

CATHOLICS

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? We called Hale's office and no one answered. Just leave a message, we were 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.

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