

NEW YORK TIMES MALIGNS SAINT; NO EVIDENCE PROVIDED

On September 30, when Bill Donohue read a *New York Times* front-page story on Saint Junípero Serra, he could hardly believe his eyes. The 17th century priest, who championed the rights of Indians, had just been canonized by Pope Francis the week before. So it came as a shock to read that he was accused of torturing Indians.

As Catholic League members know, in anticipation of the expected controversy over Father Serra, Donohue authored a booklet on him a few months ago. He read widely on the Franciscan priest, and published his findings in *The Noble Legacy of Father Serra*; he used a Q&A format to make his research easily accessible to readers. In all his readings, Donohue never found a single scholar who ever accused Father Serra of torturing Indians.

The reporter who wrote this story, Laura M. Holson, offered this remarkable sentence: "Historians agree that he [Serra] forced Native Americans to abandon their tribal culture and convert to Christianity, and that he had them whipped and imprisoned and sometimes worked or tortured to death."

Donohue readily concedes that the Indians were not treated justly. But it was the Spanish conquerors, not the Franciscans, who were responsible for the worst excesses. Indeed, Father Serra's heroism, which led to his canonization, is largely a function of his opposition to Indian maltreatment. It was he who insisted that the Indians should be treated with the dignity afforded all human beings.

On the day the story appeared, Donohue emailed the reporter asking her to provide evidence that "Historians agree" that Father Serra had Indians "tortured to death." [To read his

letter, and all the subsequent exchanges he had with *Times* officers, see pp. 4-5; it is laid out in chronological order.]

As you can see, none of the parties at the newspaper were able to answer his one question: Who are these historians? Yet they refused to run a correction.

No one disputes that radical activists, racists, and anti-Catholics have made wild and unsubstantiated accusations against the Franciscans. But there is a difference between these agenda-ridden ideologues and scholars. The latter would be expected to provide evidence, and that is why the charge that “historians agree” that Father Serra was a barbarian is complete nonsense. If this were true, the *Times* would be able to name them.

Finally, it must be said that Vatican scholars pored over thousands of documents related to Father Serra and released a 1,200 page position paper on him. They would never recommend for sainthood anyone who ever authorized the torturing of innocent persons

SYNOD SHOWS SPUNK

The Synod of Bishops has concluded in Rome. Occasionally contentious, it succeeded in addressing a wide range of issues that touch on the family. Most agree that a lot of spunk was shown. Pope Francis will have the final say.

The Holy Father got the Synod off to a good start with his opening homily. The subject was marriage. Here is an excerpt:

“He [God] made men and women for happiness, to share their

journey with someone who complements them, to live the wondrous experience of love: to love and to be loved, and to see their love bear fruit in children, as the Psalm proclaimed today says.” The emphasis on the complementarity of men and women is a clear statement reaffirming marriage as a union between the two sexes; the comment on procreation underscores this point.

“This is God’s dream for his beloved creation: to see it fulfilled in the loving union between a man and a woman, rejoicing in their shared journey, fruitful in their mutual gift of self.” Again, the pope’s clarity on this subject leaves no wiggle room for misinterpretation.

Unfortunately, some commentators evinced an ideological agenda by seeking to spin the proceedings their way. They treated the three-week gathering as if it were a Las Vegas event open to bettors.

There is plenty of time to distill the findings when they become available. Fairness dictates, however, that politics should be put aside.

PLAYBOY DECLARES VICTORY

William A. Donohue

[Editor’s note: This is a slightly longer version of an article that first appeared online at Newsmax.]

If they want to keep their jobs, the girls at *Playboy* have to put their clothes back on (or at least their pants). As reported in the October 13 edition of the *New York Times*, that is the considered judgment of the magazine’s executives; even

founder Hugh Hefner is on board. Have they gone prudish? No, it's strictly a business decision: porn is so popular that going the other way, they hope, may have a strange allure.

CEO Scott Flanders explains that *Playboy* is a victim of its own success. "That battle has been fought and won. You're one click away from every sex act imaginable for free. And it's just so passé at this juncture."

Flanders did not say who *Playboy* fought. Nor did he say what the victors won. The former is easy to figure out; not so the latter.

Marilyn Monroe graced the first issue of *Playboy* in 1953. Important as that was, it was the first installment of "The *Playboy* Philosophy" that was really ground-breaking. "Our society's repressive and suppressive antisexualism is derived from twisted theological concepts that have become firmly imbedded in Christianity during the Dark Ages," Hefner wrote. He blamed "totalitarian church-state controls of both Catholic and Protestant origin" for creating this alleged oppression.

The answer to the first question, therefore, is uncontested: *Playboy* was launched to battle Christianity, specifically Christian sexual ethics. But it is less certain who the victors are and what they won.

If *Playboy's* mainstreaming of pornography has triumphed over Christianity, it does not follow that *Playboy* won. In fact, by its own admission, it lost. To wit: In 1975, the magazine had a circulation of 5.6 million; today it stands at 800,000. And there is no assurance that when the girls put their pants back on the numbers will spike.

The Internet, as Flanders indicates, is responsible for making *Playboy* passé. But if it is the consumers of Internet porn who have won, what exactly did they win? By any honest assessment, they lost.

Those who traffic in Internet porn not only destroy their own lives, they destroy the lives of those closest to them. The research on this subject is not conflicted—it is near unanimous.

In 2010, a wide range of scholars issued a document that contained impressive data. “The Social Costs of Pornography: A Statement of Findings and Recommendations” found the support of agnostics and atheists, along with Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and Muslims. Liberals and conservatives were represented, as well as specialists in economics, medicine, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, journalism, and law.

Its first finding was that the Internet has made possible a historic level of access to pornography. Second, it found that today’s pornography is qualitatively different from what has been available in the past, and that addiction is now at record levels. The effect on women is dramatic: they feel betrayed and devastated by their partner’s pornography problem.

Fourth, children and adolescents use pornography to coerce each other into sexual behavior. Fifth, the report found that “Women of all ages comprise 80% of those trafficked, children comprise 50%, and of those women and children 70% are used for sexual exploitation.” Sixth, users undermine marital and other intimate relationships.

This report is hardly unique. Many studies have found that marital relations suffer greatly. The users of pornography find it more difficult to get sexually aroused; they also lose interest in their partner. Just as important, partners are made to feel inadequate, and many see pornography as an expression of infidelity. Moreover, children and adolescents drawn to online pornography experience psychological and behavioral consequences that are traumatic.

If pressed, the magazine’s executives might argue that despite

the negative fallout that pornography entails, *Playboy* has succeeded in making men free. However, freedom was meant to be enjoyed; there is little joy in the objectification of sex. Similarly, sexual relationships between a husband and wife who are in love are edifying, but when sexual expression is reduced to the individual level, it corrupts the attainment of love.

The *Catholic Catechism* offers a powerful rejoinder to *Playboy's* idea of freedom. It says that “the exercise of freedom does not imply a right to say or do everything. It is false to maintain that man, ‘the subject of this freedom,’ is ‘an individual who is fully self-sufficient and whose finality is the satisfaction of his own interests in the enjoyment of earthly goods.’”

The sad fact is that there are no winners in *Playboy's* battle against Christianity. Being “one click away from every sex act imaginable for free” has not made us a better society. Indeed, consumers of Internet pornography are increasingly dysfunctional. And because their loss is not confined to them, they ineluctably poison relations with others.

Winning battles with no victors sounds like an oxymoron. But in this case, it happens to be true. *Playboy's* hedonistic values may have triumphed over Christianity's more mature understanding of sexual ethics, but it has left a trail of social and moral debris in its wake. That's not the mark of a winner—it's the signature of a loser.

MEN, WOMEN, AND CHILDREN:

MADE FOR EACH OTHER

In November 2014, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith sponsored an international colloquium on the complementarity of man and woman in marriage; it was co-hosted by several Pontifical Councils. Pope Francis opened the event with a stirring address, and he was followed by approximately 400 scholars and religious leaders from around the world.

Plough Publishing House has just published an excellent book, *Not Just Good, but Beautiful: The Complementary Relationship Between Man and Woman*, that is based on some of the presentations.

Bill Donohue chose to excerpt three of the contributors: Pope Francis, Johann Christoph Arnold, and Rick Warren. The Holy Father needs no introduction. Mr. Arnold is a senior pastor of the Bruderhof, an international communal movement dedicated to a life of simplicity, service, sharing, and non-violence. A good friend to the Catholic community (he is especially close to Father Philip Eichner, the Catholic League's chairman of the board), he offers an Anabaptist perspective. Rick Warren is the best-selling Christian author who is known the world over for his cogent insights into contemporary issues.

We hope you enjoy reading these selections. For book information, see p. 2.

Pope Francis

It is fitting that you have gathered here in this international colloquium to explore the complementarity of man and woman. This complementarity is at the root of marriage and family, which is the first school where we learn to appreciate our own and others' gifts, and where we begin to acquire the arts of living together. For most of us, the family provides the principal place where we can begin to "breathe" values and ideals, as well as to realize our full capacity for virtue and

charity. At the same time, as we know, families are places of tensions: between egoism and altruism, reason and passion, immediate desires and long-range goals. But families also provide frameworks for resolving such tensions. This is important. When we speak of complementarity between man and woman in this context, let us not confuse that term with the simplistic idea that all the roles and relations of the two sexes are fixed in a single, static pattern. Complementarity will take many forms as each man and woman brings his or her distinctive contributions to their marriage and to the formation of their children—his or her personal richness, personal charisma. Complementarity becomes a great wealth. It is not just a good thing but it is also beautiful.

In our day, marriage and the family are in crisis. We now live in a culture of the temporary, in which more and more people are simply giving up on marriage as a public commitment. This revolution in manners and morals has often flown the flag of freedom, but in fact it has brought spiritual and material devastation to countless human beings, especially the poorest and most vulnerable. Evidence is mounting that the decline of the marriage culture is associated with increased poverty and a host of other social ills, disproportionately affecting women, children, and the elderly. It is always they who suffer the most in this crisis.

The crisis in the family has produced a crisis of human ecology, for social environments, like natural environments, need protection. And although the human race has come to understand the need to address conditions that menace our natural environments, we have been slower to recognize that our fragile social environments are under threat as well, slower in our culture, and also in our Catholic Church. It is therefore essential that we foster a new human ecology and advance it.

In these days, as you embark on a reflection on the beauty of complementarity between man and woman in marriage, I urge you

to lift up yet another truth about marriage: that permanent commitment to solidarity, fidelity, and fruitful love responds to the deepest longing of the human heart. Let us bear in mind especially the young people, who represent our future. It is important that they do not give themselves over to the poisonous mentality of the temporary, but rather be revolutionaries with the courage to seek true and lasting love, going against the common pattern.

Johann Christoph Arnold

Last year my wife was diagnosed with a serious cancer and more recently she suffered a heart attack. It seemed that the devil tried everything to prevent us from coming to Rome but, praise God, we are here today.

I share this because we are just like everybody else, with our struggles and challenges, and have come to understand how important it is to belong to a community of believers that protects the values that sustain marriage. This is true in the Bruderhof, the church community that I come from, and it is so in all the great faith traditions that are here today. This is why I have hope that marriage as God intended it will shine forth even in these dark times.

While serving as elder of this movement for the last thirty years, I've watched the moral and spiritual decline of Western civilization, along with the tragic breakdown of the family. All the more, we have been determined to uphold the sanctity of life, and of sex and marriage.

We believe that marriage is more than a private contract between two people. God did not have in mind merely the personal happiness of separate individuals, but the establishment of God-fearing relationships in a communion of families under his rulership. Marriage is part of God's original creation and sanctifies each generation as being "made in the image of God." God created male and female that

through their union they might fill the earth and flourish. In God's plan, every child has a father and a mother.

In my own church community, there are people from all walks of life, including some from very broken families. Like couples everywhere, couples in our church have to work hard to nurture the kind of love that truly lasts. Sometimes they find themselves in crisis due to mistrust, unforgiveness, or sexual immorality. But through the help of God and of fellow church members, miracles of reconciliation and healing can and do happen. Prayer is a crucial part of this process: as the old saying goes, "Couples that pray together, stay together."

To protect marriages, we as individuals, families, and churches must hold each other accountable and encourage each other. Our children need to see a life of modesty, simplicity, hard work, and most of all love to God and neighbor.

We must never be afraid of the ridicule and slander our witness will bring. As the apostle Paul wrote:

Do not be deceived: God cannot be mocked. A man reaps what he sows. Whoever sows to please their flesh, from the flesh will reap destruction; whoever sows to please the Spirit, from the Spirit will reap eternal life. Let us not become weary in doing good, for at the proper times we will reap a harvest if we do not give up. (Gal. 6:7-9)

So, let us hold our heads high knowing that if God is for us, who can be against us? Let us give living witness together that God's plan for marriage and children is joyful, true, and everlasting. Nothing will be able to stop us from proclaiming this childlike and simple message. It is God who holds the final hour of history in his hands, and he will be victorious.

Rick Warren

In Hebrews 13:4 we are given this clear command: "Marriage is to be honored by everyone."

Sadly, today, marriage is now dishonored by many. It is dismissed as an archaic, manmade tradition, denounced as an enemy of women, discouraged as a career-limiting choice, demeaned in movies and television, and delayed out of fear that it will limit one's personal freedom.

Today marriage is ridiculed, resented, rejected, and redefined. What are we going to do about this? The church cannot cower in silence! As you have heard, there is too much at stake.

When a culture claims to care about children, we must point out that children who grow up with both a mother and a father grow up healthier, happier, and stronger. They are less likely to fail in school, less likely to abuse drugs and alcohol, less likely to do jail time, and less likely to experience distress, depression, and thoughts of suicide. They are also less likely to perpetuate these problems to the next generation.

When a culture claims to champion women, we must point out that women who marry and stay married have lower rates of depression, have a lower risk of being a victim of crime or violence, and have a higher net worth than those living with an unmarried man.

When a culture claims to care for the poor, we must point out that the dissolution of marriages disproportionately hurts the poor. A single mother with children has never been a viable economic unit, and poor children get hurt the most by the economic consequences of divorce. Children who grow up without both mother and father are more likely to live their entire lives in poverty.

And what about men? Men who marry and stay married have fewer illnesses, fewer injuries, and live longer than single men. They earn more money and amass more net worth than single men with similar education and job histories, including men who

live with unmarried women.

On CNN I was asked, "Can you imagine ever changing your mind about gay marriage?" I said no. "Why?" I said, "Because I fear God's disapproval more than I fear your disapproval or society's." As Saint Peter has said, "We must obey God rather than men."

The only way to always be relevant is to be eternal. What is in style goes out of style; no revolution lasts. Every lie eventually crumbles under its own deception. Cultures rise and fall, cultures come and go, but the Word of God and the church of God continues. It isn't necessary to be on the right side of culture or the right of history. It is just necessary to be on the right side!

In many ways, the debate over the definition of life, of sex, and of marriage is, in reality, a question of leadership. Who is going to lead? Will the church follow the crowd, or will the church lead the crowd? In Exodus 23:2 God says "Do not follow the crowd in doing wrong." Why? Because history shows that the majority is often wrong. The dustbins of history are stuffed with the conventional wisdom of cultures that proved false. Truth is not decided by a popularity contest.

NEW YORK TIMES SMEAR OF FR. SERRA STANDS

After the *New York Times* ran a front-page story that smeared St. Junipero Serra, repeated attempts to have the paper correct the record failed.

On the day that Laura M. Holson's news story appeared, "Sainthood of Serra Reopens Wounds of Colonialism in California," Bill Donohue sent her the following email:

You said that "Historians agree" that Fr. Serra had Indians "tortured to death." I have done research on Serra and written about him, yet I know of no historian who makes such a claim. Please name them. I can name many who never made such a claim.

The following day Donohue contacted the "Corrections" section of the paper, as well as the public editor, sending them the above email. He also said, "Ms. Holson has not responded. Assuming she cannot name historians who have made such a claim, I am requesting that this merit inclusion in the 'Corrections' section of the Times."

One week went by after Donohue's email to these two parties, and still no response. Moreover, he wrote them again, sending the previous emails: "Please let me know if I can expect a correction to Ms. Holson's story. If her account is accurate, she should be able to name the historians who say that Fr. Serra tortured Indians. This story is particularly important because Pope Francis just canonized Fr. Serra when he was in DC. Thank you."

Another day passed, and still no reply. This is yellow journalism at its worst. When Donohue submits paid ads to the *Times*, he is often asked to identify his sources. Yet it accepts hit jobs like Holson's. The fact is there is no list of historians who claim Fr. Serra tortured Indians, and the *Times* knows it. The Catholic League sent this news release to a wide audience.

NEW YORK TIMES REMAINS DEFIANT ON SERRA

The following exchange occurred on October 8:

Dear Mr. Donohue:

You might have been busy with your news release of October 1 and did not have a chance to keep up with Laura Holson's coverage of the shooting in Oregon. She began filing from Oregon last Friday. So while our editors discussed your complaint when it was received, we waited to go over it with Ms. Holson until she had reached the point where she was not inundated with her coverage of that horrific event.

Certainly you have very strong views on this issue and have written extensively on it. But after many discussions, a review of past Times coverage and other resources, I agree with Ms. Holson's editors that "historians" is accurate, and therefore no correction is required.

At one point you sent us a list of books you considered to be "the authoritative books on Fr. Serra." Ms. Holson had already reviewed the writings of some of the historians you cited in that list.

If I thought having an extended conversation on this would help, I would be happy to. But after re-reading your correspondence, I cannot think of anything we could do or say that would convince you that our coverage was fair and complete – or that the reference to "historians" is accurate.

We respect your opinion and I hope you will respect our decision – even if you do not agree with it. If nothing else, rest assured that your points have been thoroughly reviewed and a great deal of time has been put into making this decision.

Sincerely,

Greg Brock
Gregory E. Brock
Senior Editor for Standards
The New York Times

Dear Mr. Brock,

Thank you for taking my complaint seriously. I have just one question: Who are the "historians" who claim that Fr. Serra tortured Indians?

Sincerely,
Bill Donohue

We at the Catholic League take great pride in providing readers with factual material; we are always ready to back up our work with evidence. It is one thing to offer an opinion, quite another to make unequivocal statements of a condemnatory nature in a news story. That is exactly what the New York Times did. Worse, it is considered the newspaper of record.

The Times only made matters worse when its Senior Editor for Standards took the side of the reporter without identifying the historians who claim that Fr. Serra tortured Indians to death.

We are disappointed that this incredible fabrication was not challenged by others. Surely there are scholars and members of the Catholic Church who are in a position to know that what the Times said cannot be substantiated. That said, we are happy that we didn't miss the opportunity to challenge them.

Bill Donohue

COULTER LEADS PACK OF CRAZIES AGAINST POPE

What do Ann Coulter and the Westboro Baptist Church have in common? Both are obscene anti-Catholics. Indeed, they are the worst of Pope Francis' vile critics to emerge during his visit to the United States.

Coulter recently tweeted that the Catholic Church was "largely built by pedophiles." This is the kind of comment we might expect from the likes of Bill Maher.

No wonder these two bigots are best of friends. Coulter also tweeted, "I'm an American and this is why our founders (not 'immigrants') distrusted Catholics and wouldn't make them citizens."

If she doesn't already belong to the Klan, they would love to have her.

"The Pope is a Lying Whore." That's the way the maniacs at the Westboro Baptist Church greeted the Pope. A few protesters from this group showed up in Philadelphia with signs that read, "Pervert Pope Francis."

Predictably, Coulter's buddy couldn't resist insulting the Pope on his weekly HBO show. "The Pope said the one regret he had was he didn't go inside the Statue of Liberty because it would be nice to say that, for once in his life, he spent some time inside of a woman." Vintage Maher.

Freedom From Religion Foundation loves abortion and hates the Catholic Church, so it was fitting that it spent over \$200,000 in full-page ads condemning the church.

Sounding like 19th century nativists, the atheists sounded the alarms in a recent edition of the *New York Times* warning us of “A Dangerous Mix.” What was so scary? The Pope’s speech before the Congress. On the same day, in the *Washington Post*, the same crazies blasted the Congress for inviting the leader of the “aggressively homophobic, patriarchal and undemocratic religion.”

The microphone was hot when CNN picked up a rant by a violent woman who threatened to throw her shoe at the Pope’s head.

Violence was more than threatened when vandals wrote “Saint of Genocide” on a headstone at the Carmel Mission in California where Saint Junipero Serra is buried.

They poured green paint on a statue of this champion of human rights (the Pope canonized Father Serra in September), smashing headstones with blood-red paint; only the headstones of people of European descent were targeted by the racists.

They were encouraged by people such as Randy S. Woodley, a professor with little credentials who teaches at a “Christian” school in Oregon: without a scintilla of evidence, this “Intercultural” guru blamed Serra for torturing Indians. Pity his students.

Alex Jones is known for dabbling in conspiracies, so it came as no surprise that this radio talk-show genius would accuse the Pope of hiring mercenaries to shield him from immigrants.

Meanwhile, the deep-thinkers at Charisma News were raising the question, “Why so Many People Think Pope Francis is the Antichrist?” Similarly, some guy named Tom Horn showed up on the online “Jim Bakker Show” wondering whether the Pope is “demonically inspired.”

George Will showcased his brilliance on all matters Catholic when he lambasted the Pope for allegedly standing “against modernity, rationality, science and, ultimately . . . open

societies.”

Someone should ask Will if he knows which institution gave us the first universities, the Age of Science, and the world’s greatest music and art, just for starters.

Judge Andrew Napolitano went off the rails when he accused the Pope of changing the church’s long-standing teaching that abortion is murder. He is factually wrong— nothing of the sort ever happened. Worse, he throws dirt at the Pope by branding him a “false prophet”; this is the kind of lunacy we are accustomed to hearing from those in the academy or the asylum.

To top things off, Daily Kos writer Frank Coccozzelli is so upset with me for not criticizing the normally level-headed judge that he incorrectly attributes to me words written by Napolitano.

Many notable conservatives were critical of the Pope’s previous remarks on capitalism and income inequality. Disagreeing with the Pope is entirely acceptable, which is why such commentary merits no attention in this article.

I only wish they listened more attentively to what Pope Francis said in the United States, instead of relying on his past, admittedly controversial, remarks. For example, in his address before the Congress, the pope called business a “noble vocation, directed to producing wealth and improving the world.” That’s a far cry from his previous, Bernie Sanders-type, comments.

Pope Francis is open to fair criticism, but when facts are distorted, they need to be corrected. Worse, the kind of rank anti-Catholicism voiced by Coulter cannot go unchallenged. It’s about time conservatives called her out for her hate speech.

CORRECTION GRANTED

A recent story in the *Los Angeles Times* on immigration and the Catholic Church said that Bill Donohue and the Catholic League were opposed to immigration reform. This is not true, we said. (In fact, we don't know anyone who doesn't want some reforms.) After doing some fact-checking, the paper corrected the story in a later edition.

POPE SAYS "LEFTISTS" EXPLOIT ABUSE ISSUE

Last May, Pope Francis spoke about allegations that the bishop of Osorno, Chile, Juan Barros, was complicit in a crime of priestly sexual abuse. The bishop, who was installed in March, has come under fire for covering up the abuses of Father Fernando Karadima. The priest was found guilty by the Vatican in 2011; the following year a Chilean court dismissed claims against him because the statute of limitations had expired.

It should be noted that the bishop's principal accuser, Juan Carlos Cruz, a gay man, was 15 when the alleged abuse occurred *and it did not end until he was 23!* Moreover, we know that a Vatican inquiry was sufficient for Pope Francis to take the bishop's side. "The Osorno community is suffering because it's dumb," he said. He explained that it "has let its head be filled with what politicians say, judging a bishop without any proof." Then the pope got specific: "Don't be led by the nose by the leftists who orchestrated all of this."

Pope Francis could have admonished the crowd not to be manipulated by critics of the Church, or by those with an agenda. Instead, he identified “leftists.” Much the same could be said about those who have sought to exploit the homosexual scandal here at home.

Professional victims’ groups such as the Survivors Network of those Abused by Priests (SNAP), along with their steeple-chasing lawyer/donors—Jeffrey Anderson is the worst of many—are leftists who hate the Catholic Church. Ditto for bishopaccountability.org, a partisan website that is anything but fair. Left-wing journalists at the *National Catholic Reporter*, which rejects the Church’s teachings on sexuality, have also exploited this issue, as have leftists in the secular media, both reporters and pundits.

Too many bishops and priests have been falsely accused by those with a left-wing agenda to dismiss the pope’s concerns. The Catholic League commends him for his courage.

“CHRISTIAN LIVES DON’T MATTER”

Here is what Chris Harper-Mercer said to his victims just before he killed them in Oregon: “Are you Christian?” After they stood up he said, “Good, because you’re Christian, you are going to see God in just about one second.” He then shot them. Another eyewitness said that after he asked if they were Christian, “then they were shot in the head. If they said no, or didn’t answer, they were shot in the legs.”

The following media outlets were among those that reported on this story but never mentioned that Christians were singled

out:

- ABC World News Tonight
- CBS Evening News
- NBC Nightly News
- PBS News Hour
- New York Times
- USA Today
- Slate
- Salon
- Gawker
- Daily Beast
- Yahoo
- Huffington Post
- Associated Press [This accounts for why so many papers across the nation made no mention of Christians.]

If African Americans or Muslims had been singled out, President Obama would have gone ballistic, Al Sharpton would be calling for street rallies, and CAIR would be asking for congressional investigations. But because Christians are being cherry picked for murder, there is no call to arms. Indeed, many major media outlets aren't even telling the truth. It's obvious—"Christian Lives *Don't* Matter"—either here or abroad.