

ASSISTED SUICIDE DATA ARE DISTURBING

[Nicholas Palczewski](#)

Support for doctor-assisted suicide is losing ground. Identical studies done in 2016 and 2025 by the Lifeway Research found that in 2016, 67% of Americans agreed with it, but in 2025, only 51% of Americans agreed. Nonetheless, as this report indicates, it remains a serious problem.

See our website, under special reports, for an extended version of this [report](#).

California

Origin

The End of Life Option Act began in 2016.

Victims

According to the Dept. of Public Health, between 2016 and 2024 a total of 8,242 people received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. Of this, 5,423 people ended their lives by ingesting the drug.

Colorado

Origin

In 2016, two-thirds of Colorado voters approved Proposition 106 which allowed for the legalization of Medical Aid in Dying.

Victims

According to the Dept. of Public Health and the Environment, between 2017 and 2024, 1,995 people received life-ending

drugs.

District of Columbia

Origin

The Death with Dignity Act of 2016 took effect in 2017.

Victims

According to the Dept. of Health, between 2019 and 2022 a total of 31 patients received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. Of this, 23 ended their lives by ingesting the drug.

Hawaii

Origin

Our Choice Act began in 2019.

Victims

According to the Dept. of Health, between 2019 and 2024 a total of 361 patients received prescriptions for life-ending drugs, ending the lives of 195.

Maine

Origin

The Death With Dignity Act became law in 2019.

Victims

Between 2019 to 2024, a total of 318 patients received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. It ended the lives of 218 people.

Montana

Origin

In 2009, the Supreme Court ruled that the state constitution

does not prohibit medical aid in dying. It also ruled that physicians who act on a patient's wishes to end their own life cannot be criminally penalized. While the ruling allowed for the practice, the state legislature has not passed a law that officially legalizes it.

Victims

No official statistics are available.

New Jersey

Origin

The Medical Aid in Dying Act began in 2019.

Victims

According to the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner, between 2019 and 2024 a total of 409 patients received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. Of this, 362 ended their lives by ingesting the drug.

New Mexico

Origin

The End of Life Option Act took effect in 2021.

Victims

The Dept. of Health does not keep annual statistics on the number of people who have died from assisted suicide. Therefore it is unknown how many have used the practice to end their lives.

Oregon

Origin

The Death With Dignity Act was initially approved by Oregon voters in 1994, but an injunction was issued. It was lifted in

1997, allowing the law to take effect.

Victims

According to the Health Authority, from 1998 to 2024, a total of 4,881 people received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. Of this, 3,243 patients died by ingesting the drug.

Vermont

Origin

In 2013, the Patient Choice and Control at the End of Life Act was passed.

Victims

According to the Dept. of Health, between 2013 and 2023 a total of 200 patients received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. Of this, 146 ended their lives.

Washington

Origin

The Death with Dignity Act became law in 2009.

Victims

According to the State Dept. of Health, between 2009 and 2023 a total of 3,683 people received prescriptions for life-ending drugs. Of this, 2,768 people ended their lives.

Sometimes it takes a personal experience before we change. Take the case of Montana State Rep. Greg Overstreet, who initially was a supporter of doctor-assisted suicide. When he was suffering from COVID and on a ventilator, doctors told him he had a slim chance of survival. He asked doctors to pull his ventilator after seven days, but extended it to two weeks after pleas from his wife. He soon made a miraculous recovery a week later. He noted that if it were not for his wife

pleading him to extend the “do not resuscitate” order, he would not have survived. His experience led him to support the prohibition of the law.

It is striking to note that the six states with the worst record are also among the least religious in the nation. A recent Pew study of the 50 states and the District of Columbia listed California and Colorado tied for 39th, Hawaii was 43rd, Oregon was 40th, Vermont was 51st and Washington 37th.

Radical autonomy has become a secular God. Its consequences are deadly.

RELIGIOUS-SECULAR DIVIDE IS DRAMATIC

[Bill Donohue](#)

The divide between Americans who are religious and who are secular (religiously unaffiliated) is dramatic: it is evident in all aspects of the culture. That is one conclusion that can easily be drawn by the data provided by the Pew Research Center’s *2023-24 Religious Landscape Study*. This is the third such national study, the earlier ones being in 2014 and 2007.

Demographic Profile

Christians comprise 62% of the population; 40% Protestant, 19% Catholic and 3% other Christians. Another 7% belong to a religion other than Christianity, and 29% are religiously unaffiliated.

While the share of those who are Christian has declined since 2014, it has slowed and may even have leveled off.

Among the 7% who belong to a non-Christian religion, approximately 2% are Jewish and 1% each are Muslim, Buddhist or Hindu.

Among the religiously unaffiliated, 5% are atheist, 6% are agnostic and 19% identify as “nothing in particular.”

Here are some of the findings that detail the secular-religious divide.

Political Ideology

Consistent with other surveys, this study found that “The most highly religious Americans are also the most Republican, conservative.” Conversely, secularists are overwhelmingly Democrats.

When it comes to Americans who identify as conservative, moderate and liberal, overall 33% are conservative, 38% are moderate and 24% are liberal. The only groups with a majority who identify as liberal are atheists (67%) and agnostics (57%). As we shall see, this has significant consequences.

Science and Religion

Is there a conflict between science and religion, as is often portrayed by the media and those in education? Religious Americans do not see it that way—it is those without a religious affiliation who believe there is. “Among Americans with low levels of religious engagement, 73% say science and religion are mostly in conflict, roughly twice the share of highly religious Americans who take the same position (35%).”

While the authors of this study do not say why, from a Catholic perspective there is no inherent tension between believing what God has created and a scientific understanding of the universe. Indeed, it was Catholic scientists during the Scientific Revolution who sought to appreciate the scientific basis of God’s creation.

But for atheists and agnostics, who discount the existence of God, all they have to fall back on is science, which they believe has nothing in common with God's creation of the universe. This belief is central to their dogma.

Government and Helping the Poor

Do secularists care more about the poor than religious Americans? Many of those in the chattering class, who tend to be secularists, believe this is the case. They point to reports like this Pew study as proof.

It is true that this study shows that "Highly religious Americans are less likely to say the government should give more help to people in need." It is also true that "Two-thirds of U.S. adults with low levels of religious engagement favor a bigger government that provides more services." In fact, "72% of atheists say the government should provide more assistance to those in need."

Not so fast. As I pointed out in my book, [*The Catholic Advantage: How Happiness, Health and Heaven Await the Faithful*](#), the social science evidence is clear: religious Americans are the most charitable and altruistic; secularists are the least generous and the least altruistic.

The reason why secularists score so poorly on these variables has much to do with their belief that government—not private individuals or religious organizations—should provide for the poor. So of course they *appear* to be more concerned about the poor when they say government should do more to help them. They are the least likely to write a check or volunteer their services.

Morality

On moral issues, the religious-secular divide is astounding.

Is it better for one parent to stay at home to focus on the

family? Most Americans (55%) say it is, and the more religious someone is the more likely he is to agree. The only ones who disagree are those who score “low” on this variable. So telling.

Should homosexuality, transgender people and abortion be accepted by society? Christians are the most likely to disagree. It is secularists who are the most accepting. This speaks to the premium which secularists put on individual autonomy, in contrast to the premium which religious Americans put on traditional moral values.

The more religious someone is, the more likely he is to say there are “clear and absolute standards for what is right and wrong.” Secularists are naturally moral relativists: to admit there are clear moral standards is to beg the question—according to whom? By definition, they cannot answer, “God.”

Religious Americans are the most likely to believe that public school teachers should lead their classes in nonsectarian prayers; secularists, of course, disagree. Secularists also oppose religious displays on public property. It’s too bad respondents weren’t asked if they opposed them on private property.

A strong majority of Americans believe that churches and religious organizations enhance community bonds, help the poor and strengthen morality in society. That says a great deal.

We are a divided country, and much of it is reflected, if not caused, by the religious-secular divide.

WHAT'S BEHIND THE QUEER AND TRANS FAD?

[Bill Donohue](#)

“Is the Trans and Non-Binary Fad Over?” That is the title of a recent [article](#) I wrote on the work of Eric Kaufmann, a professor at the University of Buckingham. After scouring the findings of several studies, he concluded that the trans and queer phenomenon is in serious decline. He made it clear, as others have before him, that young people who identify as trans and queer have multiple mental health issues.

So what's up? To put it bluntly, why are these people so screwed up?

Kaufmann is reluctant to identify the independent and dependent variable, or the cause and effect. To his credit, he sheds light on this by examining the political beliefs of these young people. What he found is critical.

He is convinced that “there are significant correlations between gender, sexuality, political beliefs and mental health. In particular, trans or non-binary individuals, as well as very liberal students, are much more likely than others to be non-heterosexual. Very liberal, trans and non-heterosexual students are also more likely than other students to be anxious and depressed...”

Kaufmann's conclusion is consistent with what he found in his 2022 report, “Born This Way? The Rise of LGBT as a Social and Political Identity.” Here are some of his most notable findings.

- Much of the LGBT rise has occurred among very liberal or far left-wing young people, and this is especially true of women

- Very liberal ideology and LGBT identification are associated with mental health problems such as depression (their happiness quotient is near zero)
- Students who major in the social sciences and humanities are especially prone to being LGBT, and the majority (52 percent) who major in race and gender studies identify as LGBT
- Non-religious students are more likely than religious students to identify as LGBT

It seems plain that ideology plays a significant role in accounting for the maladies of LGBT people. Those who major in the social sciences and humanities have long been drawn to left-wing ideologies, and those who specialize in race and gender studies are even more likely to be highly critical of the status quo. Radical ideas excite these students.

So as not to be misunderstood, most liberals do not seek to “transition” to the opposite sex, but a disproportionate number do. That still needs explaining.

To be precise, liberalism today is a far cry from the way it was understood in the nineteenth century. At that time, liberalism put a premium on free speech, especially political discourse. No more. In fact, today’s liberals have more in common with yesterday’s radicals than they do with JFK liberals.

In both Kaufmann’s 2022 and 2025 reports, he draws on the work of the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) to make his point. As consecutive FIRE studies have found, today’s college students who identify as liberal are the *most likely* to believe it is acceptable to shout down speakers they find disagreeable.

For instance, in his 2022 report, Kaufmann found that “White female students in leading US universities who identify as very liberal and support shouting down speakers to prevent

them from uttering harmful speech have a nearly 7 in 10 chance of identifying as LGBT.” This finding is startling. There is something deranged going on.

The causal sequence now makes sense.

Today’s “liberal” students do not believe in free speech, making them the most illiberal students on campus. As we learned, most are not religious, and many are militant in their secular convictions. Illiberal and secular, these students naturally evince an animus against traditional morality, and that certainly means Christian sexual ethics. For some, this manifests itself in a rebellion against nature and a desire to transcend it.

From a Catholic perspective, what the data show is entirely understandable. It is not easy to be happy if one is preoccupied with railing against one’s own biological condition. That’s not normal. Nature, and nature’s God, can never be beaten, and attempts do so not only fail, they leave behind a trail of despair.

Regrettably, those who teach gender studies, and who counsel young people seeking to “transition,” are the last ones to tell their students and clients the truth. They are doing them a great disservice. But then again many of these professors and therapists are themselves miserably unhappy, and often unstable, making this a very sick stew in the end.

CUOMO IS NOT OUT OF IT

[Bill Donohue](#)

Listening to the experts, the New York City mayoral race is

over: Zohran Mamdani is so far ahead in the polls that he is a shoo-in. Not so fast. To be sure, a lot of things have to break just right for Andrew Cuomo to pull an upset, but that is not an impossibility.

Mamdani won the Democratic primary for several reasons. Voters were turned off by the nepotism and appearance of scandal in the administration of Mayor Eric Adams. As governor, Cuomo badly damaged his reputation with his Covid policies and multiple accusations of sexual improprieties. That opened the door to a young and energetic candidate in Mamdani who was able to mobilize some 50,000 young volunteers. But there were other factors at play, too.

The day before the June primary, the weather was predicted to be 102 degrees (it turned out to be 99). "NY Primary Falling on Hottest Day of Heat Wave Could be Bad for Cuomo," was the headline in the *New York Post*. The conclusion was warranted: older voters are much more affected by bad weather patterns than young people. By contrast, the weather over the weekend, during the first days of early voting, was great, and it should be mostly fine through election day. So that pro-Mamdani factor is off the table.

Primary voters are typically the most energetic, if not extreme, of all voters, so that favored Mamdani. The primary turnout was relatively good, but in the end only 29.9 percent of registered voters participated. That is a fraction of what we are looking at now. And this time, older voters—who vote at a higher rate than any age demographic—have no reason not to vote.

On the eve of the early voting, one poll scored it 43 percent for Mamdani, 32 percent for Cuomo and 19 percent for Curtis Sliwa. Another had it 40 percent for Mamdani, 32 percent for Cuomo and 25 percent for Sliwa. But the numbers for Sliwa are not likely to hold.

It is well known among psephologists (those who study elections) that social desirability bias is often a factor. This happens when voters are uncomfortable stating their real preference, especially if their choice is seen as controversial. It is not fashionable, in most circles, to brag how great Cuomo is, but that doesn't mean that some who feel that way won't vote for him anyway. They will.

There is also the situation where a voter knows his number-one choice doesn't stand a chance of winning, so he votes for the candidate who is closest to his positions and has a shot at winning. Indeed, a Gallup poll taken this year shows that a majority of Americans (54 percent) who favor a third-party candidate would switch their vote to a major party candidate if they thought that candidate could win.

While it is true that Sliwa is not a third-party candidate, as a Republican in New York City, he may as well be. More to the point, he is not likely to get 19 percent of the vote—many who like him will vote for Cuomo, just to stop Mamdani. That helps Cuomo. Moreover, in the primary, Cuomo won the lower income voter, and with the endorsement of Adams, he is likely to do well with blacks and Hispanics.

The Patriot Polling survey reveals that Cuomo is crushing Mamdani among American-born voters, but Mamdani is crushing Cuomo among foreign-born voters. That favors Cuomo. Foreign-born U.S. citizens are less likely to be registered voters, though that is less true of Asian voters, who favor Mamdani.

Thirty percent of New Yorkers are Catholic and only 29 percent say they are voting for Mamdani; 41 percent are voting for Cuomo. Jews are 16 percent of New Yorkers, and only 30 percent are voting for Mamdani; 63 percent are voting for Cuomo. Orthodox Jews are solidly in the Cuomo camp, and they are 20 percent of the Jewish population.

Historically, in the United States, as well as in Europe, low

voter turnout does not mean apathy; rather, it means that voters are relatively content, so it does not matter a great deal who wins. High voter turnout is a sign that citizens are worried (usually in times of turmoil), and that is why they turn out in droves.

“NYC Early Voting Surges Over Weekend with Numbers 5 Times larger than 2021.” That was how the *New York Post* put it. This bodes well for Cuomo—many New Yorkers, especially Jews, are worried about a Mamdani victory.

More good news for Cuomo: the turnout over the weekend was particularly strong in Manhattan, which nearly equaled the turnout in Brooklyn. This is striking. There are over 1.1 million more residents in Brooklyn than in Manhattan, yet almost as many Manhattan voters turned out as Brooklyn voters! Moreover, Jews make up 21 percent of all Manhattan residents, so the high turnout suggests they voted in big numbers. That favors Cuomo.

The Jewish vote alone cannot push Cuomo over the line. It must be accompanied by voters who prefer Sliwa, but, knowing he can't win, will hold their nose and vote for Cuomo.

As I said, a lot of things have to break the right way for Cuomo to upset Mamdani, but it could happen. We'll soon find out.

IS THE TRANS AND NON-BINARY FAD OVER?

[Bill Donohue](#)

There has been a sharp decline in the proportion of young people who identify as transgender and non-binary. That is the central conclusion of a new report, "The Decline of Trans and Queer Identity Among Young Americans," written by Eric Kaufmann, a professor of politics at the University of Buckingham. He examined several large studies, private and public, drawing conclusions from each; he ends by offering a composite picture, based on the data from these sources.

It would be an exaggeration to say that this cultural phenomenon has totally run its course—too many elites have invested themselves, either ideologically or financially, for that to happen—but it does appear that this destructive fad is in remission. Here are some of the seminal findings, taken from Kaufmann's report.

- After surging in the 2010s and 20s, trans and queer identities are in decline among young Americans
- The transgender share among university students peaked in 2023 and has almost halved since, from nearly 7 percent to under 4 percent
- The share of students identifying as not heterosexual fell around 10 points in the same period
- The decline in non-heterosexual share is concentrated in the queer and other sexual categories (i.e. pansexual, asexual) and, to a lesser extent, bisexuality

Among Ivy League students, in 2023, 7 percent said they were neither male nor female, but in 2025 that figured dropped to 3 percent. Among the college-prep students at Andover Phillips Academy in Massachusetts, the biggest drop was recorded by bisexual students: after increasing from 10 to 17 percent between 2020 and 2023, it fell back to 12 percent in 2025. Nationwide, 95 percent of young people identified as heterosexual in 2010, but in 2022 the figure was 71 percent; today it is back to 81 percent.

"It appears that trans and queer are going out of fashion

among young people,” Kaufmann writes, “especially in elite settings.” That’s good news, especially from a mental health perspective. “In survey data,” he says, “LGBT young people report consistently worse mental health than heterosexual young people.” To wit: Trans and queer young people are considerably more likely to be depressed.

Kaufmann looks at some of the reasons why fewer young people are attracted to the trans and queer movement, but is not persuaded by any of them. There is one factor he didn’t mention but is worth considering.

The pro-trans movement in the United States and Europe was very strong in the 2010s, but there was relatively little pushback until the 20s; it has picked up quite a bit in the past few years. The medical community in Europe, and to a lesser extent in the United States, has reconsidered its earlier advocacy of gender-affirming practices. For example, there is growing evidence that puberty blockers, chemical castration and sex-reassignment surgery is deleterious to the psychological and physical wellbeing of young people.

This has spawned a growth in the number of detransitioners, mostly young women who want to recapture their nature-ordained sex. The number of public testimonials, describing in vivid detail what they have endured, has certainly convinced many of their friends to tap the brakes. To be exact, we know that the majority of those who don’t act impulsively on their itch to “transition” refrain from doing so in a relatively short period of time.

If this analysis is correct, we should expect that the trans and queer phenomenon not to return to its peak level. We have reached a tipping point, and that is good news for everyone, save those who make a living off of exploiting disturbed young people.

Europe's War on Christians and Free Speech

[Michael P. McDonald](#)

Europe, once the cradle of Christendom, has devolved into a pale imitation of itself. The last vestiges of this civilization today endure a prolonged assault that seeks to destroy it once and for all. Undoubtedly, the architects of this cataclysm are secular-globalists. Through unfettered immigration, undermining traditional morality, and censorial practices, these secular-globalists are leading Europe's war on Christians and free speech.

As we have previously noted, [France](#), the "eldest daughter of the Church," has undergone a massive demographic shift in the last half century. Today, it is estimated that over six million Muslims live in France, roughly ten percent of the population. This has led to conflict between the native-born French population and the Muslim immigrants. For instance, in 2023 the Observatory of Intolerance and Discrimination Against Christians in Europe issued its most recent report noting that there were approximately 1,000 hate crimes against Christians. There were eight confirmed cases of criminal arson attacks, and 84 Christians were victims of attacks against their persons.

Other European nations have experienced similar demographic changes, which has likewise led to increased attacks on Christians. In the United Kingdom, police detained a Jewish lawyer for 10 hours after he wore a [Star of David](#) necklace which they claimed antagonized Muslim protesters. In September of 2024, a Muslim woman entered a church in London screaming

“Allahu Akbar” and that she had come [“to kill the God of the Jews.”](#) After the incident, the Muslim community accused the pastor of making up the event and “inciting hatred.” Earlier that same year, an Essex Christian fellowship center was vandalized with graffiti reading [“This is a Muslim area.”](#)

In Germany, the situation is dire. Five men affiliated with the Jihadist organization Islamic State were arrested for [plotting to bomb Cologne’s Catholic Cathedral](#) in December of 2023. German police uncovered an Islamic State cell operating in Dusseldorf planning to attack [“Christians \(‘unbelievers’\) in churches”](#) in February of 2024. In August of that year, a 26-year-old Syrian killed three people and wounded eight in a [knife attack in Soligen](#). Islamic State would claim responsibility for the attack “directed against Christians.”

Spain, too, has seen an increase in Islamist attacks. In January of 2023, an Islamist screamed out “Allahu Akbar” and [“Death to Christians”](#) while attacking churches in Algercias killing one person and leaving four more wounded. Just before last Christmas, Spanish authorities arrested four Islamists [plotting to attack the Basilica of Santa Maria in Elche](#). The following month, two Islamist bomb threats were made against [churches in Slamist](#).

In addition to importing an entirely new population, the secular-globalists also seek to undermine traditional morality. For instance, in May of 2024, Germany [decriminalized child porn](#). This is not the sign of a thriving society; there can be no more demonstrative sign of decadence and decline. These are the type of policies, first pioneered by intellectuals in France under the spirit of [“It is forbidden to forbid,”](#) that the secular-globalists seek to usher in across Europe.

While it would be bad enough to support laws that victimize children, it reaches an even more depraved level when nihilistic shock troops intimidate Catholics and other people

of faith for going against the secular-globalist agenda. In 2023, Catholics on their way to Mass in Barcelona, Spain, were [harassed by rabid pro-abortion fanatics](#) while vandalizing the church. In 2024, left-wing extremists claimed responsibility for an [arson attack](#) on a Christian center in Bremen, Germany. Likewise, the Café Stay, a Christian ministry in Leipzig, was [targeted 15 times](#) by left-wing radicals between July 2024 and March 2025. The radicals' message could not be clearer: either get on board with these new "progressive" values or the goons will attack.

Should anyone notice the radical upending of society as a result of mass immigration or the assault on morality, the secular-globalists are fully prepared to unleash a regimen of censorship to silence any opposition to their endeavors.

Perhaps the clearest sign of this is in the United Kingdom where the government is waging war on Christians for [silently praying outside of abortion clinics](#). After creating a nearly-500-foot "buffer zone" that criminalizes anything that could be critical of abortion outside of these so-called "healthcare" facilities, authorities have hauled off to jail numerous people. And who are these dangerous criminals that even their silent prayers are threatening? One was a [76-year-old Liverpudlian grandmother](#); another was a [74-year-old Scottish grandmother](#). Joining the ranks of these "hardened criminals" was a [Catholic priest](#) and a [British army veteran](#).

Meanwhile in [Germany](#), the authorities have so aggressively pursued people expressing opinions the secular-globalists disagree with only [18 percent](#) of Germans feel free to express themselves in public.

But perhaps the gravest threat to freedom of speech comes from the European Union's [Digital Services Act](#). Not only does this law curtail the rights of Europeans, but unelected bureaucrats in Brussels seek to regulate how American social media platforms implement free speech threatening to bring their

censorial regimen to the rest of the world.

The secular-globalists have waged a destructive war on Europe. As a result of unfettered immigration, undermining traditional morality, and oppressive censorial practices, Europe's Christian heritage and free speech tradition is fading. Unfortunately, if action is not taken soon to reverse the carnage wrought by these elites this civilization will disappear from the face of the earth.

WE STAND WITH JEWS AGAINST MAMDANI

[Bill Donohue](#)

The Jewish Majority, an organization that seeks to offer an accurate rendering of Jewish priorities, has elicited the support of more than 900 rabbis across the country stating their opposition to New York City mayoral hopeful Zohran Mamdani. They cite his record of virulent anti-Semitism as their principal objection.

“When public figures like New York mayoral candidate Zohran Mamdani refuse to condemn violent slogans, deny Israel's legitimacy, and accuse the Jewish state of genocide, they, in the words of New York Board of Rabbis president Rabbi Ammiel Hirsch, ‘Delegitimize the Jewish community and encourage and exacerbate hostility toward Judaism and Jews.’”

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, the nation's oldest and largest Catholic civil rights organization, supports this statement, which is why I signed the letter (those who are not Jewish are invited to sign).

Catholics who would like to sign, click [here](#).

We have been a vocal opponent of Mamdani for months.

On August 20, I released an 18-page [report](#) titled, “The Inauthenticity of Zohran Mamdani.” It spells out in great detail why he is a menace to New York City, and to Jews, in particular. On September 30, I released another [statement](#), “Mamdani’s Communist Roots.” This was followed by another [post](#), “Does Mamdani Hate Minorities?”

Mamdani not only wants to be the Mayor of New York City, he wants to be the new face of the Democratic Party nationwide. This should matter to everyone, regardless of their political affiliation. The man’s policies are divisive, inane and downright dangerous.

AMERICANS MORE POSITIVE ABOUT RELIGION

[Bill Donohue](#)

A new Pew Research Center survey on the role of religion in American society is good news for believers, but not for non-believers. From the perspective of the Catholic League, which does battle with the foes of religion, especially Catholic bashers, this is great news.

Is religion growing in influence or declining? In February 2024, Pew found that 18 percent of Americans believed religion was gaining influence; this was the lowest level seen in decades. But a year later, in February 2025, the figure jumped to 31 percent, the highest in 15 years. What is also striking

about the latest finding is that this is true across a wide spectrum of adults.

More good news: 6 in 10 (59 percent) of respondents said it was a positive sign that religion is increasing its influence in society. Not surprisingly, atheists and agnostics are the outliers: most of them take a decidedly negative view. But that does not hold true for the religiously unaffiliated, and it is certainly not true of religious Americans.

Democrats, who are largely secularists, differ greatly from Republicans, who are largely religious; the latter are much more positive in their appraisal.

Respondents were asked if (a) they believed one religion is true (b) many religions are true, or (c) there is little or no truth in any religion. Nearly half (48 percent) said many religions may be true; 26 percent said only one is true (white evangelical Protestants were the most likely to answer this way); 18 percent said there is little truth in any religion; only 6 percent were confident there is no truth in any religion.

Consistent with what was found in asking whether it is a good thing or a bad thing that religion is gaining influence in society, there was a marked divide between the religiously unaffiliated, atheists and agnostics. The religiously unaffiliated were split on the issue of whether many religions are true (38 percent said yes, and 37 percent saying there is little truth in any religion), but among atheists only 12 percent believed that many religions are true. Interestingly, on this measure, agnostics were nearly identical to the religiously unaffiliated.

It is acknowledged by virtually everyone that there is a noticeable gap between religious beliefs and the mainstream culture; 58 percent, overall, believe there is a great deal or some conflict. This is up 16 points from 2020. The Pew

researchers do not take a normative position on this issue, but the data cry out for an analysis.

From the perspective of most Americans, who believe that it is a positive sign that religion is gaining influence in society, it is a good sign that most recognize there is a serious gap between religious beliefs and the norms and values of the dominant culture, which are decidedly secular in nature. If they weren't bothered by the gap, it would suggest that the mainstream culture is not problematic. But that is not the case. More important, it suggests that the way to close the gap is for religion's impact to *grow*, not recede.

Another issue which the Pew researchers do not address, but their data shed light on, is the existence, or non-existence, of "Christian nationalism." It has become *de rigueur* in left-wing religious circles to set off alarms over this supposed threat to democracy. In reality, aside from a few extremists, most of what the critics of this invented boogeyman are upset about (see our website for more on this issue) is nothing more than Christians who are very proud to be an American.

If "Christian nationalism" were an existential threat, it should be apparent in the responses to the Pew survey question (asked of Christian respondents) about "loving your country." Is it essential to being a Christian to "love your country"? In fact, it ranks near the bottom—only 29 percent believe this to be true. What is essential to being Christian, they said, are things like, "Being honest," "Treating people with kindness" and "believing in God" (they merited a percentage score of 86, 85, and 85, respectively).

The Founders understood, as have the most preeminent students of democracy, that religion (as de Tocqueville said) "is the cradle of democracy." This Pew survey provides evidence that this verity is not lost on most Americans, and that is very good news.

DEMONIZING CHRISTIAN CRITICS OF THE LGBTQ AGENDA

[Bill Donohue](#)

It is not enough these days for hard-core ideologues to disagree with their critics. They go for the jugular. The politics of personal destruction has never been so prevalent and so vicious.

This is certainly the case with radical LGBTQ activists and supporters. The way they treat Christian critics is particularly deplorable—they are bent on demonizing them.

Jack Phillips is well known as the Christian baker who would not personalize a wedding cake for two gay men who were celebrating their “marriage” (he never denied serving homosexuals from buying anything). On a radical LGBTQ website, them.us, his lawyers at Alliance Defending Freedom were dubbed a “hate group,” no doubt influenced by the Southern Poverty Law Center’s characterization of them. But the real haters are those who slandered these courageous lawyers.

Christians across the nation are protesting males from competing with females in sports, essentially destroying women’s athletics. As a result, the Human Rights Campaign, a gay titan, declared “a state of emergency for LGBTQ+ Americans for the first time in history.” By setting off false alarms, it makes them look like the zealots they are.

The big bogeyman for these radicals are so-called Christian Nationalists, otherwise known as Christian patriots. Leading the charge is Amanda Tyler, who leads a campaign against these nefarious creatures for the Baptist Joint Committee for

Religious Liberty. I wrote a two-part series on her work (“Myth of Christian Nationalist Violence”) that is available on the Catholic League website. More false alarms—her “evidence” of a Christian Nationalist threat is risible.

Zoey Zephyr is a trans Montana representative who says Christian Nationalists are trying “to put down roots in our part of the state.” As a result, “We’re going to throw away democracy.”

The website at lgbtqnation.com warns that “far-right white Christian cultural soldiers have raided and assaulted public education with their so-called ‘anti-woke’ and ‘anti-DEI’ crusade.” These trans-happy activists are angry with Christian parents who don’t want to sexualize their children with school material that is not age appropriate.

Rev. Pat Robertson was a highly influential Christian televangelist. When he died, “The Advocate,” a prominent gay publication, was not satisfied to say they sharply disagreed with him. No, they said he was “a truly evil man.” When Dr. James Dobson, a well respected Christian psychologist, died, the same people blamed him for promoting conversion therapy. They said he was encouraging “psychological torture,” adding that his goal was to kill these homosexuals.

Opus Dei is a Catholic organization that attracts many who want to deepen their spirituality. But to radical LGBTQ activists, it is a “far-right” menace and a “reactionary” group. For proof, the activists cite a book on the group by Gareth Gore. I reviewed this book (see “Why the Need to Bash Opus Dei?” on our website) and found it to be one of the most intellectually sloppy volumes I have read in a long time. It is replete with factual errors.

Earlier this year, President Trump established a Commission on Religious Liberty; the Catholic League has been working with them for months. Its goal is to combat anti-Christian bigotry,

but to the gay-trans crowd, this is a “chilling mission.” Evidently, it is not a “chilling mission” to eradicate other expressions of bigotry, just those that are anti-Christian in nature. Other opponents say this effort is really designed to create “Christian hegemony, resulting in Christian privilege.” Still others say its goal is “Christian nationalism.”

When the IRS dropped its prohibitions on the clergy from addressing political issues, “The Advocate” said this “takes the devil’s bargain to a new and dangerous level. It’s akin to something like doing away with all gun restrictions.” The author said, “I worry most about the Catholic Church,” citing concerns about its pro-life work.

When the Congress was about to pass Trump’s “big beautiful bill,” House Speaker Mike Johnson was seen praying before the vote. This sent a gay-trans activist into orbit. He said a photo of this “infuriated me.” Imagine that. A Christian politician prays in public and that is enough to drive some people over the edge.

Dr. Warren J. Blumenfeld is one of the more prolific Christian-bashing gay writers in the country. He says the very concept of God is used “to divide us by imposing a hierarchical positioning of people and groups into ‘us’ (the ‘ingroup’) versus ‘them’ (the ‘others,’ the marginalized, the heathens, the unbelievers, the ‘outgroup’).” Gotta give it to him—he has a very fertile imagination.

Another sage, Rodney Wilson, is convinced that “Jesus and St. Paul were asexual, and everybody in heaven is nonbinary.” He cites as evidence that St. Paul wrote, “in Christ we are neither male or female.” Hard to believe anyone really believes this, but apparently some do.

Demonizing Christians and disparaging God. That’s what radical LGBTQ activists are good at doing. Evidently, they cannot engage in a meaningful dialogue without resorting to invective

and smear tactics. Relying on bigotry to defend their agenda suggests they are incompetent, as well as unethical.

NORMALIZING TRANSGENDER ABNORMALITIES

[Bill Donohue](#)

The greatest child abuse scandal of our day is the exploitation of minors who want to “transition” to the opposite sex. Genital mutilation, chemical castration, hormonal manipulation—the very stuff of sex-reassignment surgery—are being promoted and carried out by adults who are in it for ideological or financial profit, or both. Seeking to normalize abnormal conditions is cruel and needs to end.

There are lots of parties to this problem, but no one is more responsible for seeking to normalize transgender abnormalities than the Biden administration. To pave the way for acceptance of abnormal sexual expressions, his minions decided to pan normal sexual expressions.

For example, the Department of Veteran Affairs initially banned the iconic photo of a World War II sailor kissing a nurse in Times Square; the couple were celebrating the end of the war with Japan in 1945. The Biden folks branded it “inappropriate behavior,” claiming it no longer fits the “values” of the VA.

The “values” that the Biden team embraced were not the values that most Americans wanted. To take one example, consider Biden’s choice for Assistant Secretary for Health.

Biden chose a man who falsely claimed to be a woman, Richard Levine. He went by the name Rachel, dressed like a woman, and looked like one too. But he could never change his XY chromosomes. So he lived a fictional existence, and the “Catholic” president was proud to promote it.

Policy wise, the Biden team reinterpreted “sex” discrimination in Title IX to include “gender identity.” This meant that it was okay for boys to compete against girls in sports and to use the same locker rooms and shower facilities. In a more sane time, this would be called misogynistic, but now it was being heralded by modern-day feminists.

Kamala Harris was so enthusiastic about this issue that she said illegal immigrants who were imprisoned, and wanted to “transition” to the opposite sex, should have their procedures funded by the American people. She said that in 2019. When asked in 2025 if she still held to that position, she said yes. In fact, she dedicated a whole chapter to this in her new book.

Everyone knows that only women can get pregnant, but to admit this is to ratify what nature has ordained. There’s the rub: the LGBTQ crowd is angry at nature, and at nature’s God, so they pretend that men can also get pregnant.

The 2024 Democratic Party Platform referred to pregnant women in prison as “pregnant inmates.” The legal and medical elite were already on board: the ACLU and the AMA both referred to “pregnant” people. The same logic led failed VP candidate and Minnesota Governor Tim Walz to put tampons in the boys’ bathrooms.

A Rasmussen survey found that 70 percent of Americans are concerned about school-age children being exposed to sexual material that is not age appropriate. But it is an uphill battle.

“LGBTQ+-inclusive” texts have been assigned to kindergarten

students in some schools. Another storybook for the little ones that is being used is about a transgender child who is shown in a sex-neutral or sex-ambiguous bathroom. She boasts, "My friends defend my choices and place." She makes it plain that she prefers to be referred to as "they/their/them." Gay marriage is not just discussed in these books—it is celebrated.

Why do homosexual men dressed as women—so-called drag queens—demand that they perform before children?

They went to court over this "right." Their performances include sexually explicit acts. They sued Tennessee after the state restricted drag performances when children were present (the Supreme Court declined to hear a challenge to the law). The drag queens said they were defending free speech, but what they were really defending was the right to engage in lewd acts in front of children. Why is this so important to them? This is one step away from pedophilia. It is not speech.

Harvard used to be a university where serious learning took place. No more. In the spring semester, a class will be offered on drag queens, and next fall there will be one on "Queer Ethnology." They will be taught by a visiting professor, LaWhore Vagistan, a drag queen star.

The Emmy Awards are given each year to the best TV programming. This year the show featured several drag queens who crashed the red carpet. It had nothing to do with the purpose of the event, but it did have much to do with the kind of moral destitution that Hollywood is known for. The goal was to normalize abnormal behavior.

Those promoting this sick agenda are among the most intolerant people in America. In a recent study of free speech on college campuses, it was revealed that discussions about transgender issues are not welcome; students are afraid to speak about them. That's because defending normalcy is considered taboo by

the guardians of higher education.

Normalizing transgender abnormalities is a dangerous and despicable enterprise. It leads to the sexual exploitation of children, ruining them physically and psychologically. Indeed, it is evil.