

CHURCH IS RIGHT ABOUT SAME SEX ATTRACTION

Jennifer Roback Morse and D. Paul Sullins

This is a slightly abbreviated version of what we posted online. The full report, "Refuting the Top 5 Gay Myths," is available online at the Ruth Institute.

If you thought that persons who are sexually attracted to the same sex must be gay or lesbian and can only enjoy intimacy in same-sex relations, you would be mistaken. Not that thinking this would be your fault. In the onslaught of secular media and the sometimes fumbling responses of Catholic leaders, Catholic teaching on same sex attraction is about as misunderstood as it is controversial.

Scientific research strongly supports the Church's view. Studies of the human genome and of identical twins have cast serious doubt on the often-heard claim that sexual orientation is an innate immutable trait, comparable to race. Furthermore, social science research going back to the 1990s has found that people can, and often do, change their patterns of sexual attractions and behaviors. Yet, as with a lot of research that supports the Church, these studies have been vigorously suppressed by secular academics and journals. Persons who have changed sexual orientation are functionally invisible in cultural and policy debates, including the debates over so-called conversion therapy.

The Ruth Institute sought out and surveyed people who once would have called themselves "gay" or "lesbian" but no longer do. We gathered a sample of 183 men and women who filled out an extensive survey about their journeys into and out of an LGBT experience or identity. We asked questions about religion, child abuse and various types of therapy. We asked

“before and after” questions about patterns of sexual attractions and behaviors.

Fr. Paul Sullins has just published the first round of data analysis from this survey, in *Cureus*, a peerreviewed Springer Nature journal. This paper shows:

1. Same-sex attractions can often, though not always, change, more so for women than for men. Almost nine in ten women in the sample (88%) had changed sexual attraction from mostly or fully homosexual to mostly or fully heterosexual. Fewer men, but still a sizable minority (39%), had experienced this much change in attractions.
2. Regardless of how much their attractions changed, all of the individuals in this sample had almost completely eliminated their same sex behavior. 100% of men and women reported “slight” or no same sex behavior.
3. Therapy can help, but is not necessary, to change sexual orientation. General therapy, not necessarily focused on changing same sex attraction, was more helpful for some individuals in reducing same sex attraction than therapy with a distinct goal of reducing same sex attraction. And therapy with the explicit aim of changing sexual orientation sometimes reduced other psychologically troubling issues, for instance, depression for women and self-harm for men.

The studies purporting to “prove” therapy is dangerous never include people who have “left pride behind” and usually exclude women. In other words, they evaluate change therapy by looking only at people who failed to change. What kind of grade would marriage counseling get if we only asked people who subsequently divorced? This is why our study is so important, to show the many successes from sexual orientation therapy.

Our findings show that the worldwide drive to ban all forms of

sexual reorientation therapy is deeply misguided. Women who experience persistent same sex attraction are the most likely to benefit from this therapy. Denying women therapy, based on studies that only include men, is patently unfair. Therapy that does not have the explicit goal of reorienting sexual desires can sometimes result in a reordering of desire. Sweeping bans on “conversion therapy” will likely have a chilling effect on even this type of therapy.

The drive to ban Sexual Reorientation Therapy under the tendentious label of “conversion therapy,” assumes no one can change their sexual orientation, and that even the efforts to change are intrinsically harmful. Every single person in our survey is a standing rebuke to these assumptions.

This is why the entire gay lobby goes into overdrive to discredit them. “You must be lying about living a chaste life.” “You were not really gay in the first place.” And so on.

Our study does not claim to be representative of the entire relevant population. We honestly have no idea how well our sample represents the experiences of everyone who has ever been plagued with unwanted same sex attraction and has left them behind, or who has made substantial changes in their behavior. At this point we are satisfied with showing that these are real people whose stories deserve to be part of the international conversation about “conversion therapy.”

The thoughtful responses from this group of people show that people can indeed change their behavior, feelings and self-understanding. Continuing to ignore them as if they did not exist is simply not acceptable. Our culture tells someone with same-sex attraction that they are locked into a destructive identity from which there is no escape. They don't really believe this, or they wouldn't outlaw efforts to try to change. Catholic truth offers something better: a liberation from besetting sin to live a life of freedom and holiness.

Jennifer Roback Morse, Ph.D. is the Founder and President, and Fr. D. Paul Sullins, Ph.D. is the Senior Research Associate respectively of the Ruth Institute.

TED TURNER, R.I.P.

Ted Turner, founder of CNN, died May 6 at 87. He had been suffering from dementia for several years.

Turner and Bill Donohue clashed a few times. But after they did, he acted responsibly.

In 1999, he said that everyone should promise to have no more than two children. He failed to mention that he had five. What made his position so troubling is that he was a big donor to the pro-abortion industry.

Turner opined that the Ten Commandments were “a little out of date,” and that “if you’re only going to have 10 rules, I don’t know if prohibiting adultery should be one of them.” He made his pro-adultery quip while married to Jane Fonda.

He also took on Pope John Paul II, saying he needs to “get with it. Welcome to the 20th century.”

The day after he made those comments, Donohue slammed him. The day after that he apologized.

On Ash Wednesday in 2001, after seeing ashes on the forehead of some CNN workers, he said, “What are you? A bunch of Jesus freaks?”

Within 48 hours of Donohue’s public criticism, he apologized.

May Ted Turner rest in peace. When he erred, he apologized,

and that matters.

WHY MENTAL HEALTH IS NOT GETTING BETTER

If ever there were a decided secular bias that is evident in our culture, it's the way elites continue to address mental health and wellbeing. They just don't get it.

Read the personal advice column in a newspaper or magazine, and you will quickly learn how to guard against loneliness and depression, and how to ensure happiness. Most of it is bunk. Having written a book on this subject, *The Catholic Advantage: How Health, Happiness and Heaven Await the Faithful*, Bill Donohue says there are no secrets about what works. It can be explained in one word—bonds. Personal bonds, and bonds with God. But don't look for the "expert therapists" to mention this.

In New York City there is a Center for Wellbeing & Happiness. It is located on the lower east side, serving "Black, Indigenous [and] People of Color." Apparently, no white people need apply, although they have to pay for it (it is taxpayer funded).

Got some head issues? Here's how they are fixing them.

Currently, this center is offering classes on "Fitness & Motion" that "invites you to activate and move with your whole body!" They have a "Tai Chi" class that "promotes healthy bone-density and blood circulation through low-impact conditioning." There are two different "Yoga" classes that "allow us to harness the healing power of our own bodies

throughout all stages of life,” and that “improve the flow of energy in the body.” Lots of movement to these tricks.

“Arts & Creativity” teaches “the beautiful art of Batik.” What’s that? “Wax Resistance.” What’s that? Don’t ask. There’s a “Community Knitting Group” that is taught by “Maureen, the Knitting Mama,” so that should work to settle you down. “Nutrition & Environment” focuses on—you guessed it—food. One of the classes is “Rooted in ancestral wisdom & earth-based rituals,” emphasizing “gentle movement, storytelling, winter herbs, meditation and soul-warming foods.” If that doesn’t make you feel good, nothing will.

According to a recent Echelon Poll, 65 percent of Americans believe that our mental health is “getting much/a little worse.” How could it not if the cure is self-indulgence. But don’t expect “Maureen, the Knitting Mama,” to agree.

A Gallup survey published this spring found that 19.1 percent of adults suffer from depression, which is near the highest Gallup ever recorded. Approximately 30 percent of Americans have been treated for depression in their lifetime, which is up by 10 points since 2015. Young people are among those who suffer the most. Loneliness is driving the depression, and it is not going to be alleviated by yoga or winter herbs.

Another survey, released around the same time as the Gallup one, was published by the Institute for Family Studies. It researched happiness. Again, young people scored poorly, but not all of them: unmarried young adults did the worst. Not only are married adults happier than unmarried adults—of all ages—those who attend religious services are the happiest.

Bonds. Married people can bond with each other. Religious people can bond with God. Whom do single people bond with? Whom do non-believers bond with? Moreover, bonds have nothing to do with “the flow of energy in the body.”

Catholic League staffers found that New Hampshire, Vermont and

Oregon are the three most secular states. They have at least two things in common: they are almost all white (88, 91 and 72 percent, respectively), and they have among the highest rates of age-adjusted depression rates (all over 25 percent). That won't be fixed by learning about "Wax Resistance."

If the ruling class wasn't so opposed to acknowledging the positive role that religion plays in mental health and wellbeing, they would not hesitate to embrace it. The science cannot be disputed, even by those who make money teaching how to become more self-absorbed.

Bottom line: The key to mental health and wellbeing does not lie with you. It lies with others, and with God. "Soul-warming foods" may be pleasurable, but they are not a tonic to what ails the lonely and the depressed.

DON'T FORGET SPLC'S ANTI-CATHOLIC LEGACY

Racism is a curse, and it is therefore understandable that news stories about the corrupt Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) are focused on its funding of the Ku Klux Klan. What is frequently overlooked is its record of targeting Christians, especially Catholics.

Todd Blanche, the acting attorney general, nailed it when he said SPLC was guilty of "manufacturing racism to justify its existence." That's akin to firefighters setting fire to a row of houses so they can put it out, and then demanding an increase in salary and benefits. SPLC has also invented anti-Catholicism to serve its political agenda.

Eleven charges have been brought against SPLC by a federal grand jury, including six counts of wire fraud, four counts of bank fraud and one count of money laundering. It paid at least \$3 million to eight individuals, including those linked to the Klan and neo-Nazi groups. While there is no evidence that it paid anti-Catholics, it is undeniably true that it worked to promote anti-Catholicism.

SPLC has long attacked those who stand for traditional moral values. It has a "hate map" on its website that details those groups it labels as "hate groups." Besides naming a handful of small wacky right-wing groups, it includes reputable conservative organizations such as Family Research Council and Alliance Defending Freedom. None of these are hate-mongers. The real hatemongers are those like SPLC who smear responsible entities.

Guess who SPLC denies are "hate groups"? Antifa and Black Lives Matter. Antifa is a loosely knit bunch of urban terrorists, and Black Lives Matter is a racist bunch of thugs. But not to SPLC. "Designating Antifa as Domestic Terrorist Organization Is Dangerous," and "Black Lives Matter Is Not a Hate Group." The violence these two groups have engaged in is well documented. By contrast, the conservative organizations it cites as "hate groups" have never threatened, harmed or killed anyone.

SPLC does not list the Catholic League as a "hate group," per se, but it has several listings of us. It is telling that it blames Bill Donohue for promoting hatred because he has objected to publicly funded artistic displays that show large ants crawling all over Jesus on the Cross. He is the problem for objecting, not the bigots who defile Christ. And so on.

SPLC has a history of objecting to bigots who hate Jews and blacks, but it has nothing to say when learning that the same person is also anti-Catholic. That does not offend them.

The granddaddy of them all is when it advised the Biden Justice Department how to sabotage Catholicism.

The FBI, under Biden, conducted a spy operation on traditional Catholics. It did not monitor dissident Catholics who are pro-abortion. No, it only went after those who were—in its own words—“pro life,” “pro-family,” and who “support the biological basis for sex and gender distinction.” They were literally called “domestic terrorists.”

Guess who the Biden FBI leaned on for advice? SPLC. To be sure, there were some FBI agents who warned against using SPLC as a reliable source, but they were overruled. The FBI-SPLC connection was aimed at spying on traditional Catholics so they could smear their reputation and thereby undermine their efforts. Just as SPLC “manufactured racism to justify its existence,” it manufactured anti-Catholicism to justify its existence.

It was morally bankrupt from the beginning.

SPLC was founded by Morris Dees. He was fired in 2019. According to the *Los Angeles Times*, some two dozen employees sent a letter to the board of directors before the news broke of Dees' firing. They said that “internal ‘allegations of mistreatment, sexual harassment, gender discrimination, and racism threaten the moral authority of this organization and our integrity along with it.’”

Perversely, Dees championed himself as the enemy of white supremacy, yet his own people said he was a racist. But now we know he was not alone in hating blacks. To wit: SPLC likes to grease the Klan.

SPLC is positive proof that “The fish stinks from the head down.” Lock 'em up!

WHY AMERICA IS STILL FREE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The most common way to live, across the globe and from the beginning of time, is in a state of authoritarianism. Slavemasters, feudal lords, monarchs, warlords, pharaohs, czars, barbarians—they are the very stuff of history. In other words, historically speaking, to live in a free society is a freak. It's an even bigger freak to maintain a free society; most free societies decompose rather quickly.

In 2026, an estimated 20 percent of the world lives in a free country (historically, that is an exceptionally high number); 80 percent live in non-free countries. Instead of asking why are so few free, the right question should be, “why are any people free?” It makes sense to ask this question given that living in a state of despotism is the most natural way to live.

From ancient times to today, cultures worldwide have found it necessary to build walls. Similarly, were castles built, often atop mountains. In both cases, they were made to protect people from being invaded by hostile forces. In other words, living in peace is an historical anomaly—war has always been the rule, not the exception.

Those who prevail in war become the new leaders, and almost never do they divest themselves of power—they typically grab more of it. It is also true that when the oppressed succeed in overthrowing tyrannical rule, they almost always become the new oppressors.

There are a few instances when those who take power seek to limit it. This was true of Cincinnatus: he exercised

dictatorial power to save Rome, but then gave it up a few weeks later. What's even more unusual is for new leaders to adopt a set of principles that allow for the making of a free society, and then to craft an institutional structure that facilitates this end.

This describes what the Founders yielded.

George Washington could have done what almost all new leaders have done in history—aggregate power to himself, declaring himself king. He did not do so because he believed in republican values, meaning he wanted a society where those who rule do so with the consent of the governed.

Garry Wills, an astute student of American history, noted that Washington gave up power twice: at the end of the revolutionary war when he resigned his military commission and returned to Mount Vernon, and at the end of his second term as president—he refused the opportunity to seek a third term.

We would not be free today without the principles and the tenets of America's three founding documents: the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration, insisted that our rights were inalienable and that they come from God, our Creator. All men are created equal, he said, and are entitled to equal treatment before the law. Government exists to protect the rights of citizens, receiving its legitimacy by ruling with their consent.

The Founders knew that these foundational principles were not uniformly observed, but they also knew that they gave the American people the legal edifice upon which to secure liberty and equality.

The authors of the Constitution, like most of the Founders, had a good grasp of human nature. Unlike the French, who saw man as being essentially good, the British understood that

self-interest is baked into the human condition. As such, the Brits understood the need not to deposit too much power in the hands of any person or group of persons. Hence, the need for separation of powers.

Those who executed the laws should not be the ones who wrote the laws, and those who sat in judgment about the meaning of laws should be independent of both. Thus, the establishment of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government.

The Founders also knew that to concentrate decision-making at the national level would eviscerate the power of leaders who are closer to the people. That is why they insisted on federalism.

This outcome has served us well. Vertically, powers are divided between those at the federal, state, and local level. Horizontally, they are divided by the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government.

Majority rule is the basis of a democracy, but without protecting the rights of the minority, freedom flounders. That is why the Founders gave us the Bill of Rights, ensuring that the most fundamental human rights—freedom of religion and speech among them—are not up for a vote. Provisions for amendments were made, and in due course the Constitution was amended to abolish slavery.

Has its operations been pretty? No. But has it worked? Yes.

Churchill once said that democracy is “the worst form of Government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time.” So true. Democracy is sloppy and inefficient, and can be taxing. But the historical alternatives are a disaster.

We are free today because the Founders knew that human nature existed, and that it was unalterable. Taking self-interest

into account, they allowed for the three branches of government to be co-equals, while not allowing any one branch to dominate. Madison said it best: "Ambition must be made to counteract ambition."

Happy Birthday, America!

Catholic League Report: In A Real World Test, USA Emerges #1

Most Americans are justly proud of their country, but some, primarily those on the Left, are not. They are fond of comparing America's treatment of various segments of our society to conditions that would exist in an ideal world. In this episode of "Catholic League Report" president Bill Donohue and director of communications Mike McDonald discuss an accurate cross-cultural analysis of social conditions, past and present.

To watch, click [here](#).

IN A REAL-WORLD TEST, USA EMERGES #1

[Bill Donohue](#)

Most Americans are justly proud of their country, but some, primarily those on the Left, are not. They are fond of comparing America's treatment of various segments of our society to conditions that would exist in an ideal world. Obviously, by this measure, we fail.

That's their point—they have rigged the game so as to make the U.S. look bad. Why? So they can rush to save us. They are convinced of the superiority of their political agenda, and insist that if they take command, or if their policies are implemented by like-minded radicals, there will be liberty and justice for all.

What a joke. Every country that has ever adopted the politics of the Left has ended in poverty and oppression. A much more realistic way of judging America is to compare us to other countries around the globe, both historically and today.

To that end, the policy staff of the Catholic League chose to examine the status of religious liberty, the status of racial and ethnic minorities, and the status of women that existed in 1776 and that exists today. The result was a short summary comparing conditions in the USA to that of Latin America, Africa, the Middle East, Eurasia (Russia), Europe and Asia.

The never-never land approach favored by the Left has its roots in the Enlightenment. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it was common to compare current conditions to the ideal. This conclusion is contrived and ordained: of course current conditions are found wanting. Today, left-wing professors use the blackboard to describe their utopian vision of how people should be treated, and then they can do what they delight in doing—showing how we failed.

We didn't fail—they did. They failed their students by comparing America today to some fairy-land of perfection. That is not realistic. What is realistic is to do a cross-cultural analysis of social conditions, past and present.

To read our scorecard on this subject, click [here](#).

Catholic League Report: Religious Roots Of American Freedom

The role that the Catholic Church has played historically in securing freedom is not well appreciated. In this episode of “Catholic League Report” president Bill Donohue and director of communications Mike McDonald discuss how to set the record straight, especially now that we are about to celebrate America’s 250th anniversary.

To watch, click [here](#).

MALES CANNOT CRASH FEMALE SPORTS

[**Bill Donohue**](#)

The U.S. Supreme Court ruled 6-3 that states can ban males from competing in women’s sports. At issue is whether males, who falsely identify as female—so-called transgender females—can compete against girls and women in athletic events.

The high court cited Title IX, enacted in 1972, to support its

decision. It bars discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs. It also ruled that the 14th Amendment "equal protection" clause was not violated when states ban males from competing against females.

The majority opinion said that "forcing women and girls to play against biological males can deter some women and girls who would otherwise participate in sports from doing so—out of understandable concern about suffering serious injury or participating in what they view as an unfair competition."

Such an observation would no doubt strike most Americans as common sense, but that is not the way the media are already spinning this decision.

CNN opines that this ruling means that it allows the "conservative majority" on the high court to "further cement its power in ways that has benefited Trump and Republicans." This remarkably inane comment comes the day after the Supreme Court decided against three of the four cases that Trump wanted.

Nina Totenberg of NPR, ever the left-wing zealot, is even more sinister. She begins her commentary by noting that the majority opinion was written by Justice Brett Kavanaugh "who has long coached his daughters' and other girls' basketball teams at school." Got it? In other words, this principled decision was written because Kavanaugh likes his girls to play hoops against girls.

In her dissent Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson, who cannot define what a woman is, showcases her biological acumen once again by referring to "biological sex" as "sex assigned at birth." Wrong. Sex is never "assigned" by anyone—*it is always determined by the father.*

Ten times in her short dissent she talks about "sex assigned at birth." She is an outlier again—no other Justice uses this imbecilic term.

Justice Clarence Thomas knows better. In his concurring opinion, he writes, “Sex is an immutable ‘biological’ characteristic,” and “sex is binary.” It’s a shame that Biology 101 truisms need to be said. But they must be—so many elites are ideologically drunk these days.

Kudos to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Catholic League has been making the same argument in favor of women’s rights for many years, and now it is the law of the land.

RELIGIOUS ROOTS OF AMERICAN FREEDOMS

[Bill Donohue](#)

The role that the Catholic Church has played historically in securing freedom is not well appreciated. Whether due to ignorance or bias, we need to set the record straight, especially now that we are about to celebrate America’s 250th anniversary.

CNN commentator Fareed Zakaria is a secular-minded former Muslim who has a good grasp of history. He says it is wrong to cite Greece as the birthplace of liberty as we know it. That trophy belongs to the Catholic Church.

“The Catholic Church was the first major institution in history that was independent of temporal authority and willing to challenge it. By doing this it cracked the edifice of state power, and in nooks and crannies individual liberty began to grow.” He concludes that “the rise of the Christian Church is, in my view, the first important source of liberty in the West—and hence the world.”

Zakaria is right to call attention to the fact that when liberty was established in the West, it was the first to do so in the world. We can look in vain for the historical unfolding of freedom in Islam, Hinduism and Buddhism. The truth of the matter is that, historically, Eastern civilizations have had no notion of freedom. Indeed there was no word to describe freedom in China and Japan until the nineteenth century.

What made Catholicism special was its understanding of human rights. It has long been a staple of Catholic thought that human rights inhere in every human being as a gift from God. They are not awarded to us; they are natural to us. Made in the image and likeness of Jesus Christ, humans the world over—in every society throughout all of history—possess natural rights. Governments may proclaim certain individual rights, but in Catholic thought governments can never be the origin of such rights. Our rights are inalienable and irrevocable.

If this sounds familiar, it should: it is the heart and soul of the Declaration of Independence.

There is a confluence between Catholic thought on the subject of liberty and the thinking of the men who founded America. While it is true that some of the Founders were Deists—men like Washington, Jefferson, Franklin and Paine who doubted the inerrancy of Scripture and the divinity of Jesus—all of those who forged the new social order, whether they were religious or not, understood the need for religion in a free society. They had in mind Christianity, not Taoism.

Jefferson, the author of the Declaration, made numerous references to God in our founding document. He spoke of “the laws of nature and nature’s God”; “the Creator”; “the supreme judge of the world”; and “the protection of Divine Providence.” And, of course, our rights, he said, come from our “Creator,” not from government.

Moreover, Jefferson was hardly the “separation of church and state” zealot that he has been made out to be. As president, he gave \$300 to the Kaskaskia Indians to build a Catholic church. Today, secularists fret over students in Catholic schools getting textbooks paid for with public dollars.

The ideas about freedom that guided the Founders have been realized worldwide. The 1948 U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights begins by recognizing “the inherent dignity” and “equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family.” Several popes, both before and after this human rights touchstone, wrote extensively about these issues.

It is for this reason that former U.S. ambassador to the Vatican and Harvard law school professor Mary Ann Glendon has written that “the Church has emerged as, intellectually and institutionally, the single most influential champion of the whole, interconnected, body of principles in the Universal Declaration.

Is it ignorance or bias that explains why so few Americans know about the Church’s proud role in bequeathing to us the freedoms we take for granted? Both. Catholic schools, at all levels, have not done a good job in educating students about this subject, thus their ignorance. On the other hand, not all secularists in education and the media can plead ignorance—some allow their anti-Catholic bias to color their thinking.

The truth is that Catholics should be justly proud of Catholicism’s role in the making of freedom throughout the world, and especially in the United States.