

This whole Mueller thing and the farcical Comey investigation into Hillary's emails is Three Stooges bone-headed. If there's any way to better cover the administration of justice in disrepute, do let me know.

Here we have got 140 million bucks being paid to the Clinton Foundation by Russians, a half-million to Bill personally by Russians, all potentially in connection with and in exchange for State Department approval for the sale of uranium producing facilities to Russians. Now imagine that instead of Bill and Hill getting all that loot from Russians it was Trump. Imagine the ensuing shit-storms.

I just finished a book about the Roman Republic and the dirty-dog machinations, murders and mayhem between contending factions. This crap in Washington is another example that tells us that while history doesn't repeat it sure as hell does rhyme.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- o 100th Avatar December 1, 2017 at 2:12 pm #

I believe Kunstler called it a place not worth caring about.

He was referring of course to our built environment

Now it's our political, social, "cultural", and virtual environments

Nothing of redeeming value

Poof

[Log in to Reply](#)

- volodya December 1, 2017 at 2:30 pm #

It's a damn lucky thing that there's two wide oceans on either side. While the wide expanses of deep water didn't protect the Amerindians, they're a not inconsequential barrier and they do buy some time.

Not so for Europe. Imagine those guys, especially France, with refugee spigots from the middle east and Africa wide open and the Libyan ulcer bleeding human torrents onto European shores. Imagine that state of affairs with Mother Merkel in charge of European bank vault and with national self-loathing the predominant sentiment.

To say that western Europe is totally and completely screwed is probably understating things by a couple orders of magnitude. For some places there's some hope, those that didn't drink the PC Kool-Aid and succumb to witlessness. Maybe they can salvage something out of this fucking debacle.

All I'm saying is it could be worse.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- o outsider December 1, 2017 at 10:38 pm #

volodya,

By the look of things, you'd think the democrats are in charge, not the GOP. But that's where we fool ourselves. The Deep State does what it wants to do – doesn't matter who controls Congress. That is so painfully obvious. If Trump had any control, Hillary would be the one facing jail, not himself being threatened with impeachment. Jeff Sessions, as his first major act upon being confirmed as AG, recused himself from the Russia investigation. Thus an Obama holdover, Rosenstein, appointed Mueller to be Grand Inquisitor. How much of this mess should be laid at the feet of Sessions, who wimped out when a man of strong character was needed?

[Log in to Reply](#)

- o SpeedyBB December 2, 2017 at 2:25 pm #

(Name of book please?)

Young and frisky, I read Daniel P. Mannix' 'We who are about to die, salute you'. That hooked me on the history of Rome. Wow.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- volodya December 2, 2017 at 3:01 pm #

Speedy, It was The Storm Before the Storm by Mike Duncan.

An entertaining romp. It's not one of those tomes that requires the stamina of a canal horse.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- 35. Tia December 1, 2017 at 1:53 pm #

I am a seventy year young female. Before retiring two years ago I worked as a secretary for all of my adult life. I have been sexually harassed numerous times at work and also outside of work, starting at the age of twelve. Never by a family member. I always thought (when I was younger) that there wasn't anything I could do about it. It was the way life is (or was). I would like all of you "men" to think about how you would feel if your wife/partner, mother, sister, or daughter or any female you love and respect was violated sexually.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- o Sean Coleman December 1, 2017 at 2:41 pm #

Why should I believe you?

[Log in to Reply](#)

- malthuss December 1, 2017 at 2:49 pm #

????

[Log in to Reply](#)

- Tia December 1, 2017 at 3:00 pm #

You don't have to believe me. I know my own truth and hope you know yours.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- Sean Coleman December 1, 2017 at 5:07 pm #

Tia

“You don't have to believe me.”

“I know my own truth.”

Why doesn't that inspire confidence?

[Log in to Reply](#)

- GreenAlba December 1, 2017 at 6:30 pm #

“Why doesn't that inspire confidence?”

I presume because you made your mind up to discredit the poster without the slightest evidence.

I take her statement ‘I know my own truth’ to mean that she knows what happened because she was there, not that she believes in truth relativism. But I think you knew that.

- Sean Coleman December 2, 2017 at 12:26 pm #

GreenAlba

Does it seem true to you? Given that we are in a witch hunt where people say all kinds of things they might not otherwise say? I would expect a genuine victim to respond robustly. I would and I expect you would too.

Have you seen her replies further down? Has she backed up her story? I had originally written “I don't believe you” but thought it was too provocative as I thought there was a chance, albeit unlikely, that maybe she had something. Now I think it even less likely.

Let her answer for herself.

- elysianfield December 1, 2017 at 8:18 pm #

Tia,

You mentioned yourself being “sexually harassed”, but then question us regarding our families being violated sexually...we need definitions here. Do you consider harassment as being violated sexually?

[Log in to Reply](#)

- 36. 100th Avatar December 1, 2017 at 2:07 pm #

What a country of assholes.  
Deep ignorance fueled by the deep state  
We deserve any and all emergencies  
Long and short

Did you know that the markets are tanking because Flynn says Trump directed him to speak with Russians

And speaking with Russians is apparently illegal

And what a way to bring down the illogical stock market and illogical president with one shot.

One can be conveniently blamed on the other  
Or vice versa

Wait, oh, it's already recovering  
Back up 50 points...

[Log in to Reply](#)

- volodya December 1, 2017 at 2:18 pm #

Well, as long as it's back up...

[Log in to Reply](#)

- 37. malthuss December 1, 2017 at 2:37 pm #

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K8kua5B5K3I>

Life in Chinas bitcoin 'lab' mine whatever.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- 38. KesaAnna December 1, 2017 at 2:38 pm #

I would like all of you “men”

I think that is akin , for example , to some guy walking into a meeting of Girl scouts , and saying ,

I would like all of you “women”.....

It’s a kind of sexual abuse itself.

” I would like all of you “men” to think about how you would feel if your wife/partner, mother, sister, or daughter or any female you love and respect was violated sexually. ”

I’m not a man.

And I’m not interested in feelings , emotional appeals, or identity politics.

I have little doubt that even the rich , the beautiful , and the popular have gotten their share of being fucked over.

Things are tough all over.

And that is not going to change.

I would like you folks to consider how acting like a spoiled child in a toy store in relation to the law is slitting your own throats , cutting off your own nose to spite your face.

I doubt you will though. You will only reign yourselves in when the butchers bill arrives at your own door and , too late , it’s ” oh fuck ! I never knew the bill would be that high ! “

[Log in to Reply](#)

◦ Tia December 1, 2017 at 2:47 pm #

Using gender references is sexual abuse????? WTF?

[Log in to Reply](#)

▪ KesaAnna December 1, 2017 at 3:17 pm #

putting the word in quotation marks is not only or merely a reference. It implies more , which you clearly know .

A person ignorant of that fact would not use the quotation marks to begin with.

Try again.

[Log in to Reply](#)

▪ Tia December 1, 2017 at 3:39 pm #

Call me ignorant, call me a stale old bitch, I don’t care what you think of me. That is none of my business it’s yours. I’m out of here, had enough negativity for the day. Peace.....

[Log in to Reply](#)

▪ elysianfield December 1, 2017 at 8:23 pm #

Kisa,  
A breath of reason...I assume the butcher’s bill will be addressed to Mr. and Mrs. ....

▪ elysianfield December 1, 2017 at 8:26 pm #

Tia,  
We are not calling you anything. I am interested in your perspective, but need a bit of help defining terms. Were you ever sexually harassed to the extent of a physical sexual violation? These words mean something.

▪ elysianfield December 1, 2017 at 8:27 pm #

Kesa...sorry for the typo....

[Log in to Reply](#)

39. Sean Coleman December 1, 2017 at 2:39 pm #

I’ll try to keep it brief because I have commented repeatedly over the last few months about contemporary witch-hunts. They are the big story.

This just ratchets up the insanity another notch. Touching a woman’s bare back now. It is not that ‘all women are liars’, which would be a ridiculous claim, but that anyone who makes accusations during a witch hunt is most likely either exaggerating the trivial or lying about the serious. It is possible that they are being either reasonable or truthful but, in my own experience of looking into these things, unlikely.

Let us re-cap. Weinstein: what evidence is there of serious assault or rape, which is sometimes assumed here? Trump: same question. Cosby and any number of abuse scandals. It is only my own limited experience and judgement but all such scandals turn out to be almost entirely or wholly false. If it seems too good to be true then it isn’t. (And I mean ‘all’.)

In witch hunts people lose the run of themselves. They lose their reason. Why did this woman (if she did) come out with this allegation now after having earlier accepted Keillor’s apology? Did she discuss it with friends, who pressed her to do it or was she simply swept up in the moment? (I am thinking about those who take out claims in my own country. I think they often don’t intend to but change their minds after talking to friends or relations.)

I just watched a 10min clip of Keillor on Letterman in 1983 and he was very entertaining. I also saw a clip of him on the Simpsons following Avatar’s post above and that was even funnier.

I understand that historical witch hunts were not driven by the ignorant masses but by well-meaning, educated and responsible people. (See Richard Webster's Sceptical Essays website.)

They happen within the context of a wider mass fantasy. (This is my own view and I don't think I have seen it argued by anyone else.) This fantasy is fairly identical with what is called political correctness, every cherished belief of which appears to be built on delusion (or at least all those I have looked at so far). My position may sound extreme but it is easily defended by simply asking, "Where is your evidence to the contrary?" I came across Colin Flaherty the other day and this is exactly his argument too.

I saw a clip of Keillor on Letterman (1983) and he was entertaining and also a short clip from the Simpsons (Avatar refers to it), which was funnier.

Here is Peter Hitchens on a related topic:

<http://hitchensblog.mailonsunday.co.uk/2017/11/a-nostalgic-evening-in-oxford-in-which-i-am-the-object-of-a-silent-protest-.html>

Log in to Reply

- o GreenAlba December 1, 2017 at 3:12 pm #

Hello Sean

I don't think it's helpful to mix everything into the same pot. I'm not going to deal with everyone you've mentioned but the Garrison K case is nothing whatever to do with the Cosby case. Cosby drugged women to rape them. The only reason he didn't go to jail is because of the statute of limitations. The statute of limitations in California was lifted precisely because of the Cosby case:

<https://www.theatlantic.com/news/archive/2016/09/california-statute-of-limitations/502307/>

Log in to Reply

- 100th Avatar December 1, 2017 at 5:20 pm #

There is a sculpture of Cosby somewhere, I forget where  
It was renamed the statue of limitations

Log in to Reply

- GreenAlba December 1, 2017 at 6:30 pm #

@Avatar

Haha...

Log in to Reply

- Sean Coleman December 1, 2017 at 5:54 pm #

Green Alba

"I don't think it is helpful to mix everything into the same pot."

It is the only way it can be understood. Witch hunts need to be studied seriously as distinct phenomena. (I was searching for a less high faluting word than phenomena but couldn't find it.) They share many of the same characteristics.

Bill Cosby. Here is a short video by Alexander Baron.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3xGQbXMUPWk><https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3xGQbXMUPWk>

I like Alexander, not least because when I first looked into the Savile case and was wondering why the world had gone mad his was the first article I came across that shared my scepticism. (I was sceptical because all the accusations I looked at were not just weak but frankly ridiculous.) Alexander thinks the first of the women to accuse Cosby may well have a case (if I remember correctly) and I think he may think that Savile was not entirely without fault. I don't know about Cosby although I would be inclined to believe he is fully innocent. As for Savile I think he is fully innocent, strange as that may sound.

I didn't know about the Californian statue of limitations amendment. It is worrying when witch hunts undermine laws and institutions that have been developed for good reasons. In his 'magisterial' (I suppose) examination of the North Wales children's home abuse case, The Secret of Bryn Estyn, the late Richard Webster showed how the high emotions generated led to dangerous changes in the admissibility of same evidence in British courts.

In Portugal the well-known television personality Carlos Cruz ('Mr Television'), who I think presented their version of Who Wants To Be A Millionaire, was convicted on novel judicial notions, invented especially for his case, 'a resonancia de verdade and (I think) 'a resonancia emocional', 'the resonance of truth and emotional resonance, which really meant 'They can't all be lying, can they?' Over forty charges (again from memory) were withdrawn at a late stage in his trial and replaced with fresh ones, giving his lawyers no time to build a defence. This was because they could not stand up because the witnesses were making it up as they went along. The police would not look at his mobile phone records or his bank card purchases because they would prove his innocence. He says that that they didn't do any searches for that very reason. The deputy leader of the Portuguese Socialist Party was put behind bars for a time, ruining his career.

There are just too many of these cases. The Boston abuse scandal involving the Catholic Church. They even made a film about it which may have won an Oscar. Half-million dollar payouts for claims against progressive gay priest Fr Paul Shanley. Recovered memory evidence. Most of the cases collapsing on the eve of the trial yet still convicting him.

Then there is the notorious Shieldfield case where two nursery workers were accused of the most grotesque crimes and the judge threw it out for the complete lack of evidence. What did Newcastle City Council do then? It's own enquiry which found them guilty, of course. A libel judge singled out a professor of sociology and a paediatrician who was, let's say, extremely careless in her procedures, for particular criticism. The two workers had to go on the run in fear of their lives. Look it up on Webster. It is astonishing.

There are so, so many and as soon as the nonsense dies down in one place it pops up in another. I am reading Jung's Psychological Types to see what the great man might have made of it.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- Sean Coleman December 1, 2017 at 5:57 pm #

“In his ‘magisterial’ (I suppose)”

I mean it really is magisterial for its depth of research, its insights and its sober judgement. I would heartily recommend it. I was just trying to avoid a cliché.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- 100th Avatar December 1, 2017 at 6:58 pm #

Ray Hudson, is it you?

- Sean Coleman December 1, 2017 at 6:33 pm #

Cosby. Just checked. To set the record straight, Alexander Baron considers Andrea Constand to be in a different class from the other accusers (I think there were 25 at one stage, perhaps even more now). However he thinks they had a consensual relationship, possibly after drinking too much, and that she later (a year later) changed her mind, possibly convinced by someone that he had drugged her (Cosby had a ‘Spanish Fly’ thing going in his comedy routine). He also says that Cosby had a history of womanizing. (See “Bill Cosby: A Voice Of Reason”)

[Log in to Reply](#)

- GreenAlba December 1, 2017 at 6:34 pm #

“I don’t know about Cosby although I would be inclined to believe he is fully innocent.”

Does that very inclination, without any evidence, not worry you?

“As for Savile I think he is fully innocent, strange as that may sound.”

Again, what you think comes from your ‘inclination’, which shouldn’t really be trusted. Evidence is what matters. And don’t think it is strange. I think it is quite frightening. Because of the ‘inclination’.

[Log in to Reply](#)

- Sean Coleman December 2, 2017 at 12:12 pm #

GreenAlba

“Does that very inclination, without any evidence, not worry you?”

“Inclined” is a common turn of speech. It obviously means that, in the light of what I have found about the Cosby case in particular, and of witch hunts in general, it is the most likely thing to have happened, reasonably. I wasn’t there on every occasion, so I don’t know, but I am inclined to think he is fully innocent, especially as only one of the witnesses appears to have any credibility (my carefully chosen link is a good illustration). If Bill Cosby (let’s give the man the benefit of his first name occasionally, he has been through a lot) had a reputation as a particularly chaste, faithful and responsible citizen (unlike, say, most priests, bishops and doctors) then I would probably have written “strongly inclined” instead of just “inclined” but I don’t think he does. I don’t pick and choose my opinions to win an argument.

If there is anything in what I wrote there that have difficulty understanding someone will help you out. As long as it doesn’t have to be me again.

To echo what (I think) you said in another reply to me up-thread (and which I will deal with after this if I have time), I think you knew this already.

“without any evidence”

It should be obvious from what I have written here and elsewhere on CN that I have looked at the evidence. You would be correct to assume that my “inclination” was sceptical, but after looking at a lot of this kind of thing, a lot of the “evidence” that is, this is a reasonable approach. I gave a few examples above and, as I said, I could have given many, many more. And I am not even an expert in this (a surprising number are).

“your ‘inclination’ ... shouldn’t really be trusted. Evidence is what matters”

My scepticism appears to me to be fully justified, even if it flatly contradicts received opinion and conventional wisdom. If I were alone in this I would be more circumspect, of course, but many people share my view. Posters are free to disagree and if they can present compelling evidence I will have to revise it, reluctantly admittedly.

Can you keep up? Am I rambling?

Now here is the important bit. For someone who says evidence is so important you haven't produced any and show not the slightest sign that you have looked into any of it.

To quote your own words back, "Does that... not worry you?"

"Evidence is what matters... I think it is quite frightening. Because of the 'inclination'."

Believe it or not, I only mentioned some people's doubts (among those who have actually looked at the "evidence", unlike you) about Jimmy Savile to ease your distress in discovering that you have been taken in.

You have never made an secret of your own 'inclination'. Fair play to you, you might have been tempted to disown it, but you have kept it up doggedly (or brazenly) in the face of all the, er, "evidence".

Time is pressing and I will pass over your earlier statement, "I'm not going to deal with everyone you've mentioned" but I can tell you it did make me laugh. You will doubtless also not deal with the theory of relativity or Basque grammar or the history of Leyton Orient F.C., other things you probably know absolutely nothing about. For which I am grateful.

I have told you already that you are dishonest in argument and that you affect condescension towards those who fail to share your foolish delusions. I have made an effort of late to treat you as a serious and reasonable opponent but, as you can see here, it is an impossible uphill task. So respond to your further ill-educated posts with mockery, or not all, this is why.

- GreenAlba December 3, 2017 at 10:44 am #

Mr Coleman

Thank you for your helpful and not-at-all condescending post (I think you won the prize there).

I will make a few points, which I will try to make clear as I won't be revisiting this particular thread – I have work to do. And someone took exception to the number of my very recent posts, which I totally accept. However, the person didn't know – because why would they even think to enquire? – that I patiently and unassumingly read both JHK's articles and some of the comments below them for a decade before taking the liberty of commenting at all. I doubt that applies to most commenting on here. But 'revenons à nos moutons...' (forgive me – I know you like research).

I am a fan of your interest in the psychology of witch hunts. I have never, in any of my posts, said that I don't accept the existence of witch hunts or false allegations. I accept both, from Salem to the Birmingham 6, passing by Timothy Evans, and the morons who attacked the home of a British paediatrician on the basis of the 'paed' prefix (such is life in tabloid Britain). I agree with you on Shieldfield. There are more.

You may also note that in this thread I have posted numerous comments which all reiterated that I think the Garrison Keilor episode is shameful, the shame to be primarily dropped at the door of the woman who pretended to accept his apology for his very minor offence and then pursued him through a lawyer. That hasn't stopped some people on this thread accusing me of condemning GK, one even in shouty capitals, when I was the only one to actually quote the words of the man himself, the source of my indignation against the woman in question. You will note that I accepted GK's version of events here without question, even though I had no particular reason to. I chose to. You will further notice that in my post of 11.57am I responded to what I thought was another poster's entirely unjustified presumption by saying 'I don't think it's OK to assume he did anything else just because other men have committed multiple misdemeanors.' Thank you for taking note of that. Witch hunts are not my thing.

I have seen the film you mentioned. I have also seen the Pope apologise to the many victims of abuse perpetrated within the Catholic Church. I also accept the existence of the Magdalen Laundries, the mass graves in Tuam:

(<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/ireland-baby-remains-tuam-galway-home-unmarried-mothers-deaths-abortion-a7609486.html>)

...and the mass graves in Lanarkshire :

(<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/bodies-hundreds-children-buried-mass-grave-lanarkshire-smyllum-park-catholic-orphanage-a7938716.html>).

At the same time I accepted at the time, having disinterestedly (note: I don't mean uninterestedly) watched events unfold, that the outrageous calumnies perpetuated around the 'satanist' child abuse scandal in Orkney were exactly that, likewise the nonsense in Cleveland. It is for that reason that I never read any article by Beatrix Campbell:

(<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/the-moral-entrepreneurs-who-cash-in-on-child-abuse-9600692.html>).

I abhor the hounding of the man who lived next door to where the McCanns stayed in Praia da Luz and of Christopher Jefferies:

(<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/nov/29/christopher-jefferies-tv-joanna-yeates-murder>).

That doesn't mean I have to accept your claims about the innocence of Jimmy Savile, in whose case there were acknowledged cover-ups. I have taken the trouble to read several articles on the subject which take the cautious approach you would recommend, including one citing Richard Webster, and another in Spiked. I totally agree about media feeding frenzies. I have never disagreed. I also agree about the potential unreliability of evidence where compensation is involved (but this doesn't mean all people who accept compensation made up their stories). On balance, despite the media frenzy argument, I do not accept your view that Savile is 'almost entirely innocent'. As it may be right. As it is your right to enjoy your status as a self-styled maverick.

From a response to someone else, if you will forgive me:

"By the way, my interest has always been psychological. Why do people want to believe and why are they so reluctant to be disabused by the evidence? That is what got me into it and what I think about most."

I also have my own interest in the psychology of evidence-denial. That is why, harking back to previous comments of yours to me, I don't take my information about climate science from your recommendation, Charles Moore, who read English and History at Cambridge, rather than Atmospheric Physics, for example, while I would be happy to accept the writings of the Telegraph's own science editor, who sensibly chooses to accept the actual science, rather than politically motivated conjecture of a scientifically ignorant journalist, however he may otherwise merit respect. I believe you chose the non-scientist, Moore, which is your prerogative.

I think we have mutually agreed to ignore each other's posts in future, which I believe would be for the best and to the benefit of the entire blog.

Have a good day, Mr Coleman.

- Sean Coleman December 3, 2017 at 12:39 pm #

GreenAlba

I noticed your posts about GK and agree with your opinion about the accuser although I don't share your view that his was a misdemeanour, albeit minor.

When I talk of evidence I don't mean what you have picked up in the course of reading the Guardian (responsible for one of the most ridiculous contributions to the Savile coverage with their Feb 2015 editorial (no less) comparing him in all seriousness with Pol Pot and suggesting his corpse be dug up to satisfy popular rage). I am talking about making an effort to look at the accusations themselves although this is difficult.

An article about the Tuam story in the Independent is hardly digging into the story. Does that story really seem likely to you? I mean, if you step back and think about it for a moment. It was an article in the Ind. on Sunday which really kicked off the Bryn Estyn witch hunt. Editor Ian Jack recognizes that he should have heeded the red lights about the story from a novice freelance reporter. (At the start of Webster's book of the same name.

You can climb down off your high horse. Do you need to be reminded that you first accosted me here some months ago after I had mentioned Savile? I can't remember if you attacked me for being disgraceful or disgusting. I think it might be the latter. Do I have to go looking for it to show you? I thought you were just another shrill internet nutcase at the time.

- GreenAlba December 3, 2017 at 12:57 pm #

Mr Coleman

PS This is a genuinely and neutrally offered reference, simply because I think your stated interest in the topic means you may find it interesting. I did.

<https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/02/27/why-facts-dont-change-our-minds>

- Sean Coleman December 3, 2017 at 2:32 pm #

Thanks for the link. It is like those referenced by Asa Wikforss (Swedish philosopher in her Alternativa Fakta). She says that when facts are produced which challenge your beliefs it often only reinforces them. She is aware of all the pitfalls and says they affect both sides in the big debate but her own views aren't for changing. It ain't easy.

I came back to look at your earlier links. McCann: I had doubts myself about the treatment of this man, the initial 'arguido', if that is who you mean. Did you know that the dog which found the piece of a child's skull at Haut de la Garenne, the house of horror, in Jersey (it later turned out to be wood or coconut shell) sniffed out something dodgy in the boot of the McCanns' car.



Eddie the Wonderdog would do more good chasing cats. Actually I think there were two of them.

Lanarkshire. I'll check this one out, but as you know yourself, time is limited. Who knows, it might be the exception that disproves the rule. (Another exception I am awaiting is two introverts marrying each other.)

I am glad for your own sake you don't read Beatrix Campbell as this is exactly what I had been thinking. It would be easier if you were one of the usual head bangers because then I could have a laugh.

By the way, I don't really know who Charles Moore is. You must be thinking of Booker.

- GreenAlba December 3, 2017 at 6:25 pm #

Here I am when I said I wouldn't – hey ho ☐

Thanks for the Wikforss reference – found a video that I have bookmarked for when I have time (if only...)

Charles Moore writes for the Telegraph, which is not my rag of choice, clearly, although I do read odd articles when they arise. Yes, you may be right that it was Booker you'd mentioned (also has a degree in history!).

I don't really follow the McCann story any more. Not that I follow such things in huge detail anyway, but this one was harrowing. Yes, it was the first guy questioned – I think he lived next door with his mum or something, but can't really remember. That makes you suspicious these days, it would seem.

My abiding thought is as a mother I'll never understand how they could leave their children alone anyway, even 30 yards away, or whatever it was. I couldn't leave a young child sleeping alone like that for any time at all, even just in case they woke up to find themselves alone. Not that hindsight every helps, I realise – it presumably tortures them every day anyway.

Didn't know about the dog in either case – yup, not a prize professional pooch...

I haven't read any details about the two mass graves incidents other than that they were discovered – it was just in my mind as one of them was very recent. Some pretty rank stuff went on in these homes for 'wayward' girls, it would seem.

Anyway, cheers and good night!

- GreenAlba December 3, 2017 at 6:31 pm #

Sorry when I said wayward girls I was thinking of one of the Irish incidences (or perhaps the story that gave rise to the Philomena film). At least one of those two I mentioned was just just a normal children's home, I think.

- Janos Skoreny December 1, 2017 at 7:40 pm #

Sometimes a cigar is really a cigar. The homosexual infestation of the Church is an absolute reality admitted by the Church itself at this point. Fr James Martin SJ, an obvious Gay himself, is working to normalize it with the full blessings of the Vatican.

Log in to Reply

- GreenAlba December 1, 2017 at 8:05 pm #

Young gay men have historically headed towards the Catholic Church because it was the only place they felt they could quietly live out their lives without the mindless prejudice heretofore applied to gay men, including by their own families. Child abuse is a totally different matter and has no connection to homosexuality per se. Children abused by priests have been both girls and boys.

- outsider December 1, 2017 at 10:17 pm #

Janos,  
What would happen if the Pope came out as Gay? After all, he said something like "Who am I to judge?" Perhaps he's waiting for the right time.

- Janos Skoreny December 2, 2017 at 1:45 am #

But far more boys as Gays abuse children at a far higher rate.

- GreenAlba December 2, 2017 at 6:40 am #

"But far more boys as Gays abuse children at a far higher rate"

And I'm sure you have some statistics for that from a legitimate source everyone respects?

- Sean Coleman December 3, 2017 at 12:20 pm #

Janos

Rory Connor (Irish Salem)



<http://www.irishsalem.com/international-controversies/usa/index.php>

“Paul Shanley was both a priest AND a promiscuous homosexual who was great hero to American liberals and gays – until it suited their purposes to throw him to the wolves.”

In particular look at the links to articles by JoAnn Wypiewsky. From memory he was not convicted for his relations with gay young men but of the abuse of young boys when he was a primary school teacher years before. Their testimony (or at least some of it – again from memory) was based on retrieved memories. One of them had his epiphany on his way to Las Vegas for a weekend’s gambling. As I said elsewhere here most of the charges were dropped on the eve of the trial because they were so shaky. It is a wonder the remaining one was pursued (again from memory, and I think pressure may have been put on the accuser to tough it out – check with the Wypiewsky articles).

While I am here, in Cosby’s case the only credible witness, Andrea Constand, waited a year before deciding she had been attacked.

- Ricechex December 1, 2017 at 11:01 pm #

Thanks for clarifying this! I knew this was a witch hunt and said so to a friend. However, I was unable to understand–why? by who? Who is recruiting all these women to come forth and report that someone grabbed their \*\*s during a picture taking event? Why would a woman bother over such a small infraction?

Something is seriously WRONG here. And men are getting fired for it, no questions asked.

Here is another case to add–happened in CA years ago. This developmentally delayed guy who was a volunteer at the church was accused of child sex abuse to multiple children. Parents went ballistic. They brought in therapists who “verified” that these kids were abused. It simply was not true. It was a mass hysteria/group think.

<http://www.nytimes.com/1994/06/03/us/prosecutors-rebuked-in-molestation-case.html>

[Log in to Reply](#)

- Sean Coleman December 2, 2017 at 12:56 pm #

Richard Webster’s Sceptical Essays website is perhaps the best place to start. I’m no expert (few are) but this is where I started, so I am possibly alone in having been a Savile sceptic out of intellectual conviction rather than just being a natural sceptic like all the rest (whom I envy). Even so it never occurred to me at first into looking into the Big Daddy of them all, the Jimmy Savile fantasy, until I got into a Facebook argument with my sister, who believes all this nonsense.

Webster died in 2011. Here is his story of the Shieldfield case I mentioned:

<http://www.richardwebster.net/cleared.html>

Also look at his Casa Pia summary.

For Boston look up Irish Salem and then look under International Controversies and choose USA.

- Sean Coleman December 2, 2017 at 12:58 pm #

By the way, my interest has always been psychological. Why do people want to believe and why are they so reluctant to be disabused by the evidence? That is what got me into it and what I think about most.

40. Janet December 1, 2017 at 2:49 pm #

It could be that the topic of sexual politics is a distraction from Trump’s Russian collusion to undermine democracy.

Oh, yes, collusion did happen. The guy who knows Trump’s collusion with Russia happened is Trump’s former national security adviser Michael Flynn. Flynn has admitted guilt and is prepared to testify against Trump as part of an FBI investigation into Russian interference in the election.

Next step, impeachment.

Now CFN can get back to its important discussion of how virile men make passes at women (i.e., unwanted sexual contact) ... as if men don’t have vocal cords .... men must grab what they want, grab pussies, and then say their criminal behavior is just “human nature.”

[Log in to Reply](#)

- Ol’ Scratch December 1, 2017 at 3:12 pm #

Yep, still butthurt for Hillary, I see. Have you sought counseling? You know I’m always here for you.