

# YAHOO HOMEPAGE FEATURES PORN

[Bill Donohue](#)

Most Americans would not approve of graphic sex advice being prominently featured on the homepage of a popular search engine. They would be more outraged if it were posted midday when after-school boys and girls could easily access it. But this is exactly what Yahoo did on January 30.

[Yahoo is mostly owned by Apollo Global Management, headquartered in Sunnyvale, California.]

The first post below the headline story on Yahoo read, "My Boyfriend Has a New Request for When I Go Down on Him. I Have Concerns." Below, in smaller print, it said, "I want to at least try."

Clicking on this post takes the reader to an advice column that originated on Slate. It is the kind of sex advice that one would expect from a hard-core sex website or magazine, not from a conventional search engine's homepage. That it was posted at 3:13 p.m. makes it totally irresponsible.

Because of the graphic nature of the advice column, we will not make it widely available. Suffice it to say that it is an explicit description of fellatio, with some novel, and quite sick, suggestions.

Members of the media, or adults who would like to read the column so as to better inform others, can email us at [pr@catholicleague.org](mailto:pr@catholicleague.org) and we will send it to you.

*Contact: Joanna Rose, Global Head of Corporate Communications, Apollo Global Management, Inc.: [Communications@apollo.com](mailto:Communications@apollo.com)*

---

# RELIGIOUS “NONES” ARE A SOCIAL LIABILITY

[Bill Donohue](#)

The recent Pew Research Center survey on religiously unaffiliated Americans (also known as “religious nones”) has been cited by a number of media outlets as proof that they are not a whole lot different than the rest of the country. This is pure spin. In fact, the data reveal just the opposite.

The survey was huge: in the summer of 2023, 11,201 respondents were questioned about their religious beliefs. It found that nearly 3-in-10 Americans (28%) have no religious affiliation. Of that group, 17% say they are atheists; 20% identify as agnostic; and 63% confess to being “nothing in particular.” When asked why they are not religious, two-thirds of them say they question a lot of religious teachings or don’t believe in God.

Who are they? The typical “religious none” is young, white, identifies as a liberal, and votes for the Democrats. This is consistent with past research. Not surprisingly, nearly half of atheists and agnostics are college graduates; their professors did a good job. So right off the bat, these people are not just like the rest of us.

As expected, the religiously unaffiliated do not believe in God as described in the Bible, but the majority (56%) believe in a higher power. Half (49%) say they are spiritual or that spirituality is very important to them. Among those who are religiously affiliated, the figure is 79%.

“Most ‘nones’ believe animals other than humans can have

spirits or spiritual energies—and many say this is true of parts of nature, such as mountains.”

While those who find spiritual meaning in mountains, but not in God, may not identify as Norse pagans, that is what they are. This belief system is traceable to Northern Europe in the 10th century.

The Pew study found that the majority of the “nones” (54%) who think of themselves as spiritual engage in behavioral practices such as “centering themselves.” According to one psychologist, this is a state of mind, or a place, that “we know we have to get back to when we’re not feeling like ourselves.” While others reach for aspirin or a drink, these people concentrate on “centering themselves.”

“When we center ourselves, we bring calm to our emotions. We do so by slowing down our breathing so that we ‘feel’ more of what’s going on around us.” In fact, the best way to “center ourselves” is to “Breathe in for a count of five, and then for a count of ten.” But make sure you “do so slowly and deliberately,” or it might be a bust.

The Pew researchers say that the religiously affiliated also see themselves as spiritual beings. Yes, but the big difference is that their master status is determined by their belief in the Biblical God. It is one thing for Christians to say they are spiritual as well as religious, quite another to say they find spiritual meaning exclusively in the Alps. In fact, most atheists say the natural world is all there is.

As we have seen, the data make it clear that the religiously unaffiliated have a different demographic profile than most Americans. We also know that they harbor a set of beliefs that sets them apart from the average person. But these attributes are of no major behavioral consequence to the rest of us. The same is not true when it comes to assessing civic life.

Social capital means something to all of us. For example, we

all benefit when the norms and values that make for productive members of society are widely internalized; conversely, we all lose when they are not. On this index alone, the “religious nones” are underperforming.

The survey found that “By a variety of measures, religious ‘nones’ are less civically engaged and socially connected than people who identify with a religion.” To be specific, “they are less likely to vote, less likely to have volunteered lately, less satisfied with their local communities and less satisfied with their social lives.”

Free societies depend on vibrant mediating institutions, namely those that are intermediate between the individual and the state. They include the family, church and voluntary organizations.

This survey found what others have found: the religiously unaffiliated are significantly less likely to volunteer (17%) than the religiously affiliated (27%). Moreover, those who attend religious services at least once a month “volunteer at much higher rates (41%) than *both* religiously affiliated people who don’t attend regularly (17%) *and* ‘nones’ (also 17%).”

The research also found that the “religious nones” are more likely to say they “felt lonely at least occasionally in the last seven days.” The figure for them was 26%; it was 17% for the religiously affiliated. This makes sense: the former report that they are less satisfied with their social lives.

The data indicate that the religiously involved are a net plus to society; the religiously unaffiliated are a net minus. To put it differently, young, white, liberal Democrats are more likely to retreat unto themselves, drawing off the social capital of the rest of us. Quite frankly, they are a social liability.

---

# SINCE WHEN ARE CHRISTIANS A “PRIVILEGED” GROUP?

[Bill Donohue](#) sent the following letter to the Chief Diversity Officer at The Johns Hopkins University wanting to see the evidence that Christians constitute a “privileged” group.

January 29, 2024

Dr. Sherita H. Golden  
Chief Diversity Officer  
The Johns Hopkins University  
2024 E. Monument Street, Ste. 2-600  
Baltimore, MD 21205

Dear Dr. Golden:

You recently posted a piece in the university’s “Monthly Diversity Digest” listing various demographic groups which, you claim, enjoy a “privileged” position in American society. They include “whites, Christians, males, and heterosexuals.”

I am aware that a spokesman for Johns Hopkins Medicine addressed the ensuing controversy and that you have since retracted your comments. That is all fine and good, but there is one demographic group that you mentioned that is of particular interest to me, namely, Christians.

I would like to know how you determined that Christians are a “privileged” group. As a sociologist and the president of the nation’s largest Catholic civil rights organization, I am concerned that if your assessment is wrong, it could have far-reaching consequences for Christians.

In a survey done by the Pew Research Center on the income of

various religious groups, it listed 15 Christian ones. Only two of them—those who belong to the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)—have a family income above that of atheists and agnostics. (The two wealthiest religious groups are Jewish and Hindu.)

Those who earn less than atheists and agnostics, but who are nonetheless above the median income, belong to the following groups: Orthodox Christian, United Church of Christ, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, United Methodist Church, Presbyterian Church in America, and Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

Those who earn below the median income, and are considerably less well off than atheists and agnostics, belong to the following groups: Catholic, Churches of Christ, Southern Baptist Convention, Assemblies of God, American Baptist Churches USA, Church of God in Christ and National Baptist Convention.

The data do not support your conviction that Christians are a “privileged group.” But they do indicate that atheists and agnostics qualify as such. Could you explain why they were not listed as “privileged” groups but Christians were?

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

cc: Ronald J. Daniels, President, The Johns Hopkins University  
Louis J. Forster, Chairman, Board of Trustees

---

# NFL JOINS HANDS WITH LGBT BIGOTS

[Bill Donohue](#)

The National Football League (NFL) is pairing with an anti-Catholic LGBT organization, GLAAD, during Super Bowl week, celebrating what it calls “A Night of Pride with GLAAD.” Sponsored by Smirnoff, the fun and games begin on February 7 and will be carried on CBS Sports, GLAAD, and NFL social channels.

GLAAD has a history of anti-Catholic antics, ranging from celebrating anti-Catholic plays to bashing popes. More recently, it heralded the decision by the Los Angeles Dodgers to honor an anti-Catholic group, the Sisters of Perpetual Indulgence, at its June 16 game in 2023; the Dodgers reversed its earlier ruling to disinvite the Sisters.

On June 17, NBC Los Angeles noted the role of the Catholic League in getting the Dodgers to initially disinvite the bigots. “The Dodgers pulled the Sisters from their Pride Night the day after Bill Donohue...had emailed Major League Baseball Commissioner Rob Manfred to urge the team to yank the group.” Manfred was bombarded with emails from our subscribers.

But then the Dodgers caved in to gay pressure groups. Sarah Kate Ellis, president and CEO of GLAAD, said the ruling to reinstate the Sisters restored “fairness.” Fairness to whom? Not to Catholics.

[As we recounted at the time](#), the Sisters have a long history of Catholic bashing extending back to 1979.

Why is the NFL cheering homosexuals and the sexually confused (males who think they are females and vice versa)? Why is the NFL now aiming at the kids? To be precise, why is it hosting

its second annual Pride Flag Football Clinic for young boys? Does it really expect that these kids are the future of the NFL? Or are they pandering?

More seriously, why is the NFL teaming with GLAAD, an organization that is not shy about bashing Catholics? If it is wrong to host an anti-gay group during Super Bowl week, why is it acceptable to host an anti-Catholic group?

For that matter, if the NFL is reaching out to young LGBT boys, why doesn't it reach out to young Christian boys? Why doesn't it have a clinic for young Jewish and Muslim boys?

The NFL, under its woke commissioner, Roger Goodell, is not content to promote professional football. Its foray into left-wing politics is no secret, but less well known is its embrace of anti-Catholic bigotry. But now the word is out. Our fans will surely weigh in against him.

*Contact the VP for Corporate Communications:  
[Brian.McCarthy@nfl.com](mailto:Brian.McCarthy@nfl.com)*

---

## OUR ABORTION-HAPPY CATHOLIC PRESIDENT

**Bill Donohue**

President Biden is the most abortion-happy president in American history. He simply can't stop talking about it. That he identifies as a Catholic makes him all the more contemptible.

Vice President Kamala Harris is so enthusiastic about abortion that she is embarking on a nationwide abortion "tour," criss-

crossing America on behalf of abortionists and the makers of mail-order death pills.

On January 22, the Biden administration announced that it is going all-out in its promotion of chemical abortion. They will not be enforcing existing law, and that is because they regard those laws to be too restrictive. This explains why Biden is resorting to an executive order. The goal is to increase access to chemical abortion.

The typical method of using chemicals to kill a baby in utero is for a pregnant woman to take mifepristone (RU-486), a pill that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved for use up to 10 weeks of pregnancy; no one knows how often it is used after 10 weeks.

But we do know about the condition of unborn babies at 10 weeks. That is when the baby's heartbeat is detectable. It is when the baby's brain and lungs are starting to form. It is when the baby already has a clearly identifiable human shape.

There are many side effects to this pill. They range from excessive bleeding to septic shock. According to the Charlotte Lozier Institute, chemical abortions have a complication rate four times that of surgical abortion. As many as one in five women will suffer a complication.

The constitutionality of relaxing restrictions on chemical abortions will soon be decided. On August 16, 2023, the Fifth Circuit ruled against the FDA. It said that "thousands of women, and as many as hundreds of thousands, have experienced serious adverse effects as a result of taking the drug, and required surgery or emergency care to treat those effects." This ruling was appealed and the Supreme Court will render a decision in the spring.

On January 23, Biden spoke in Virginia about abortion rights, hailing his administration's policies. Among those policies is the new directive from the Department of Health and Human

Services that provides training health care workers about federal requirements in the Emergency Medical Treatment and Labor Act (EMTALA). The 1986 law does not specifically mention abortion, but the administration nonetheless argues that “the required emergency care can, in some circumstances, include abortion care.”

EMTALA has never been used before to regulate abortion and nowhere in the law does it mention abortion. This is a novel ploy: The Biden administration wants to force hospitals—including Catholic ones—to perform abortions even if the states ban them. The legality of this, too, will be decided by the Supreme Court this term.

Our borders are being crashed in record numbers by illegal aliens. Inflation is hurting everyone, especially the poor. Violent criminals are being treated like the catch-and-release illegal migrants—they are back on the street before the cops complete the paperwork. Some of the schools are sexually engineering children and in many cases are enabling child abuse by encouraging the sexually confused to transition to the opposite sex.

And what is Biden obsessed with? Finding new ways to kill the unborn. This speaks volumes about the priorities of our abortion-happy Catholic president.

Contact the White House Secretary: [karine.jean-pierre@who.eop.gov](mailto:karine.jean-pierre@who.eop.gov)

---

## DISNEY'S DRIFT SOUTH CAN BE

# REVERSED

[Bill Donohue](#)

Today marks the one year anniversary of the Catholic League's documentary on Disney, "Walt's Disenchanted Kingdom." Millions of Americans have watched it on multiple platforms, including Amazon. It is a critical look at how the once family-friendly giant lost its moorings and joined the culture war against our Judeo-Christian heritage. The all-star cast helped make it a success.

Our video was masterfully done by Jason Meath Productions, and was well received by Americans all across the country. It won many awards in several film festivals, including Best Short Documentary.

The year 2023 was not kind to Disney. Indeed, it headed south. How much a role our documentary played in that development we cannot say with any precision, but it is fatuous to say it was without effect.

In terms of market share, Disney slid to second place last year; Universal Pictures came out on top. Also, for the first time in many years, Disney didn't have one of the top three movies. Pixar, the Disney branch most responsible for pushing the LGBT agenda, did so badly that it shed 20 percent of its staff; more than 300 employees have been let go. In addition, attendance at Disney theme parks declined in 2023.

The man most responsible for this disaster, Disney CEO Bob Iger, is not complaining, at least not about his compensation. Why should he? His collective bosses paid him \$32 million for his performance.

The good news is that there are signs that Disney got the memo. In September, after a summer of lousy box office receipts, Iger told investors he will seek to "quiet the

noise.” The noise came from parents who do not want to expose their children to raunch.

At the end of November, we learned from a corporate disclosure that Disney is rethinking its woke policies. “We face risks relating to misalignment with public and consumer tastes and preferences for entertainment, travel and consumer products, which impact demand for our entertainment offerings and products and the profitability of any of our businesses.”

George Washington University law professor Jonathan Turley picked up on this admission and explained why Disney departed from the kind of wholesome fare that made it famous.

“For shareholders,” he said, “it may seem counterintuitive that corporate executives would trade off profits for political or social agendas. However, it does serve as a rationale for individual corporate executives who are professionally advanced when they champion such causes.” In other words, veterans like Iger are the most likely to let their ideological agenda trump their obligations to shareholders.

But when investors revolt, even guys like Iger have to listen. He said something in early December at a summit in New York that was unexpected. “Creators lost sight of what their No. 1 objective needed to be. We have to entertain first. It’s not about messages.”

That was refreshing, if not altogether honest. Those who create Disney fare do not do so without the blessing of their bosses, and that certainly includes Iger.

If Disney seriously wants to rebound, it can begin by treating Americans the way they do the masses in China. Last June, Americans were treated to Pride Month in Orlando and Los Angeles. But guess what? There was no four week celebration of homosexuality and transgenderism in Hong Kong or Shanghai.

Similarly, Disney has long cut morally objectionable footage from its movies to accommodate Muslims in the Middle East. So why are American kids treated to their sexual grooming films?

We would love to see Disney get back to basics and treat children as children again, sparing them of any sexual agenda. If they do turn the corner, the dividends will be morally impressive for the country and financially impressive for Disney. That's a win-win.

Contact Disney's communications chief:  
[Kristina.Schake@disney.com](mailto:Kristina.Schake@disney.com)

If you would like a copy of our DVD documentary, please contact [info@catholicleague.org](mailto:info@catholicleague.org). The cost is \$10, including shipping and handling.

---

# CHEERING FOR SAME-SEX BLESSINGS

**Bill Donohue**

The Vatican decision to allow priests to bless same-sex couples has led to a firestorm of protest. The Catholic clergy, in many parts of the world, are simply refusing to heed this directive.

So who likes this decision? We put together a sample of comments made by various segments of the population; we even included some who said this new development is a sham because it didn't go far enough.

Notice the comment made in the first entry of this report by Catholics for Choice, an anti-Catholic letterhead funded by

the establishment. Its leader says, “While some priests have been secretly blessing same-sex unions for years, to now do it publicly—with the backing from the pope’s teachings—will be transformative for advancing LGBTQIA+ visibility and inclusion.”

In December, Fr. James Martin said that after the document on blessing same-sex couples was issued, he was delighted to bless a gay couple (in a living room), saying, “It was really nice to be able to do that publicly.” Thus did he tacitly admit that he had been doing so all along.

In the 1990s, I had dinner with a priest who said he allowed girls to be altar servers long before it was permitted. He bragged how his defiance of Church strictures helped pave the way for reform. This is how the so-called progressives operate—by stealth.

The same phenomenon has obviously been going on with regards to same-sex blessings. Indeed, it wouldn’t come as a shock to learn that gay-happy priests have presided over the illicit “marriage” of two men or two women.

To read the report, click [here](#).

---

## FEDS AT TREASURY SEE RELIGION AS A THREAT

*Bill Donohue emailed this letter to Rep. Jim Jordan today about an office in the Department of the Treasury that sees those who buy religious books as a possible threat to the nation.*

January 19, 2024

Hon. Jim Jordan  
Chairman, House Judiciary Committee  
2138 Rayburn House Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20515-0216

Dear Chairman Jordan:

Thank you for making public your letter of January 17 to Noah Bishoff, the former Director of the Office of Stakeholder Integration and Engagement in the Strategic Operations Division of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN). I am delighted that you addressed the actions taken by his office following the events of January 6, 2021.

What FinCEN did is disturbing on many levels, but there is one aspect that is of grave concern to the Catholic League, and that is the vile attempt to label religious book buyers as extremists.

It was startling to read that FinCEN investigators actually asked financial institutions to provide them with customer transactions of an "extremist" nature. They specifically asked them to search their records, filtering them by certain terms, such as "MAGA." Other indicators of extremism, they said, included "the purchase of books (including religious texts) and subscriptions to other media containing extremist views."

"In other words," you wrote, "FinCEN urged large financial institutions to comb through the private transactions of their customers for suspicious charges on the basis of protected political and religious expression." As you aptly noted elsewhere, this means that if someone bought a Bible, that kind of transaction could be flagged as an index of extremism.

To say this is surreal is an understatement.

On the website of FinCEN, it says, "The mission of the

Financial Crimes Enforcement Network is to safeguard the financial system from illicit use, combat money laundering and its related crimes including terrorism, and promote national security through the strategic use of financial authorities and the collection, analysis, and dissemination of financial intelligence.”

You have asked Mr. Bishoff to contact your office by the end of this month so that a transcribed interview with your Committee can be scheduled. Perhaps he can explain what the buying of religious books has to do with FinCEN’s mission statement. Are they considered a conduit to domestic terrorism?

As the president of the nation’s largest Catholic civil rights organization, and as the author of several books on Catholicism, I would like to know which kinds of religious books were of interest to Bishoff’s team of investigators. For example, those written by orthodox Catholics, or those written by Catholic bashers? I doubt it was the latter.

On five occasions last year, I wrote to you about the FBI’s unjustified probe of Catholics, and I appreciate all that you have done about it. Now we have to turn our attention to the conduct of the Treasury Department.

On May 4, 2017, President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13798–“Promoting Free Speech and Religious Liberty.” He wanted to ensure that these rights were being observed in the executive branch. “In particular,” Trump said, “the Secretary of the Treasury” must safeguard religious liberty. He did not say why he singled out the Department of the Treasury. Perhaps Bishoff can explain why.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

Contact Russell M. Dye, Communications Director for Rep. Jordan: [Russell.Dye@mail.house.gov](mailto:Russell.Dye@mail.house.gov)

---

# LYING ABOUT LATE-TERM ABORTIONS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Most Americans want abortion legal but restricted. Most but not all. There are some who favor abortion unlimited—for any reason and at time of gestation. The media will tell you this isn't true. They're lying.

Last September, Vice President Kamala Harris was interviewed on "Face the Nation" by Margaret Brennan. Brennan made the point that Republicans are saying they support abortions "up until, you know, birth." Harris replied, "Which is ridiculous." Brennan agreed, saying, "Which is statistically not accurate."

When Chris Christie was a Republican candidate for president, he told Mika Brezinski on MSNBC that in his state of New Jersey abortion is legal "up to nine months." She disagreed, saying, "It's not an abortion at nine months. And there's not a doctor that would do it. And it only happens in extremely severe circumstances."

"The claim that Democrats support abortion up until the moment of birth is entirely misleading." That's what former White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki said on her MSNBC show.

Jim Acosta of CNN took issue with a family leader on this

subject, saying, "Democrats are not in favor of abortion right up until birth."

On "Meet the Press," former President Donald Trump said that some Democrats support abortion up to "nine months and even after birth you're allowed to terminate the baby." The NBC host, Kristen Welker, said, "Democrats are not saying that."

Steve Benen, an MSNBC producer for "The Rachel Maddow Show," also took issue with Trump's claim that some Democrats support "after-birth" abortion. "There is no such thing. The claim is simply insane."

All of these people who defend the Democrats on this issue are wrong. I will prove it.

Pennsylvania Senator John Fetterman believes in no restrictions on abortion. When asked during a debate, "Are there any limits on abortion you would find appropriate," he answered, "I don't believe so."

In 2015, when Debbie Wasserman Schultz, chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee, was asked if she was okay "with killing a 7-pound baby that's just not born yet," she replied that she supports "letting women and their doctors make this decision without government getting involved." Senator Rand Paul rightly noted, "Well, it sounds like her answer is yes, that she's OK with killing a 7-pound baby."

In 2020, when Vice President Mike Pence called out Democrats for supporting abortion without restrictions, he was challenged by Jane Timm of NBC News. "Elective abortions do not occur up until the moment of birth," she said.

Tony Perkins, president of the Family Research Council, rebutted her argument. "Believe it or not, 22 states—*almost half*—allow birth day abortion. And in seven of those, women don't need a reason. A pregnant mom at 39 weeks can literally walk into a willing clinic and ask for an abortion, no

questions asked.”

Perkins knows what he is talking about. Quite frankly, under *Roe v. Wade*, abortion-on-demand, while not a *de jure* right (it was not permitted after viability except in limited cases), was a *de facto* right. For proof, consider *Doe v. Bolton*, the companion case to *Roe*; it opened the door to abortion-on-demand.

In *Roe*, the high court said the states may outlaw abortion “except where it is necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother.” The ruling in *Doe* defined what an “appropriate medical judgment” was. It entailed the “physical, emotional, psychological, familial, and the women’s age—relevant to the well-being of the patient.”

Not surprisingly, every state law that attempted to limit post-viability abortions to those necessary for the *physical* health of the women failed in court when challenged. In effect, the joint decisions in *Roe* and *Doe* legalized abortion up until birth. So when Democrats say they simply want to codify *Roe*, what they are saying is they want to make all abortions legal, at any time during pregnancy.

Some Democrat governors actually favor allowing a baby who is born alive from a botched abortion to die unattended.

On January 22, 2019, New York State Gov. Andrew Cuomo signed legislation that allows premature babies who survive a chemical abortion to be denied treatment. Shortly thereafter, the Democrat Governor from Virginia, Ralph Northam, signaled that he was not satisfied with sanctioning abortion up until birth.

If a baby survived an abortion, he said, “The infant would be kept comfortable. The infant would be resuscitated if that’s what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother.”

It was so thoughtful of Gov. Northam, who is a pediatrician, to assure us that the baby would be “kept comfortable” before they put him down or let him die.

So there we have it. Contrary to what the media and the Democrats have been saying, there are plenty of Democrats who support legalized abortion through nine months of pregnancy, for any reason whatsoever. There are even those who are okay with infanticide.

---

## MSNBC SMEARS CHRISTIANS

*This is a copy of the letter that Bill Donohue emailed to the president of MSNBC and to the parent company's CEO at Comcast.*

January 17, 2024

Ms. Rashida Jones  
President, MSNBC  
30 Rockefeller Plaza, Bldg. 620  
New York, New York 10112

Dear Ms. Jones:

Recent anti-Christian attacks by MSNBC hosts and guests demand a vigorous network response.

On January 16, MSNBC guest Tara Setmayer, representing the Lincoln Project, smeared Christians when she referred to them as a “death cult.” She also accused evangelical Christians of being a national liability. “Not only have they failed America, but they’ve failed Christianity.”

On January 15, MSNBC host Joy Reid complained that Iowa has

too many “white Christians,” saying they are overrepresented “in the caucuses.” She attributed to them the conviction that “everyone who is not a white conservative Christian is a fraudulent American, is a less-real American.”

If a guest or host on MSNBC said that Muslims are a “death cult,” there would be repercussions. If it were said that Jews have failed both America and Judaism, there would be repercussions. If it were said that atheists believe that everyone who is not a non-believer is a fraudulent American, there would be repercussions.

Why have there been no repercussions regarding the anti-Christian remarks made by MSNBC guests and hosts? Bigotry against any demographic group should never be given air time on television.

I would appreciate a response to this serious issue.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.  
President

cc: Michael J. Cavanagh, President, Comcast

Contact Jones: [Rashida.Jones@nbcuni.com](mailto:Rashida.Jones@nbcuni.com)