

# COMBATING TRANSGENDERISM; VICTIMS ABOUND

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

We are witnessing the greatest exploitation of children and women in recent times, and it is being driven by politicians, educators, therapists, and doctors, all of whom falsely claim to be on their side. The problem is transgenderism, the pernicious ideology that maintains that there are more than two sexes and that they are interchangeable.

This issue of *Catalyst* has several articles on this subject. We are taking our case to government officials, the medical profession and the media.

Children are having their sex changed without parental consent. The same teacher that is barred from giving students an Advil are allowed to aid and abet their physical transitioning to the opposite sex. If the parents object, the state can take their children away from them. It's already being done in some states.

Girls have always been expected to compete against girls in sports, but now boys can compete against them, effectively eviscerating their rights. All the boy has to do is claim he is a girl and bingo—he can join the girls' team and shower alongside of them.

When a Christian male heterosexual engages in misconduct, it makes the news. When a girl who "transitioned" to a boy commits a violent crime, a cover up ensues. This is what happened in Houston after a girl named Genesse switched her sex, adopted the name Jeffrey, and started shooting in Joel

Osteen's church. But the authorities quickly put the kibosh on the records, essentially covering for the transman. Bill Donohue asked the Houston mayor to release the records.

Young people who transition to the other sex—most of them are girls—often regret their decision. Unfortunately, not a few therapists and doctors jump at the chance to “gender affirm” them. There's big bucks to be had. But few are willing to help them “detransition” back to their nature-determined sex. Worse, those who do choose this route are bullied and stigmatized for doing so.

Pope Francis has condemned gender ideology many times, and so have the U.S. bishops. As for the Catholic League, this has become the number-one civil rights issue of our time. Children and women are being abused physically and psychologically, and the perpetrators are not some strange-looking sexual deviant—they are the elite in the fields of education and medicine.

We will continue to issue reports, write letters to the authorities and professionals, address radio and TV audiences, grant interviews, and conduct ad campaigns, all with the goal of stopping this demonic form of child abuse.

There is some good news. There are signs that transgenderism is peaking. But the most resistant remain the most well-educated persons in America.

---

## IRISH EPIPHANY?

Is Ireland witnessing an epiphany, or was the recent pro-family vote an anomaly?

On March 8, Irish voters overwhelmingly voted “No” on two initiatives that could have changed the country’s Constitution.

The first would have redefined “family” as either “founded on marriage or on other durable relationships.” It was rejected by 68 percent of the voters.

The second would have removed a clause noting that the “state recognizes that by her life within the home, the woman gives to the state a support which without the common good cannot be achieved.” Voting against this referendum was 74 percent of the voters.

Liberals in Ireland and the United States were appalled. The half-Indian, openly homosexual Irish Prime Minister, Leo Varadkar, was sure the people would vote “Yes.” He said of the outcome, “when you lose by this kind of margin, there are a lot of people who got this wrong and I am certainly one of them.”

In America, before the election, the Associated Press wrote, “Ireland’s Constitution says a woman’s place is in the home.” That’s a twisted interpretation. More accurately, voters chose to honor the role that women, many of whom are mothers, play in society.

These two votes stand in stark contrast to the 2015 referendum on gay marriage (62 percent voted for it) and the 2018 vote legalizing abortion (supported by 66 percent of voters). Whether this represents a sea change is too early to tell.

---

# BIGOTRY AND DISHONESTY ARE COMMONPLACE

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

**William A. Donohue**

In my years dealing with the media, government officials, educators, activists, business people, lawyers, artists, and others, I have met my share of bigoted persons. This is not surprising given the nature of my job. Unfortunately, many of these people are also dishonest. When bigotry and dishonesty are mixed together, it's a bad combo. Regrettably, this is commonplace.

This issue of *Catalyst* has its fair share of examples. I have added a few more current ones that may be of interest to our readers.

When a crowd of disrespectful LGBT activists turned out for a funeral service at St. Patrick's Cathedral in February, some in the media gave a totally dishonest account. The New York *Daily News*, which is hanging on by a thread, took the side of the disruptors saying that the Catholic Church "has long condemned queer and transgender people."

As I pointed out, this is simply wrong. The Church does not condemn any demographic group. It condemns sinful behavior. That's not a small difference.

Time.com falsely argued that the Church "has isolated many queer folks from its doors." But the Church doesn't isolate anyone. If some of these people chose to do so—because the Church condemns homosexual behavior (so do most world religions)—that is their choice. So be it.

In the run-up to the traditional St. Patrick's Day Parade on Staten Island, the biggest media outlet in the area, *Advance/SILive.com*, lobbied to have an alternative parade because the traditional one did not allow gay groups to march under their own banner.

Since when is it the business of the media to hijack an ethnic or religious event, turning it into something that misrepresents its purpose? Just as obnoxious was the dishonest reporting. Gays have always marched in these parades—just like pro-life Catholics—but in neither case should they be allowed to do so under their own banner. The parade is not about gay rights or the rights of the unborn—it's about St. Patrick.

"60 Minutes" recently aired a segment on Moms for Liberty, the women's group that believes children should be treated as children and not be subjected to sexual engineering.

The segment was dishonest—the tape was cut and spliced—making it appear as though these women were book burners. Nonsense. They simply think that books that are highly sexual, if not pornographic, should not be made available to kids. But the show did not air that part of the taping.

When CBS asked me to comment on the Staten Island Patrick's Day Parade it misspelled a word that I wrote in my email response, and attributed the misspelling to me! Similarly, when the *Baltimore Sun* insinuated that I misstated data regarding a plan to expand a probe of Catholic dioceses in Maryland and Delaware—I did not—it was nauseating to read that these "fact checkers" couldn't even spell my name correctly.

Some government officials are guilty of bigotry and dishonesty. The Maryland Attorney General is obsessed with misconduct in the Catholic Church—his earlier investigation got him nowhere (the bad priests are long dead or out of ministry)—yet he has had absolutely nothing to say about the horrible sexual abuse of minors taking place right now in the

state's public schools.

We have to start calling those who work against women's sports for what they are—misogynists. That applies to New York State Governor Kathy Hochul. She wants boys and men to compete against girls and women in sports, and to use the same locker rooms and shower facilities. Yet she has the nerve to say that those who disagree with her are exploiting “vulnerable children.”

On the night of his State of the Union speech, President Biden trotted out a woman from Dallas who left Texas to have an abortion. He referred to her baby as a “fetus” (he refused to call her baby a baby) telling everyone that she had to abort her child because her doctor said her own life was at risk. Not so. We know from court records that her doctor did not assert that the woman had a “life-threatening physical condition.”

To make matters worse, why didn't Biden mention that the baby was diagnosed with a disability? Why was it important that he, and his wife, chose this particular woman to showcase that evening? Babies with disabilities deserve the same rights as every other baby.

Disney says it is committed to inclusionary policies, yet in its hiring decisions it continues to give preference to groups that are already overrepresented, e.g., LGBT persons, while never addressing those who are seriously underrepresented, such as Catholics.

On [pp. 8-9, Fr. Paul Sullins](#) has a splendid piece on how dishonest scholarship is these days. Anyone who threatens the conventional wisdom on college campuses, as espoused by left-wing professors, is subject to banishment, or worse.

To be sure, there are good men and women who work in all of these fields, but too often the bigots and the liars rule the roost. They must be outed, resisted and defeated.

---

# THE POLITICS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Fr. D. Paul Sullins

For years, as a faithful Catholic social scientist, I have experienced embedded, irrational opposition to the expression in scientific settings of evidence and truths that support the Catholic faith or the natural law. Like today's often-noted two-tier system of justice, more permissive for progressives and more rigorous for conservatives, there are two tiers of academic review for scholarly research.

Studies whose findings advance the progressive causes favored by today's trenchantly liberal scholarly associations, especially issues of sexuality and gender, are put on a fast track to publication. For these studies, the standards of normal science are often relaxed or overlooked altogether. The result is a body of weak, biased research published under color of science but without the credibility and rigor usually ascribed to scientific findings. Nevertheless, they are typically lauded as definitive scientific evidence, with favorable commentaries and many citations and popular publications. More propaganda than science, I call this the Propaganda tier.

In direct contrast is the Challenge Tier, studies whose findings challenge or obstruct one or more points of the dominant progressive orthodoxy. The same processes that encourage the appearance of Propaganda studies work in reverse to present a gauntlet of opposition to Challenge studies. Editors often dismiss them out of hand, without even sending them to peer review, because they don't want the findings to

become more widely known or cannot imagine that the findings could be correct. Reviewers amplify minor weaknesses or limitations to reject the study. If they do get published, they are ignored and rarely cited, or are met with angry scholarly denunciation and specious calls for their retraction, which increasingly are successful.

Increasingly, the scholarly world is moving from merely discouraging and impeding Challenge studies to openly censoring them altogether. I am going to illustrate this trend with two stories from my own experience.

In May 2016 I published an analysis of late-onset depression among children with same-sex parents using data that interviewed the same individuals at age 15 and age 28. Three Propaganda studies had used the age 15 data to show that such children were not more depressed than those raised by man-woman parents. I found that although there was no difference at age 15, by age 28 such children had developed three times the risk of depression as the general population. A gay activist who ran a website promoting the idea that children were no worse off with same-sex parents wrote a negative editorial full of falsehoods about the study in Slate magazine, and some pro-family media ran positive stories about the study. In August the gay activist submitted his editorial as a letter to the journal editor, to which I wrote a response refuting the multiple false statements therein.

There things sat until August 2017, over a year after initial publication, when my article was unexpectedly cited by a lurid anti-gay poster during the referendum debate on gay marriage in Australia. The poster pictured an abused child, used a pejorative term for gay persons, and referenced a data table in the article that the rate of all-cause child abuse, meaning the sum of physical, sexual and emotional abuse, reported by the children raised by same-sex parents was very high: 92%. Although notably high, this statistic was a minor point that did not figure into the main argument of the article, and had



not been mentioned by any previous commentary on it pro or con. It appeared for only a few hours at a single location in Melbourne before it was taken down, but not before some photos of it had been posted on social media. (It came out later that the unsigned poster had most likely been placed by pro-gay sources in an attempt to discredit my study. Think about it. How many street posters include detailed academic citations?)

Within 24 hours I was contacted by several Australian news organizations and the journal publisher for comment. I made a statement denouncing the use of my scholarly findings for anti-gay bigotry, and I offered to join in such a statement with the publisher. But on one point I could not satisfy them: I was unwilling to retract the finding itself. As unattractive as it may be, the poster accurately cited my paper, which in turn accurately reported the finding in the data. The publisher then issued an official notice of concerns about a scholarly study, which implies some form of dishonesty and is usually a prelude to retraction. This statement, however, recounted an earlier attempt by the publisher, in June 2016, to have the study retracted amid concerns from "some readers" over several features of the study, including "the potential conflict of interest implied by the author's position as a Catholic priest." At that time, however, the journal editor pushed back, telling the publisher that he "believed that the article's reviewers addressed these concerns, and the author made sufficient revisions to the article to address these flaws." This was why, the notice explained, the publisher had subsequently invited the negative editorial, so that "the criticisms of this study [could] become part of the scholarly record."

This treatment, of course, was patently unfair. The notice was entirely unwarranted, unfairly stigmatizing my study as if it had involved some misconduct. It did not seem to matter to anyone that I had no knowledge or control over how my published results were used or misused in public debate. No

one was willing to publish or even acknowledge my statement denouncing anti-gay bigotry. I had not been made aware of the initial effort to retract my study, what the concerns were and from whom: all of which violates publication ethics.

No one from the publisher was willing to explain exactly what conflict of interest was implied by being a Catholic priest. This didn't surprise me. This was little more than thinly disguised religious bigotry, which they were unlikely to admit or perhaps even recognize. The "conflict" was simply that the Catholic faith upheld a view—the importance of a child being raised by his or her own biological parents (see *Donum Vitae* 2; *Amoris Laetitia* 176)—which they could not tolerate. In their eyes, my challenge to a point of progressive orthodoxy itself constituted a form of misconduct, stemming from my Catholic faith commitments, which they were barely restrained by a stalwart editor from erasing. By the time of my second story six years later, however, the censorship of scientific findings simply because they may affirm Catholic teaching rather than the politics of progressive orthodoxy was openly advocated.

In late 2022 I published a rebuttal to a series of studies by LGBT scholar-activists who were attempting to establish that therapies to help persons sexually attracted to persons of the same sex try to reduce or avoid acting on those attractions, commonly called "sexual orientation change efforts" (SOCE), increased the lifetime risk of gay suicide and therefore should be banned by law. Due in part to the effect of these studies, SOCE has already been banned in over 20 U.S. states, in prohibitions drawn so broadly they could also inhibit Catholic pastoral care. Titled "Sexual orientation change efforts do not increase suicide: correcting a false research narrative," my study re-analyzed the strongest of these studies, using the same data it had, and pointed out a disabling error: in its measure of "lifetime suicidality," the study had included suicide attempts and thoughts that had

occurred before the subject had undergone SOCE therapy.

This was not an inconsequential error. Obviously, to avoid overstating harm from an intervention, a study must find out whether the harm may have already been there before the intervention. When I took suicidality before SOCE into account, the effect was dramatic. For persons undergoing SOCE, it turned out, not just a little, but the majority of reported suicidality happened before undergoing the therapy. Almost two-thirds (65%) of suicidal thoughts preceded the therapy, with the result that the rate of suicide ideation following therapy was lower than for persons who had never undergone SOCE. Predicted suicide attempts were strongly reduced, under real life conditions, following SOCE. My corrected results suggested that the LGBT activist scholars had confused the cause of the problem with what was, at least in part, a cure for the problem.

As my study's conclusion put it:

Imagine a study that finds that most persons using anti-hypertension medication have also previously had high blood pressure, thereby concluding that persons "exposed" to high blood pressure medication were much more likely to experience hypertension, and recommending that high blood pressure medications therefore be banned. This imagined study would have used the same flawed logic as [the studies claiming that SOCE caused suicide], with invidious consequences for persons suffering from hypertension.

In normal scientific discourse, the exposure of such a serious error would lead to the reconsideration or restatement of the flawed studies involved. Instead, my study was met with a series of angry editorials by the most prestigious scholars of the topic calling for its retraction, even suppression. The authors of the study I critiqued, who were affiliated with the Williams Institute, a research center formed to advance gay rights, doubled down on their false reasoning, refusing even

to acknowledge that an effect cannot logically precede a cause. Others resorted to conspicuous falsehood about their own earlier research findings. One commentary clearly illustrated the anti-science bias involved.

Two European public health scholars wrote that, even if my findings were true, their publication was “egregiously problematic ... for the simple reason that the problem with SOCE is not just about outcomes and well-being but primarily about rights and autonomy so that a methodological analysis seeking to undermine causation is just irrelevant.” Regardless of their effect on suicidality, for these theorists the mere attempt to change someone’s sexual orientation violated their bodily autonomy and sexual rights. Thus “the potential for these conclusions drawn by Sullins to be used nefariously in political and legislative debates can put sexual minority individuals in real danger if legislation allowing for these harmful practices is implemented or just debated.”

“Or just debated.” For these scholars, the assertion that sodomy is as morally acceptable and normal as heterosexual relations is not simply an opinion with which others may reasonably disagree, but has the status of a rigid article of faith, the denial or even debate of which cannot be tolerated. Evidence that may impede the advance of the gay rights agenda is “nefarious” and must be suppressed, even if it is true, by preventing its publication and dissemination.

Unlike the Catholic faith, which welcomes doubt and debate from all quarters because it believes its teachings to be demonstrably true and wants persons to come to believe them, the secular articles of faith are not open to question or debate. For a long time now, those who dare to question them have risked being ignored or discredited. Increasingly they risk being censored outright.

*Father Paul Sullins, Ph.D., taught sociology at The Catholic University of America and is a Senior Research Associate at*

## SUPPORT DETRANSITIONERS

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

March 12 was Detransition Awareness Day, the most important LGBT day of the year. Those who are responsible for transgenderism, the pernicious ideology that holds that the sexes are not binary and are interchangeable, will never call attention to this day, and that is because it seriously undercuts their crusade. But we at the Catholic League are not afraid to celebrate it.

The tide is turning. The insane idea that biology doesn't matter—we can self-identify our sex—has peaked. It is true that the Biden administration continues to promote transgenderism. It is also true that elite American institutions in the behavioral sciences and the medical community continue to misinform the public. But the good news is that, even there, many are rethinking their position, coming over to our side.

Our side is the side of science. Their side is the side of politics.

Jamie Reed is a middle-age woman who calls herself a queer and says she is politically to the left of Bernie Sanders. She is married to a woman who thinks she is a man, a so-called transman. She took a job in 2018 at a transgender center at St. Louis Children's Hospital and saw how children with gender dysphoria are treated. She left last November because of what

she witnessed.

“By the time I departed,” she wrote, “I was certain that the way the American medical system is treating these patients is the opposite of the promise we make to ‘do no harm.’ Instead, we are permanently harming the vulnerable patients in our care.”

To those who think this is just anecdote, they’re wrong.

The American College of Pediatricians recently did a review of more than 60 studies on the issue of adolescents who have transitioned. They concluded that “There are no long-term studies demonstrating benefits nor studies evaluating risks associated with the medical and surgical interventions provided to these adolescents.” Similarly, there is “no long-term evidence that mental health concerns are decreased or alleviated after ‘gender-affirming therapy.’”

The same organization found that “there is strong evidence that children and adolescents who identify as transgender have experienced significant psychological trauma leading to their gender dysphoria.” Therefore, they said, they “cannot condone the social affirmation, medical intervention, or surgical mutilation of children and adolescents identifying as transgender or gender nonconforming.”

By all accounts, the Europeans are way ahead of the Americans. The medical profession there has woken up and begun to realize that transgenderism should not be promoted. Even the Dutch, who were the first to tout its benefits in 2011, have concluded their enthusiasm for transitioning was not based on strong data.

The *Economist*, an influential British liberal weekly, wants desperately to believe in transgenderism, but has to admit that the medical evidence in support of it is “worryingly weak.” It cites a review of this subject conducted by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. “The

academic evidence it found was weak, discouraging and sometimes contradictory...”

Tavistock, the English institute, is the world’s largest pediatric gender clinic. It was closed last year after an independent review. According to the Society for Evidence Based Gender Medicine, the clinic was “not a safe or viable long-term option.” This is because their work was “based on poor evidence and its model of care leaves young people ‘at considerable risk’ of poor mental health.”

The authors of an article published last year in the journal of the Danish Medical Association found their initial well-meaning intentions were based on insufficient evidence—they encouraged transitioning—but came to realize that they were doing more harm than good and sharply reversed course.

Dr. Riittakerttu Kaltiala, a Finnish-born psychiatrist who heads the department of adolescent psychiatry at Finland’s Tampere University Hospital, was among the first physicians in the world to head a gender identity clinic for minors. She, too, has reversed course.

In a statement she wrote that was signed by 20 clinicians from nine countries, she said, “Every systematic review of evidence to date, including one published in the *Journal of the Endocrine Society*, has found the evidence for mental health benefits of hormonal interventions for minors to be of low or very low certainty.” She knows why so many professionals have been snookered. “Medicine, unfortunately, is not immune to dangerous groupthink that results in patient harm.”

Last year, a group of five professionals in Norway examined what the medical community was promoting and took them to task for not following the science. Sex-affirming treatment with hormones and surgery, they said, was “not correct.” They explained why. “Such treatment methods, which have irreversible and significant consequences, have a weak

knowledge base.”

In a lengthy piece published in February by the *New York Times*, it found that young people who have detransitioned, and medical professionals who no longer support transgenderism, are often stigmatized for doing so.

Those who have detransitioned, or are contemplating it, deserve our widespread support. They do not need to be marginalized by bullies who are too ideologically corrupt, or greedy, to realize that transgenderism is a monumental fraud.

---

## LGBT MANIA ABUSING KIDS AND PARENTS

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

What started as switching the genitals of minors behind the backs of parents has now evolved to the stage where children are being abducted from their parents if they object. This is the kind of nightmare that few would believe could happen in the United States as recently as 9/11. It is also the kind of condition we would normally associate with totalitarian regimes.

In 2015, Oregon became the first state in the nation to allow 15-year-olds to get sex-reassignment surgery without parental consent. Now the state of Indiana is taking children away from their parents if they object.

The U.S. Supreme Court has declined to hear the Indiana case.



When a Catholic couple learned that their son identified as a girl, they provided mental health services for him, but they did not agree to affirm his new status. Government officials learned of this and moved with dispatch to remove the teenage boy from his parents and place him in a home. There was no evidence of parental abuse of any kind, just a disagreement about the kind of treatment the boy should have.

This is child abuse and the abuser is the government. The sincerely held religious convictions of a responsible Catholic couple have been eviscerated by ideological zealots who work for the state. Even if the couple were atheists, the government has no right to do this. Instead of putting the confused child in a home, the government officials who abducted him should be sent to prison.

This madness never ends. There is a bill in Illinois that would allow the government to charge the parents of a minor with child abuse if they do not accede to their child's desire to transition to the other sex, or have an abortion.

All over Europe, nations which once heralded sex transition surgeries for minors are pulling back, and this includes the Netherlands, home to studies from 2011 which concluded they are beneficial. They later found the data were weak and reversed themselves.

Britain, Finland, Norway and Sweden were once strong advocates, but no more. They now regret doing so. The evidence is clear: so-called gender-affirming care for minors is dangerous to their mental and physical health. Regrettably, the U.S. has yet to figure this out. It is still harming innocent children, and this crusade is being led by the Biden administration.

Minors are not allowed to get a tattoo and teachers are not allowed to give them an aspirin. Yet these same children are allowed to have their hormones altered and their genitals

mutilated while keeping their parents in the dark. But it is okay for school officials to know. Indeed, they are often the officiators.

Parents are the only ones who can stop this insanity—the medical profession, educators and government agents have become the enemy. The monetary and ideological profit being made by legally exploiting children is what fires them. There can't be enough lawsuits.

---

## SUPPORT WANING FOR LGBT MOVEMENT

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

There are now more Americans who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgender than at any time in history. A new Gallup poll shows that the LGBT population stands at 7.6 percent. But look for it to peak soon.

More than half of that population identifies as bisexual, a tribute, no doubt, to the encouragement they receive from those who tell young people that in order to find their true self, they need to “experiment.”

Then there are activists like Andrea Long Chu, a man who falsely claims to be a woman—he is featured in *New York Magazine*—who argues that transitioning to the opposite sex (a biological impossibility) is a fundamental human right, even for kids. He realizes, however, that he is having a hard time trying to convince liberals to get on board. Many have elected

to sit this one out.

Chu is not wrong in his assessment: many liberals are reluctant to embrace transgenderism, and that is because they know in their heart of hearts that this sick ideology is a fraud. But God forbid they get tagged as a conservative, so it is best to sit this one out. How brave.

The good news is that support for transgenderism is waning. By a margin of 3-1, a new Rasmussen poll found that the public is opposed to giving minors puberty blockers and submitting them to sex-reassignment surgery. As for males who claim to be a female and want to compete in girl and women's sports, the survey found that by a margin on 7-1, Americans are opposed to it.

More good news. In England, the National Health Service has ruled that doctors can no longer prescribe puberty blockers to children seeking to transition. The statement said that "there is not enough evidence of safety and clinical effectiveness."

There will come a day when the public will look back at this period in Western history (the rest of the world has never bought into this mad idea) and declare it to be an era when child abuse was celebrated by the medical profession, as well as by elites in all walks of life.

This is the most critical civil rights issue of our day—protecting children from those activists, philanthropists, educators, journalists, social media influencers, therapists and doctors who prey on them for ideological or financial profit. The tide is turning against them, but it is not fast enough.

Had we followed the teachings of the Catholic Church on this subject—as well as on matters of sexuality in general—we would not have gone down this road in the first place. However, it is never too late to wake up.

---

# COVERING UP FOR A MASS SHOOTER

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

The shooter who was killed after crashing Joel Osteen's Lakewood Church in Houston on February 11 has been identified as Genesse Ivonne Moreno. She was a biological woman, but was she also a transman? It matters, because the media have been quick to cover-up such stories.

We have prepared a timeline of media reports that unfolded. (It is available on our website.)

On Monday, February 12, the Houston CBS affiliate reported that "Moreno had used multiple aliases, including Jeffrey Escalante...." Jeffrey?

According to the Texas Department of Public Safety, Moreno primarily identified as "Jeffrey Escalantemoreno." Why would a person who was not trans do that? It makes no sense. Do people called Jeffrey go around calling themselves Janice?

As a side note, we found that in mug shots taken years ago, as compared to recent ones, Moreno appears to look more feminine than she was at the time of her death.

The Houston NBC affiliate described her as "transgender" in its online reporting on February 12. During its noon broadcast that day, the Houston NBC affiliate once again describes Moreno as "transgender."

The Daily Wire also reported that according to arrest records, "Moreno identified as a man named 'Jeffrey' in recent years." This is telling.

Back to the Houston NBC affiliate. We found that it stopped describing Moreno as transgender on February 12 in its evening report. But it did mention that the Houston Police Commander said there were some "discrepancies," including the alias Jeffrey Escalante.

It matters greatly if Moreno identified as a man named Jeffrey. Unfortunately, as we have detailed, trans persons have a violent history.

Last year, we provided evidence of this on March 31, October 11 and October 12. Moreover, on March 30 last year we called attention to the games the media were playing trying to downplay the violent streak in trans persons. We noted that NBC News was the most egregious offender.

When the media were covering the clergy sexual abuse scandal, they made sure every miniscule piece of information was made public. But when it comes to trans violence, they do just the opposite.

It has been well established that trans persons have serious mental issues. They need help, not compassionate cover-ups. The sooner they are treated for their psychological disorders, the better they will be and the safer the public will be.

Bill Donohue sent a letter to Houston Mayor John Whitmire to ask him make public all records that pertain to this issue. A copy of his letter was also sent to Troy Finner, Chief of Police.

---

# NY WOMAN GOV. SIDES WITH MISOGYNISTS

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

Why does the woman governor of New York, Kathy Hochul, want to destroy women's sports?

Bruce Blakeman is the Nassau County executive. He recently signed an executive order mandating that any sports entity that wants to hold athletic events in county parks or facilities must "expressly designate" that its teams are male, female or coed, based on the biological sex of the athlete. In other words, males who falsely identify as female must compete against other males; the obverse holds as well.

It is to be expected that the ACLU would object—any organization that falsely believes that men can become pregnant is bound to get it wrong. But Hochul is a woman who says she champions women's rights. Not when it comes to women's sports.

Hochul went ballistic when Blakeman held his ground. She accused the women's rights advocate of "bullying trans kids."

This is a lie. He did nothing of the sort. Trans kids are not barred from competing in athletics nor has Blakeman bullied them.

"There is nothing lower than trying to score cheap political points by putting a target on the backs of some of our state's most vulnerable children," Hochul said.

"Putting a target" on the backs of young people? Accusing someone of violence is a serious matter, and if Blakeman were

not a public figure, he could sue her for libel and win. Hochul is out of control.

Hochul is not only discriminating against women, she is endangering them. To cite a recent example, in February three female basketball players in Massachusetts were injured by a male who falsely claimed to be a woman. The coach of the girl's team forfeited the game after the remaining players on his team were afraid to compete.

Surveys show that 7-in-10 Americans are opposed to allowing biological men to compete in women's sports. But Hochul still doesn't get it.

Hochul can shout from the rooftop about being a supporter of women's rights, but the fact is that it is Blakeman, not her, who is the real deal. She has laid anchor with misogynists, doing the dirty work of sabotaging women's rights.

---

## MARYLAND AG ASKED TO END CHURCH PROBE

*This is the article that appeared in the April 2024 edition of Catalyst, our monthly journal. The date that prints out reflects the day that it was uploaded to our website. For a more accurate date of when the article was first published, check out the news release, [here](#).*

*Catholic League president Bill Donohue asked Maryland Attorney General Anthony G. Brown to end the investigation of clergy sexual abuse in the Catholic Church. It has yielded not a single indictment and the alleged offenders are either dead or missing.*

February 27, 2024

Hon. Anthony G. Brown  
Maryland Attorney General  
200 St. Paul Place  
Baltimore, MD 21202

Dear Attorney General Brown:

It is exasperating, to say the least, to learn that your office wants to continue its investigating of clergy sexual abuse of minors in the Catholic Church. After all, the results of the 463-page interim report on the Archdiocese of Baltimore released last April on this subject turned out to be a total waste of money. It did not result in a single indictment.

There is a good reason why nothing came of the probe: of the 156 individuals who were accused of molestation dating back to the 1930s, 104 of them—two-thirds—are dead. Another third are alive, but none is in ministry; it is unknown whether they are alive or dead.

Of the 156 individuals, the archdiocese had already published the names of 152 of them. Two were nuns, four were male teachers, five were deacons, one was briefly in the seminary in Maryland before being kicked out, and 144 were priests.

Most of the abuse took place in the 1960s and 1970s. Between the mid-1930s and the mid-1940s, there were zero instances of alleged abuse. Between 1990 and 2019, there were virtually no instances of alleged abuse. Which begs the question: Why is the investigation being extended?

What makes this particularly disturbing is the fact that a *USA Today* study of the sexual abuse of minors in the public schools, in every state, found that Maryland public schools had such a horrific record that the researchers gave it an "F."

Yet there is no probe of the public schools. Why is this?



Why is it that the law in Maryland says that those who successfully sue a private institution can be awarded as much as \$1.5 million, but if the exact same offense were to take place in a public institution, the award is capped at \$890,000? This smacks of discrimination—we all know which private institution stands to be investigated and which private ones will be given a pass.

This is madness. The scandal in the Catholic Church is long over, not only in Maryland but across the nation (see my book [\*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes\*](#)).

At this point, given all that we know of the 2023 report, it makes no sense to pursue this matter any further. That is why I am requesting that you finally end the investigation.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

cc: Maryland Gov. Wes Moore  
Maryland lawmakers  
Baltimore Archbishop William E. Lori