

MEDIA BLACKOUT ON CLERGY ABUSE DATA

[Bill Donohue](#)

Whenever there is a whiff of bad news about the Catholic Church, the mainstream media never miss a beat in reporting it. But when there is good news, they go mute. The latest example is the news about the almost complete eradication of clergy sexual abuse. Not one secular media outlet in the United States ran a story on this issue.

Every year, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) issues an annual report on clergy sexual abuse. The audit is prepared by StoneBridge Business Partners, which works in cooperation with the National Review Board for the Protection of Children and Young People, a lay advisory board established by the USCCB.

The 2023 report, which covered allegations made between July 1, 2022 and June 30, 2023, found that there were 1,308 allegations involving 17 current year minors. Four of the allegations were made by males and 11 by females; 2 were listed as unknown. Of the 17, only 3 were substantiated.

During this period, there were 47,987 members of the clergy. This means that **0.006 percent** of them had a substantiated case of sexual abuse made against him by a minor. (In the previous year's report, there were 7 substantiated cases.) Of the accused, 91 percent are either dead or have been kicked out of ministry.

If there had been a sharp uptick in the number of cases, it would be all over the news. Such a story would have been picked up by the Associated Press, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, NPR, PBS, ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, MSNBC—and every left-wing internet and social media site.

But because this problem has all been wiped out, practically no one knows anything about it.

The fact that more females than males are making these allegations suggests that the crackdown on homosexuals in the priesthood has worked. They are responsible for 8-in-10 cases of the sexual abuse of minors (only a very small percentage of these offenses have ever been committed by pedophiles). For more detail on this see my book, [*The Truth about Clergy Sexual Abuse: Clarifying the Facts and the Causes*](#).

Congratulations to the bishops for implementing the necessary reforms. And shame on journalists and the talking heads for the total media blackout. There is no other organization in the nation where adults regularly interact with minors that has a better record on this issue than the Catholic Church.

POPE AND RICHARD DREYFUSS IN THE HOT SEAT

[Bill Donohue](#)

Pope Francis and Richard Dreyfuss are both in the hot seat for making remarks that some interpret as offensive. The pope has apologized but not Dreyfuss. Are they guilty as charged, or are people overreacting?

Italian bishops told media sources this week that when the pope met with them in a closed-door meeting last week, he spoke out against having homosexuals in the seminaries. He said, "There's already too much 'faggotry'" in the seminaries, including "even those who are only semi-oriented." He expressed his concerns over seminarians who are supposed to be

celibate but live a “double life,” living secretly as gay.

Due to the fact that homosexual priests (not pedophiles!) are responsible for most of the cases where a minor has been sexually abused—8 in 10 of these cases—the Vatican sought to correct this problem in 2005 when it barred those with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” from entering the seminaries. Subsequently, the number of abuse cases has declined to almost nil.

Is the criticism of Pope Francis warranted? Is the word “faggot” objectionable?

It wasn't too long ago that the word “queer” was deemed offensive, but this is no longer the case. Now it's standard in the mainstream media to refer to homosexuals as queers. According to LGBTQ Nation, the term has been “reclaimed” (which explains why they added the “Q” to their acronym). They say that “The use of the word ‘queer’ has become so widespread that it's now represented by the letter ‘Q’ in the initialism LGBTQ+.” But we still don't know who the + people are.

If it is okay to call homosexuals queers, is it time to reclaim the word “faggot”? Some are already doing that.

André Wheeler is a self-described black queer. Four years ago he admitted that growing up he was aghast at the term “faggot.” But then he heard more and more people in social media dropping the word and found that his objections began to wither. He points out that Dan Savage, the anti-Catholic queer writer, began calling his sex advice column “Hey Faggot” in the 1990s. Wheeler confesses that he still winces when he hears the word “faggot,” but “I also want to reclaim” it.

That being the case, one could argue that the pope's reference to “faggots” in the seminaries is not necessarily objectionable. It may be that the perception of this term is evolving.

Richard Dreyfuss of “Jaws” fame upset some people over the weekend when speaking at a Massachusetts theater, The Cabot. He said that “the parents of trans youth, allowing them to transition, was bad parenting and that someday those kids might change their minds.”

Officials at The Cabot were quick to issue a statement slamming Dreyfuss for his “distressing and offensive” remarks, and apologized to those who were hurt. Naturally, they said he violated the “welcoming and inclusive environment for all members of our community.” Except for him, that is.

In my upcoming book, [*Cultural Meltdown: The Secular Roots of Our Moral Crisis*](#), I devote a lengthy chapter to transgenderism, the pernicious ideology that falsely claims there are more than two sexes. Worse than this is the exploitation of children by those in education and medical circles; enabling kids to “transition” is child abuse.

Ergo, what Dreyfuss said is an understatement. The apologies should be issued by his critics for contributing to this alarming problem.

Even if one allows that the pope should not have used the word “faggotry,” and even if one allows that Dreyfuss should have stayed away from politics, it is much more disconcerting to read the sanctimonious comments of their critics.

As for the Catholic League, we will refrain for now from talking about “faggots” (keeping an eye on its evolving acceptance), but will continue to condemn gender ideology.

NFL GOES MUTE ON McMANUS AND JAGUARS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Brandon McManus, the kicker for the Washington Commanders, has been hit with a lawsuit by two flight attendants who claim that when he was the kicker for the Jacksonville Jaguars he made unwelcome sexual advances while on board a plane last September; it was on the flight to London that the alleged sexual assault took place. The lawsuit also names the Jaguars, alleging that the team did not create a safe environment.

We have no opinion on this matter: we assume McManus is innocent—he claims he is—until proven otherwise. But we do have an opinion on the NFL.

Earlier this month, when the kicker for the Kansas City Chiefs, Harrison Butker, a Catholic, gave a Catholic speech at a Catholic college, he was given two standing ovations by the graduating class at Benedictine College. But because his speech mentioned the positive role that stay-at-home moms play, his free speech was condemned by those who fancy themselves as beacons of tolerance.

The NFL joined that chorus. “His [Butker’s] views are not those of the NFL as an organization. The NFL is steadfast in our commitment to inclusion, which only makes us stronger.”

So what has the NFL had to say about McManus? “We are aware of the matter but will decline comment.”

In other words, the NFL has no stomach for kickers who are traditional Catholics but it has nothing to say about kickers who are accused of sexually assaulting women. Is that because the Jaguars are party to the lawsuit and that implicates the NFL?

There have been roughly 5,400 news stories about Butker since his May 11 speech. He has been lied about—how many actually read his speech?—and subjected to incredible vitriol for simply defending traditional values. Butker said on May 24 that “At the outset, many people expressed a shocking level of hate. But as the days went on, even those who disagreed with my viewpoints shared their support for my freedom of religion.”

The NFL has been quoted approvingly every day since it released its statement. By throwing Butker under the bus, it gave cover to those who exercised a “shocking level of hate.” Now it sits comfortably in silence while alleged *behavior* against women—not *speech* about women—is in the news.

I am [writing](#) to NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell about this matter. I urge you to contact his office.

Contact Goodell's communication chief: Brian.McCarthy@nfl.com

BIDEN ADMIN FUNDS ATHEISTS ABROAD

[Bill Donohue](#)

Congressional investigators recently uncovered that the State Department's Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor awarded a \$500,000 grant to Humanists International (HI), an organization that promotes atheism. While this money was supposed to be used to encourage religious tolerance particularly of minority faiths, and protect the religious liberties of people abroad, the Biden administration has gifted the funds to their radical atheist friends who actively

undermine religious freedoms.

One glaring example of the programming this grant supports is HI's work in Nepal to "conduct advocacy and membership activities promoting humanism," and to "increase and diversify their membership work." In other words, the State Department gave funding to HI to host a membership drive in Nepal.

This is wrong on many levels.

Firstly, these types of grants were not designed to gain converts for a particular religion, but rather to ensure that the basic human freedom to be true to your faith is respected. Yet somehow the Biden administration believes it is appropriate for the atheists to use this money to win "converts." Rest assured that if some Catholic relief organization included proselytizing as part of its work the Biden administration would have pulled the plug on that programming.

Secondly, HI is a collection of some of the most rabid anti-Catholic organizations, and their disdain for religious liberty is palpable. In the United States, the HI coalition includes American Atheists, the American Humanist Association, and the American Ethical Union along with several other organizations. In addition to their participation with HI, these radicals also belong to the Coalition of Secular Americans. Under Biden, these militant secularists have had greater access to the administration particularly through [the Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships Office](#). Is it any wonder then, that HI received this grant?

Drawing inspiration from its anti-Catholic membership, HI has a history of attacking the Church. While it is unsurprising that an atheist group would support abortion, transgenderism, and the radical LGBT agenda, HI has condemned Catholic teachings on these subjects and maintains the notion that the Church is a great impediment to human flourishing.

Finally, and most importantly, Nepal does not have a great record when it comes to protecting religious liberty. Even the State Department's most recent "Report on International Religious Freedom" notes several serious violations.

In the report, the State Department notes that in 2021 four Christians, including two Catholic nuns, were arrested for violating Nepal's law against proselytizing. Additionally, Catholics in Nepal have noted an increase of inflammatory material on social media and a rise in discriminatory and divisive religious content on traditional media. This has led many Catholics to conceal their faith from their local communities out of fear of discrimination and violent attacks. Protestants and Muslims have noted similar violations of their rights as well.

According to its constitution, Nepal is a "secular country." While Hindus enjoy many privileges, atheists are largely accepted in Nepal as the Communists currently hold a majority in its parliament.

Fortunately, Representatives Michael McCaul (R-TX), Chris Smith (R-NJ) and Brian Mast (R-FL) recently called out the State Department for its support of HI. While the State Department has promised to "take immediate action" and "recoup the misused funds," it is with good reason these three are skeptical that the State Department will follow through. After all, the Biden Administration has been placating these militant atheists for years, even using programs designed to help faith-based organizations to do so.

Email the head of the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, Deputy Assistant Secretary Robert S. Gilchrist:
gilchristrs@state.gov

BOY SCOUTS SURRENDER

[Bill Donohue](#)

Effective in February, the Boy Scouts of America (BSA) will be called Scouting America. The name change was occasioned by years of harassment, lawsuits and bad decisions. The policy changes that the BSA have made are tantamount to surrender. The organization will never be the same.

In the early 1990s, I was asked by the Claremont Institute's Center for the Study of Natural Law to write a monograph about legal attacks on the BSA. "On the Front Line of the Culture War: Recent Attacks on the Boy Scouts of America." It was published in 1993; [a second edition was published in 1996](#).

Before writing my piece, I spoke to an official of the BSA in Irving, Texas explaining what I was doing. He was not at all concerned about the mounting lawsuits, and tried to belittle the issue. He proved to be as clueless as many bishops in the Catholic Church were at that time over the same issue.

Both institutions refused to take the homosexual crisis seriously, and both paid a huge price, financially and reputationally, as a result. We are talking about billions of dollars in both instances. The damage that homosexual Scoutmasters and homosexual priests have done is astounding. Their victims are legion.

In the 1990s, the BSA was sued for its policies on gays, God and girls. It banned openly gay youngsters, required scouts to profess allegiance to God and banned girls. In 2013, it ended the ban on gays and in 2018 it allowed girls to join. While it still encourages Scouts to believe in God, it allows youngsters who belong to non-theistic religions (e.g. Buddhists and Hindus) to be Scouts in good standing.

In short, in the name of inclusivity, the BSA caved. It used

to be a paragon of diversity, but it decided to throw diversity to the wind and bow to the demands of inclusivity. Ironically, like virtually every institution these days, it professes an allegiance to both diversity and inclusion, not realizing that a commitment to one excludes a commitment to the other. It's a mantra, not a reasoned idea.

When the BSA was sued for banning gays, Lee Sneath, its spokesman, said that "as an organization that stresses the values of the family, we believe that homosexuals do not provide the proper role model for youth membership." Though that policy is no longer extant, it was based on sound moral principles.

As political scientist Harry Jaffa explained, "From ancient—and biblical—times, this practice [homosexuality] has been regarded by the greatest legislators and moralists as a vicious sexual perversion. It is condemned equally by the Old and New Testaments, and by Plato in his *Laws*. Thomas Jefferson, in a criminal code written during the American Revolution, made it a felony in the same class as rape. In this he only followed the common law."

Sneath was not off base when he argued in the early 1990s that the Scouts "provide a natural hunting ground for pedophiles." It is undeniably true that homosexual Scoutmasters, having easy access to young boys, were responsible for the rampant sexual abuse. Judge Sally G. Disco of the Los Angeles County Superior Court understood that the exclusion of homosexuals was critical to the Boy Scout mission, but her position has long fallen out of favor with the courts.

The reason the BSA excluded girls should be obvious. There is such a thing called the Girl Scouts. But in a time when the president of the United States wants to punish institutions that don't allow males to compete with females in sports, and to shower with them, the obvious needs explaining. Breaking News: Males and Females are biologically different.

It wasn't just left-wing organizations like the ACLU that helped bring down the BSA; it was the establishment. Levi Strauss, Bank of America and Wells Fargo yanked their donations to the BSA in the summer of 1992 over the exclusion of homosexuals.

The United Way of DeKalb County, Illinois denied funding to the local BSA council, as did the United Way of the San Francisco Bay Area. (Nationwide, the United Way contributed roughly 25 percent of the BSA budget at that time.) The National Park Service jumped on the bandwagon by terminating all agreements with the BSA.

In other words, the Left and the ruling class worked in tandem to defeat the BSA.

In 1993, when I wrote my monograph for the Claremont Institute, the BSA had 4.3 million members. In 2020, it had half that number. Today it is down to around a million

The Scout Oath remains the same today as it did when it was published in 1911. "On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout Law; To help other people at all times; To keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight."

The Oath hasn't changed, but the will to operationalize it certainly has.

CATHOLIC KID SCOLDED FOR PATRIOTIC SPEECH?

Bill Donohue wants to share with the public his letter to the

principal of a Catholic school. If you would like to contact the school, here is its email address:
office@stbonaventureschool.org

May 22, 2024

Ms. Mary Flock
Principal
St. Bonaventure Catholic School
16377 Bradbury Lane
Huntington Beach, CA 92647

Dear Principal Flock:

News reports say that you ordered a middle-school student, Jimmy Heyward, to remove from a speech he planned to give “all parts about patriotism.” His speech reportedly speaks positively about veterans, the National Anthem and the Pledge of Allegiance.

In a statement issued by your school to the media, it says that “school administrators felt encouraged by the words of patriotism but were discouraged by what is perceived as some negative comments and sought adjustments to make it more positive.”

I am a veteran. I am also the president and CEO of the nation’s largest Catholic civil rights organization. Accordingly, I would like you to share with me, and with the public, precisely which parts of the speech you found objectionable.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

TRADITIONALISM SCARES LIBERAL CATHOLICS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Liberal Catholics joined with the Catholic haters in slamming Kansas City Chiefs' Harrison Butker after he touted traditional Catholic moral theology in his commencement address at Benedictine College on May 11. The bigots are easy to understand: they believe in nothing but themselves and hate everything about Catholicism. Liberal Catholics don't hate their religion but they are embarrassed by traditionalists.

There is nothing that makes liberal Catholics more nervous than being lumped together with traditionalists. I've seen this first-hand for decades. Fr. Andrew Greeley was perhaps the most famous liberal Catholic who got the jitters whenever a Catholic critic said that Catholics were close-minded (meaning they ascribe to orthodoxy). He made it clear that he never wanted to be associated with them.

Catholic bashers can produce the most vulgar artwork, sing the most obscene lyrics, tell the most insulting jokes—all aimed at Catholic teachings or the clergy—and they will rarely upset liberal Catholics. Why not? They want their secular allies to praise them for having an open mind.

No one ever called Fr. Greeley parochial. His sex novels won him the applause of the secular elites, which is why he never stopped writing them; he made sure he would never be thrown in the same bin with conservative Catholics.

The latest example of this phenomenon occurred when a writer for *America* took the side of Butker's critics.

Butker's speech was too much for Zac Davis, an associate editor at *America*, a Jesuit publication. He began his piece by quoting the Associated Press, which called it "A step back in time." He also quoted the NFL for saying the speech violated its "commitment to inclusion," a commitment which obviously does not *include* the right of Butker to espouse Catholic teachings at a Catholic school. Davis added, "In secular outlets, Mr. Butker's discussion of gender roles caught the most attention."

Notice the obsession with secular elites. This is exactly the way liberal Catholics think. Nothing is more important than winning their affirmation. Always insecure, their fawning of secular elites is astounding.

A few years back, Chris Cuomo interviewed me a couple of times on CNN. At one point he said that some Catholics don't want to be associated with me. I responded by saying I don't like being associated with your brother, Andrew (who is Catholic); he was then governor of New York but was subsequently forced out of his job after a series of unseemly allegations. In other words, because I am a conservative Catholic, liberal Catholics want to distance themselves from me lest they get tagged as "close-minded."

There is a related problem for liberal Catholics. Most are not championing abortion rights, but most do not want to be labeled pro-life either. That's because the last thing they want to do is lose the admiration of secular elites, virtually all of whom are pro-abortion. They would rather sit on the sidelines before ever condemning abortion.

If only liberal Catholics felt the same way about abortion as they do racism, the pro-life cause would deepen. But they don't. They see abortion as unfortunate but racism as obscene.

Both are obscene.

It is striking to see people like Whoopi Goldberg and Bill Maher speak in defense of Harrison Butker while the Catholics at *America* criticize him. Looks like not all members of the secular elite are hopeless. Wish we could say the same about all Catholics.

NORAH O'DONNELL MISREPRESENTS THE POPE

[Bill Donohue](#)

In her CBS interview with Pope Francis, Norah O'Donnell made it appear that the pope approves of homosexuality. He does not. This is a serious misrepresentation.

She mentioned, in a voiceover, that during an impromptu press conference in 2013, "he spoke on the subject of homosexuality." She quoted him as saying, "Who am I to judge?" She also quoted a more recent remark, "Homosexuality is not a crime."

The latter comment is not in question. But she only quoted a portion of his former remark. Worse, she implied that he was speaking about homosexuality. He was not.

On his trip back from Brazil in 2013, Pope Francis was asked about a particular priest, Monsignor Battista Ricca. He had been accused, but not convicted, of homosexual encounters. The pope said in reply, "If someone is gay and he searches for the Lord and has good will, who am I to judge him?'"

It should be clear that the pope was not talking about

homosexuality, which is behavior, but about someone's sexual orientation, which is a condition. Conduct and status are not identical: being a homosexual and practicing homosexuality are two different things.

Had O'Donnell not left off the last word of the pope's remark, namely "him," it would be obvious that he thought it inappropriate to judge a person because he is straight or gay. He was not endorsing sodomy.

She is not the first to misrepresent what the pope said in this interview, but given the high profile that CBS is giving it, it is startling to see how sloppy the reporting is. That's assuming it was a mistake.

Contact Christa Robinson, executive vice president, communications: RobinsonC@cbsnews.com

PEARL JAM SINGER UNLOADS ON BUTKER

[Bill Donohue](#)

When Kamala Harris recently dropped the *F-bomb*, in her sitting capacity as vice president of the United States, her descent to the gutter was noticed by millions. But when low-class rockers call Harrison Butker a "f**king p****y," it is par for the course. Butker has been condemned by anti-Catholic bigots for giving a Catholic speech at a Catholic college. The latest to chime in is Eddie Vedder.

Who is Eddie Vedder? Never heard of him. But I have heard of Pearl Jam, and he is their lead singer. Not knowing anything

about him, I wondered if he was a pro-abortion, pro-transgender, former or current alcoholic and/or drug user, who is filthy rich. That was the extent of my internet search. Guess what? I was right about everything.

Vedder's love for abortion is so strong that in 1992 he scrawled "PRO-CHOICE!!!" in bold letters on his bare left arm during a performance on "MTV Unplugged." In 2020, he confessed to the *New York Times*, "my thinking about abortion germinated from personal experience." We can only guess what that means, and quite frankly it's best we don't know. We do know that while he doesn't value innocent human life, he does value the rainforest; he is a generous donor to its preservation.

When North Carolina and Tennessee objected to allowing boys to compete with girls in sports, and shower together, Vedder went ballistic. Nice to know what angers him.

According to one music source, "Pearl Jam members were known to drop acid or smoke pot." Vedder was also known for his heavy drinking and chain smoking.

Vedder bought a home for \$34 million. That was a generation ago, in 1990. Today his net worth exceeds \$100 million. No doubt he hates white privilege.

This is just the kind of guy we would expect to attack Butker.

Oh, yes, he proudly exclaims that people like him are "more tolerant, they're more understanding [and] more emphatic of others." Excluding, of course, the unborn, women, girls, and Catholics.

Why is it that it is always the tolerant ones who are the biggest Stalinists?

Contact Pearl Jam's publicist, Sarah Seiler:
Sarah@PearlJam.com

WE ARE CLUELESS IN COMBATING SUICIDE

[Bill Donohue](#)

The latest data show that a record number of Americans are committing suicide. Almost 50,000 killed themselves in 2022, up by 2.6 percent from the year before. We have a mental health crisis on our hands, but we are failing to address it properly.

A third of students have considered quitting in the last six months, citing mental health concerns. Among college students, two-thirds of bachelor's degree students who have considered pausing their studies mention personal mental health reasons, such as emotional stress.

So what are colleges doing about it? What is the government doing about it? We know what to do but we refuse to do it.

We have known for a long time that those who take their religion seriously are the least likely to suffer a mental health crisis. Conversely, the more secular the person is, the more likely he is to have such a problem. But given the prevailing anti-religious climate on campuses, and the proverbial government aversion to religion, those who are suffering are being ill-advised. If they are lucky, they're told to get a therapy dog.

Harvard School of Public Health reported in 2020 that women who attend weekly religious services are 68 percent less likely to die "deaths of despair"—suicide, drug overdose and alcohol poisoning—than others; men are 33 percent less likely.

As I reported in my 2015 book, [*The Catholic Advantage: Why Health, Happiness and Heaven Await the Faithful*](#), those who regularly practice their religion are much more likely to be healthy, physically and psychologically, than secularists. They are also more likely to be happy. Importantly, given that they are more likely to exhibit altruistic tendencies, chances are they have a leg up getting into heaven.

Unfortunately, the number of Americans who identify with a religion is lower now than ever before. Approximately 30 percent answer “none” when asked what their religious affiliation is (they are the so-called nones). This alone explains why millions of these people continue to suffer mental health problems, having nowhere to turn (save for Fido) for relief.

Worse, when they seek relief, the therapists are not likely to encourage them to rethink their religious status. For example, the least religious of all professors are psychologists: 50 percent report being an atheist and 11 percent identify as agnostic. In short, they are more likely to be a liability than an asset.

No organization that deals with suicide is more clueless in dealing with it than the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). In its section on “Risk and Protective Factors,” it lists all kind of things—from chronic pain to criminal problems—but not a word about eschewing religion. Similarly, it addresses ways to protect against suicide risk, but never lists religion as a resource.

In the section “Prevention Strategies” it mentions “Provide for therapeutic approaches,” but has not a word to say about anything resembling a religious-based program.

Not only is the CDC afraid to mention how religiosity (religious beliefs and practices) affects our mental health, much of its advice is politically skewed.

The CDC reports that the largest increase in suicide, 8.1 percent, was among those 65 or over. Also, men are 50 percent of the population but makeup nearly 80 percent of suicides: their rate is four times higher than the rate among females. Men who are 75 and over have the highest suicide rate of any age group in the country. Moreover, non-Hispanic white men have the highest suicide rate compared to other racial and ethnic groups.

Hardly a day goes by without some news story reporting that “people of color” and women have higher rates of illness from one condition or another than white men—and we must act now to help them!—but when white men are committing suicide at a higher rate than anyone else, no one is there to plead their case. This is a national disgrace.

The kinds of jobs men have explains it all. Those who work in mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extraction have the highest suicide rate, followed by those who work in construction, other services (e.g., automotive repair), agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting, transportation and warehousing.

How can it be, then, that the CDC attributes suicide and suicidal behavior to such problems as racism and discrimination? Their own data show that white men have the highest suicide rate. In fact, the only ones witnessing a *decrease* in suicide are American Indian/Alaska Native people.

This is so typical of the liberal establishment—they see racism everywhere, even in instances that are contradicted by the data. Evidence doesn’t matter—politics does.

If we were serious about suicide we wouldn’t treat religion as if it were a problem. It’s an elixir.

It needs to be said, however, that we shouldn’t recommend a relationship with God for purely health reasons. If religion isn’t taken seriously, it belittles its meaning. Religion should not be used simply as a tonic, but we should also not

shy away from touting its many benefits.