

MAMDANI'S COMMUNIST ROOTS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Is New York City mayoral hopeful Zohran Mamdani a Communist? He says he is not, but that doesn't mean much. After all, he knows he could not win running on the Communist Party line because it is not one of the nine political parties on the ballot in November.

Mamdani was groomed by his far left-wing parents to become a radical activist in the Communist mold. His father, Mahmood Mamdani, is a Marxist professor of African history at Columbia University, and his mother, Mira Nair, is a filmmaker and an anti-Israeli activist.

They gave Zohran the middle name of "Kwame," after Kwame Nkrumah, the African dictator who was so admired by the Communists in the Soviet Union that they gave him the [Lenin Peace Prize in 1962](#). This was not an odd choice—it made perfect sense given the politics of Zohran's parents.

Zohran has long been immersed in his father's writings, most of which are standard Marxist critiques of Western civilization. But it appears his mother's Indian ancestry has also had an impact on him; he follows Indian politics quite closely.

In 2020, at age 21, Arya Rajendran was elected the mayor of Thiruvananthapuram, the capital of Kerala. She is a member of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) or CPIM. Zohran tweeted her a congratulatory note, calling her "[Comrade](#)," which is classic Communist lexicon describing an ally. He made it clear that he was thinking about running for mayor of New York City, and was encouraged by her Communist victory. "So what kind of mayor does NYC need right now? Me."

The Communist Party USA (CPUSA), loves Mamdani. After winning

the primary, they [said](#), “We stand with Zohran Mamdani against the racist and anti-Communist attacks on him...”

Joe Sims, co-chair of CPUSA, was ecstatic, [bragging](#) how Mamdani defeated Andrew Cuomo. “The double digit margin victory sent shockwaves throughout the democratic establishment—shockwaves through Wall Street. What an achievement! And I don’t know about you but it lifted me right up.”

People’s World is the successor to the *Daily Worker*, once the most prominent Communist publication in America. They also [celebrated](#) Mamdani’s primary victory, cheering his policy prescriptions and imploring Democratic leaders to follow suit.

One reason why Mamdani won the primary was the skill employed by his followers; they knew how to manipulate the ranked-choice voting system. He received help from *Hammer & Hope*, a black radical publication. [They ran a “DREAM” campaign](#). It stands for “Don’t Rank Eric Adams for Mayor” and “Don’t Rank Evil Andrew for Mayor.” *Hammer & Hope* is not just another left-wing organ. It is a self-avowed [communist publication](#).

Mamdani has long admired black communists. Fred Hampton, the Black Panther leader, was an avowed communist, but that didn’t stop Mamdani from calling the convicted thug a champion of “[Black liberation](#), socialist revolution, and solidarity with the poor, the workers, and the colonized around the world.”

Mamdani’s housing advisor is Cea Weaver. In 2017, she tweeted, “[Elect more Communists](#),” and the year after she said, “[Seize private property](#).” Tascha Van Auken is his field director, and she has worked with the [Working Families Party](#) (WFP), an affiliate of the [Communist Party](#). Mamdani is listed on the ballot as the [#1 choice](#) of WFP.

Mamdani is fond of using the exact language invoked by Karl Marx. He supports a “[social housing](#)” bill that would allow New York state to seize private property for the purpose of

renovation and rehabilitation. Indeed, he has explicitly called for the "[abolition of private property](#)," taking a page right out of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Marx and Friedrich Engels [wrote](#), "the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property."

Mamdani knows what he is aiming for, [explaining](#), "the end goal of seizing the means of production" is a priority. This is another pick up from Marx and Engels, who [wrote](#) that "the proletarian revolution will transform existing society gradually and will be able to abolish private property only when the means of production are available in sufficient quantity."

"Each according to their need, each according to their ability" is what Mamdani [wrote](#) in 2020. In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, Marx [described](#) how people would be treated once communism succeeded: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Josh Hammer, Newsweek's senior editor-at-large, got it right when he [said](#) Mamdani "is better understood as a full-fledged communist" than as a socialist. Still, some insist Mamdani is a socialist, not a communist. If he is, he is more of the Leninist variety.

Lenin knew what he was talking about when he [said](#), "The goal of socialism is communism." That has Mamdani's face written all over it.

PETITION SEN. DURBIN TO DECLINE AWARD

[Bill Donohue](#)

On the morning of [September 23](#), I issued a news release about a “Lifetime Achievement Award” being given to Sen. Dick Durbin on November 3 by the Archdiocese of Chicago. As I detailed, it was already setting off alarms among the clergy and the laity. The reason is simple: there has never been an abortion he couldn’t justify; his voting record on other matters is also in opposition to core Catholic teachings.

By that afternoon, it was becoming clear that this issue was red hot. That is why I wrote an open letter to Sen. Durbin noting the divisions this issue is causing in the Catholic community. I asked that he decline the award and put this issue to rest. We sent the [letter](#) in the overnight mail to be delivered the morning of September 24 in his D.C. office; his district office received a copy in the afternoon.

As you know, many bishops have criticized Cardinal Blase Cupich for naming Sen. Durbin as the recipient of this Catholic award. As lay Catholics, it falls to us to persuade the lay party to this dispute, namely Sen. Durbin, to change his mind.

We need as many Catholics as possible to petition Sen. Durbin to decline the award. Please do so, and ask your family and friends to follow suit.

Contact Durbin’s chief of staff, Pat Souders:
pat_souders@durbin.senate.gov

HILLARY HATES WHITE CONSERVATIVE CHRISTIAN MEN

[Bill Donohue](#)

In an interview Hillary Clinton had with Rachel Maddow on September 24, she bemoaned the current state of disunity in the country, blaming white conservative Christian men for ruining the nation. She accused them of trying to “turn the clock back” in an effort to “recreate a world that was never dominated, you know—let’s say it—white men of a certain persuasion, a certain religion, a certain point of view, a certain ideology, it’s just doing such damage to what we should be aiming for.”

Now who did she have in mind? Was she referring to those of “a certain persuasion,” “a certain point of view” and “a certain ideology” who are progressive Democrats?

Who was she referring to when she spoke about those of “a certain religion”? Might they be Buddhists?

She previously said that half of Trump supporters were a “basket of deplorables,” so we know her comment about a “certain point of view” was aimed at conservative Republicans. She had no problem playing the race and sex card—identifying white men as the guilty party—but on religion she balked. Yet we all know she was referring to Christians.

The woman has identity politics simmering in her brain. She doesn’t see people as individuals, but as members of a group. Then she divides the groups into classes—good guys and bad guys. The baddest of the bad guys are white conservative Christian men, people just like Charlie Kirk.

Ideas, Hillary, have consequences. Yours are lethal.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN TRUTH DOESN'T MATTER

[Bill Donohue](#)

When truth doesn't matter, all things are possible, including some very unseemly things.

There is a front-page article in the September 25 edition of the *New York Times* that is as fascinating as it is disturbing. Well researched, it is the story of Amy Griffin, one of the richest women in the country. She is the 49-year-old author of *The Tell*, a best-selling memoir that recounts her recollections of being raped on several occasions by a middle-school teacher in Amarillo, Texas, starting when she was 12.

Her recollections were not of the ordinary kind—they were drug-induced memories. To be specific, she claims that her memory was repressed until she took MDMA, a drug found in Ecstasy and Molly. The allegations she made against the teacher were disclosed during therapy sessions while under the influence of the illegal psychedelic drug.

The newspaper would not have posted a 5,000 word article about Griffin unless she was a VIP. And that she is. The glitterati who came rushing to her side, promoting the book, include Oprah Winfrey, Jenna Bush Hager, Gwyneth Paltrow and Reese Witherspoon. The latter spoke for many when she said, “By opening up her heart, she became a beacon for women everywhere.”

She spoke too soon.

What do we know about the alleged rapist? We know that he has

worked in the school district for 30 years and his record is spotless: there has never been one complaint made about him.

Suspicious about Griffin's account have mushroomed. "Some have questioned the reliability of decades-old memories unearthed during drug-assisted therapy." Others are questioning why no one knew anything about what allegedly happened. Where are the bruises from her violent experiences? There are many other serious issues with Griffin's story.

She claims that subsequent to her memory being jarred, she believes that one of her childhood friends, "Claudia," was also abused by the same teacher. But when Griffin asked her about this she said no. Griffin also writes about an incident that took place at a church youth group gathering in her house. But her family says they never hosted such an event.

In her book proposal, Griffin said another man had raped her. But she made no mention of it in her memoir. When she reported her claims of abuse to a detective, she never told him her account was a recovered memory, induced by drugs. More important, he says that from his experience, sex crimes against children typically have many victims. Yet no one, other than her, has ever accused the teacher of anything.

When *New York Times* reporters asked Griffin for an interview, she stiffed them for more than three months. To top things off, her lawyer said that by asking her to answer 11-pages of questions, "the mere sending of this document has caused additional trauma and extreme physical and emotional harm to a survivor of sexual assault, which is inexcusable."

Rick Doblin is the nation's biggest advocate of the therapeutic drug MDMA; he also connected her to her therapists. When asked about the reliability of "repressed memories," he said, "Whether it's real or not—meaning whether the incident actually happened—from a therapeutic perspective, it doesn't matter. A lot of times people will develop stories

that help them make sense of their life. In the therapeutic setting, what Amy went through whether it's true or not, it has value because the emotion is real."

This is what happens when the quest for truth is abandoned: falsehoods can be treated as a positive good—even if they ruin someone's life—as long as they bring solace to the complainant.

Why should Catholics care about this story?

Father Gordon MacRae is sitting in a New Hampshire prison today because an ex-con claimed that once his "repressed memory" was unleashed, it allowed him to recall that MacRae abused him many years earlier. And he is not the only priest to have suffered this fate.

Sociologist Richard Ofshe and journalist Ethan Watters studied the issue of "repressed memory" and they noted that "it has never been empirically demonstrated." Dr. Paul McHugh, the renowned Johns Hopkins psychiatrist, has long dismissed this as a dangerous idea that literally manufactures victims. Researchers at Harvard Medical School found that "repressed memory" is a "cultural creation having no basis in science."

William O'Donohue, and other clinical psychologists at the University of Nevada, Reno, studied the literature on this subject and concluded that "there is a large amount of scientific evidence that clearly shows that repressed memories simply do not exist." People do not forget their trauma, they said. "Indeed, traumatic events are actually quite memorable."

The media should ask Oprah, Jenna, Gwyneth and Reese, along with Amy Schumer, Laura Dern, Naomi Watts, Anna Wintour, Savannah Guthrie, and Katie Couric, how they feel now about their heroine.

Assuming that accused men are definitely guilty of sex crimes against women has become so easy, especially for cultural

elites. But as this story reveals, those who rushed to Griffin's side are the ones with egg on their face. Throwing the first stone can be risky.

OPEN LETTER TO SEN. DURBIN: DECLINE CATHOLIC AWARD

September 23, 2025

The Honorable Richard Durbin
711 Hart Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Durbin:

On November 3, you are scheduled to receive the Lifetime Achievement Award at the "Keep Hope Alive" Benefit, presented by the Archdiocese of Chicago's Office of Human Dignity and Solidarity Immigration Ministry.

You are no doubt honored to receive this award. However, it has created a firestorm in the Catholic community, involving both the clergy and the laity. In particular, it has drawn the ire of some bishops. The anger being expressed is not confined to Chicago—it is national in scope. I am afraid it will only increase once more Catholics learn of the controversy.

The proximate cause of the backlash is your voting record on abortion, an act which the Catholic Church declares to be "intrinsically evil." Your support for same-sex marriage, and your probing of the religious convictions of Catholic nominees for the federal bench, have also elicited much criticism.

Pope Leo XIV is off to a good start, and among his top

objectives is the restoration of unity in the Catholic Church. This is also a priority of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops. Regrettably, once it was learned that you were chosen to receive a Catholic award, it created the very division that the pope and the bishops have been trying to quell.

Accordingly, I respectfully request that you decline this award. In doing so, you will help ameliorate Catholic discord. Moreover, by putting the interests of the Catholic community above your own interests, it will only redound to your benefit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.
President

SEN. DURBIN'S CATHOLIC AWARD SETS OFF ALARMS

[Bill Donohue](#)

Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Illinois), who identifies as Catholic, has been named by the Archbishop of Chicago, Cardinal Blase Cupich, the recipient of the Lifetime Achievement Award at the "Keep Hope Alive" Benefit on November 3. It has already set off the alarms among the clergy and the laity.

Leading the criticism is another Illinois bishop, Thomas

Paprocki, Bishop of the Diocese of Springfield. "Senator Durbin, who has been banned from receiving Holy Communion in the Diocese of Springfield, Illinois since 2004 for his public support for abortion, should not be celebrated by the Church."

Durbin supports partial-birth abortion, the procedure where the skull of a child who is 80 percent born is crushed so as to allow him to pass through the birth canal. He also believes that a child born alive as a result of a botched abortion does not need to be attended to by medical personnel, letting him die on the physician's table. Similarly, he holds that even though an unborn child can feel pain—and indeed can even survive—at 20 weeks gestation, he does not want to ban these abortions.

Supporting Bishop Paprocki's position is San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone. He posted on X a statement of "solidarity" with him.

The Catholic League has often tangled with Sen. Durbin.

It seems every time Durbin takes a position against religious liberty, he walks it back, only to walk it back again.

On July 27, 2005, I issued a news release noting how Durbin told a CNN correspondent that he "needs to look at everything, including the nominee's faith." He was referring to the Catholic faith of Supreme Court nominee John Roberts, something he pledged to probe during the hearings.

This was a departure from what Durbin said on April 15, 2005, when he was asked about the religious beliefs of a nominee to the federal bench. "By the Constitution and by law, we cannot even ask that question, nor would I."

Yet on June 11, 2003, Durbin took umbrage at Circuit Court nominee William Pryor when Pryor merely noted the historical relationship between Christianity and the nation's founding: "Do you understand," Durbin said, that this "raises concerns

of those who don't happen to be Christian that you are asserting an agenda of your own, religious belief of your own inconsistent with separation of church and state?"

After taking flack for that remark, Durbin said on July 23, 2003 that members of the Senate Judiciary Committee ought "to expunge references to religion from this point forward." He added, hypocritically, "This is beneath the dignity of the committee."

The very next day, July 24, he reversed himself, saying, "If Senator [Jeff] Sessions is suggesting that anyone who has a religious belief should never be questioned about it, even if it has political implications, I just think [that] is wrong-headed."

On July 31, he reversed himself again, this time having the audacity to co-sponsor a resolution saying, "It shall not be in order to ask any question of the nominee relating to the religious affiliation of the nominee."

The man's duplicity is astounding.

On September 7, 2017 I wrote to Durbin about the suitability of Notre Dame Law School professor Amy Coney Barrett to sit on the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals. I asked why he continued to probe her about her "orthodox Catholic" views when she made it clear that it is *never* appropriate to impose one's religious convictions on cases before the bench. I had to ask, "Do you similarly probe prospective federal judges who are not Catholic about the orthodoxy of their religious beliefs?"

I addressed Durbin again on November 11, 2021, after he complained about being singled out by Bishop Paprocki by refusing to give him Holy Communion (because of his pro-abortion votes). He was right to note that he was being singled out, but what he failed to say is that he had previously been told not to go to Communion by then Monsignor Kevin Vann (now bishop of Orange, CA) of Blessed Sacrament

Church in Springfield. In other words, Durbin was making up his own rules again.

On the website of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops there is a document, "Catholics in Public Life." It says, "It is the teaching of the Catholic Church from the very beginning, founded on her understanding of her Lord's own witness to the sacredness of human life, that the killing of an unborn child is always intrinsically evil and can never be justified."

It also says, "The Catholic community and Catholic institutions should **not honor** those who act in defiance of our fundamental moral principles. They should not be given awards, honors or platforms which would suggest support for their actions." (Emphasis in the original.)

No wonder the alarms are going off.

UN CELEBRATES WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

[Bill Donohue](#)

Today the United Nations is holding a high-level meeting celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women. Too bad it is such a sham. But this is nothing new.

In 1995, the Catholic League was denied a request to be recognized as an NGO (non-governmental organization) by the UN Representative on Accreditation, NGO Status; we sought to participate in the Fourth World Conference on Women. We are a legitimate Catholic organization, listed in the *Official*

Catholic Directory. Catholics for Choice is a pro-abortion, anti-Catholic entity, yet it was granted NGO status. That was a sham.

At the Fourth World Conference on Women, the Holy See delegation, led by Harvard law professor Mary Ann Glendon, succeeded in stopping a challenge to the proposition that the family is the basic unit in society. Those who railed against the Holy See sought to elevate alternative life styles such as cohabitation and homosexual liaisons to the status of family. Thus did they make a sham of the objective meaning of the family.

The latest sham is having Sima Bahous preside over the 30th Anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women. She is Executive Director of UN Women and Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations. The purpose of the anniversary celebration is to advance “gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.” Choosing Bahous to lead this effort is a curious choice given the status of women in her home country, Jordan.

To begin with, the United Nations primarily views women rights as revolving around three main topics—abortion, contraception, and LGBT ideology. This has nothing to do with the most basic hardships experienced by women in most parts of the world. Rather, it reflects the ideological preferences of the highly secular Western nations.

If Bahous were truly an advocate for women, it would not have taken two months to condemn the kidnapping, rape and murder of innocent Israeli women by jihadists in the aftermath of the Hamas attack on Israel on October 7, 2023.

Moreover, if Bahous actually listened to what Jordanian women wanted, she would change her focus. The status of women in Jordan is pathetic.

- In August of 2017, Jordan finally repealed a law that

allowed rapists to skirt justice for their crimes. According to Article 308 of the Jordanian legal code, which was adopted in 1960, a man who raped a woman could avoid punishment for his crime if he married her for three to five years. After a contentious debate, the Jordanian parliament voted to repeal this barbaric law.

- Similarly, while Jordan moved to criminalize “honor killings,” several legal loopholes allow this practice to continue. An “honor killing” is a sanctioned murder of an individual perceived to have brought dishonor to the family. Typically the victims of these savage attacks are women, and this is common in Muslim countries. Under the current Jordanian penal code, judges can impose mitigated sentences if the families of the female victims do not support the prosecutions of the male attacker. Additionally, the penal code allows men to kill or attack their wives or other female family members if they catch them in the act of adultery or in an “unlawful bed” and receive a reduced sentence.
- Jordanian women face unequal treatment when it comes to marriage.
 - If a woman wishes to marry before she turns 30, she needs the permission of her male custodian, usually her father. Without the custodian’s consent, she will be barred from marrying.
 - Further, Jordanian women are not allowed to marry non-Muslim men.
 - Additionally, Jordanian women who marry non-Jordanian men cannot automatically pass their citizenship on to their children.
- Likewise, Jordanian women face unequal treatment in family courts. In Jordan, family-related matters are handled by Sharia courts using Islamic law, and, unsurprisingly, women do far worse than men under this legal code.
 - Jordanian women generally receive less inheritance under Sharia law than their male family members.

- Likewise, Jordanian mothers have limited custody over their children. All decisions regarding the raising of children are made by the fathers.
- Conversely, if a father chooses to abandon his children, a mother has very little recourse. Paternity in Sharia courts is determined by a father claiming the child—there is no authority for mandating a paternity test. If a father refuses to acknowledge the child as his own, then he has no obligation to care for the child. Of course, women do not have this option.
- In termination of a marriage, Jordanian men essentially have access to no-fault-divorce. A man can simply pay back his wife's dowry to end the union. Jordanian women, on the other hand, must show cause for why the marriage should be ended.

There are so many real problems facing women the world over, yet the UN is bent on addressing abortion and the LGBT agenda, matters of interest only to Western elites. Thus have they made a sham of the conference.

FBI TACKLES ANTI-CATHOLIC BIGOTRY

The FBI is now cracking down on anti-Catholic bigotry, trying to undo the incredible anti-Catholicism that existed in the Biden administration.

To read Bill Donohue's letter to FBI Director Kash Patel, pledging the support of the Catholic League, click [here](#).

WHEN FIDO HAS MORE RIGHTS THAN FREDDY

[Bill Donohue](#)

The Catholic Church regards animals to be part of God's creation, and are therefore deserving of respect. But only men and women are made in the image and likeness of God. Moreover, animals do not share the same dignity as human beings. Nor are they capable of being held morally responsible for their behavior. As such, while animal welfare is imperative, in no way can animals be said to possess rights.

However, the latest Gallup poll on morality reveals that Democrats and young people appear to be more concerned about the rights of Fido than his owner, Freddy.

When asked if abortion is "morally acceptable," 78 percent of Democrats and 59 percent of those 18-34 agree; this compares to 20 percent of Republicans and 43 percent of those 55 and over. But when it comes to medical testing on animals, only 45 percent of Democrats and 35 percent of young people agree; the majority of Republicans (69 percent) and the oldest generation (52 percent) agree.

In other words, while nearly 8-in-10 Democrats are okay with abortion, less than half are okay with medical testing for animals. The majority of young people are also okay with abortion, but they draw a hard line when it comes to medical testing of animals.

Why are Democrats and young people showing more respect for the rights of Fido than Freddy?

From a wealth of survey data we know that Democrats and young people are the least religious; they are much more likely to answer "none" when asked what their religious affiliation is. How does this explain their moral choices?

What unites Democrats and young people, and what separates them from most Americans, is their penchant for autonomy. For many of them, autonomy is their god. Abortion, they reckon, is all about "bodily autonomy," hence it is morally acceptable. The competing right of the child to live is given short shrift.

The interest in protecting animals cannot be explained by an affection for autonomy. Something else is going on.

Young people are more likely to own a pet than older people, and may therefore be more protective of their status. More important, however, is their relatively high exposure to videos and instruction on animal rights in school and social media. As for Democrats, they are more likely to take an expansive view of rights than other Americans (save for the life of the unborn). Because they fancy themselves as being open-minded, they regard an exclusive interest in human rights as chauvinistic.

If there is one person who has given intellectual heft to the moral choices of Democrats and young people it is Princeton professor Peter Singer. He is the father of the animal rights movement. He is also a proponent of infanticide.

Singer believes that chimps and gorillas should have the same rights as humans. He takes animal rights so seriously that he won't eat clams. Why not? Because he is uncertain about the capacity of shellfish to suffer. But what about babies? He is not only okay with abortion, he argues that parents should be allowed to kill their kids until their offspring are 28 days old.

Now it would be unfair to say that Singer is representative of

what Democrats and young people believe. But even if he is an outlier among them, it is disturbing to see Democrats and young people having more in common with him than with Republicans and older Americans.

Whether it is Singer's influence or not, his inhumane perspective has made its way into the pop culture. In a recent ESPN interview, there was a sign on a bookshelf behind the speaker that read the following:

DOGS ARE WELCOME
Humans Tolerated

We need to get our moral house in order. If we can't conclude that Freddy should be awarded a higher moral plane than Fido, we are heading towards disaster.

KIRK WAS KILLED BECAUSE HE WAS CHRISTIAN

[Bill Donohue](#)

Charlie Kirk was assassinated because he was an outspoken Christian. This is undeniable. Yet the media continue to bury this fact. Of course he was a conservative Christian—those are the only Christians targeted by Christian haters.

The suspected killer, Tyler Robinson, was also a sexually confused young man. It takes a very disturbed man to be "[romantically involved](#)" with a man who desperately wants to be a woman.

Apparently, Robinson's roommate, Lance Twiggs, had a great effect on his ideological convictions, and they were not of

the MAGA variety. They also spent a lot of time together engaging online communities, many of them violent. Not surprisingly, Robinson had an affection for Antifa, the urban terrorist group of left-wing maniacs.

According to [relatives](#) of Twiggs, “He hates conservatives and Christians. He hated us. He was not raised that way, but he, over the years, has become really detached [and] been radicalized. He has obviously gotten progressively worse the last year or two,” saying he was “always very angry.”

Robinson made it plain to his family that he had a special hatred for Kirk’s Christian message. In an [affidavit](#), a relative said that he “didn’t like Kirk” and was “full of hate and spreading hate.”

An important part of Kirk’s message was a strong defense of traditional Christian family values, something which is anathema to the LGBTQ crowd. Kirk deplored the entire transgender movement, and was therefore seen as the enemy. Liberal Christians tend to be on the transgender side, which is why they are safe.

In a [YouGov poll](#), more Americans (24 percent) believe that Robinson was a Republican than any other political affiliation. That is flatly wrong.

As federal authorities, and Utah Gov. Spencer Cox, said, the [evidence](#) shows that he became “deeply indoctrinated with leftist ideology.” They concluded that he had only been “radicalized” in recent years. Those years coincide with his relationship with his trans boyfriend.

The public can be forgiven for being wrong about this. After all, they have been victimized by the media, which is mostly covering up for Robinson’s lifestyle and convictions.

It is true that Robinson was raised a Mormon, but it is also true that he was no longer a practicing member of his

religious community. His parents are Republican, but he never was. It appears he was apolitical until, that is, he hooked up with his boyfriend.

Robinson was not simply involved with a man who hated being a man, he himself [exhibited ties](#)—at least online—to the “furry” community. “[Furries](#)” are people who dress up as animals and consider themselves to be a mix of humans and animals. Many give themselves names, choose a species, and attend conventions with like-minded people. Most of the “furries” are homosexuals.

Now why aren't most of those in the media telling the truth to the American people?

Too many of them believe in a libertine conception of morality, one which prizes unbounded sexual freedom. It is a destructive mentality, resulting in higher mortality rates, depression, loneliness and suicide for those who practice it. It is not only self-destructive, it is socially destructive.

What could be more different from Christian sexual ethics than the idea that it is natural for people to hate their sex and their humanness? Let's face it, it is not normal to rebel against one's nature, reconceptualizing oneself as a member of the opposite sex and another species.

The big media are in denial. We researched how many have reported on the maladies that consume Robinson and Twiggs, and came away practically empty. Nor are they highlighting the virulent anti-Christian bigotry that bedevils them. They would rather lie than let the truth be known. They have too much invested ideologically, financially and emotionally to change.