Anti-Christian programming must stop

Don Wildmon
Executive Director
National Federation for Decency

Recently I visited with a very fine Christian gentleman who was not familiar with our work. Being one who seldom watches television, and knowing that we would be visiting, he decided to watch television for a couple of nights prior to our meeting.

He told me of one program in which a very derogatory statement was made concerning Christians. He said he was hurt and offended by the program, and that the comment was totally unnecessary. When I told him that the networks are anti-Christian in their programming, it was a learning experience for him.

What do I mean when I say the networks are anti-Christian? I do not mean that they are indifferent to the Christian faith. I mean that they are clearly hostile to and prejudiced and biased against Christians and Christianity. Having monitored television for nine years, I know of only one program cast in a modern day setting which depicted anyone being a Christian in a positive manner.

Some months back, the research team of Lichter and Rothman made the most indepth study ever conducted of those who are responsible for our entertainment programs. Those researched represented the "cream of television's creative community."

Of the people who control television, who tell us what we can watch on the networks, 59% were raised in Jewish homes, 25% in Protestant homes, and 12% in Catholic homes. (This compares with a population which is 67% Protestant, 22% Catholic and 2.5% Jewish.) At the present time 93% of these people say they seldom or never attend worship and 44% currently claim no religion at all.

Lichter and Rothman said that 97% of these people believe a woman has the right to decide on abortion, only 5% strongly agree that homosexuality is morally wrong, only 16% strongly agree that adultery is morally wrong, 69% feel the government should redistribute the income in our society, and 45% believe the government should guarantee everyone a job.

When asked what groups they would give the most influence to if they could reshape society, they placed religion next to last, listed only above the military.

Quoting the study, "...two out of three believe that TV entertainment should be a major force for social reform. This is perhaps the single most striking finding in our study. According to television's creators, they are not in it just for the money. They also seek to move their audience toward their own vision of the good society."

Programs which belittle or demean the Jewish religion and Jewish people are, and should be, unacceptable. However, those responsible for our entertainment programs night after night air programs which belittle or demean Christianity and Christians.

Ben Stein, in his book *The View From Sunset Boulevard*, says that "...the attitudes of the people who create television coincide almost exactly with the picture on television." If Stein is correct, and we believe he is, then the anti-Christian programming is simply a reflection of the bias and prejudice against Christian people by those who are responsible for that programming.

It is time for this bias and prejudice to end. There is no place for it in our society. Along with a 35% reduction of sex, violence and profanity on the networks this fall, Christian Leaders for Responsible Television has called for an immediate end to this ugliness.

CLRTV was right in saying that this bias and prejudice against Christians and Christianity must immediately cease. Hopefully, those responsible for the programming will respond positively. Our society has no room for people who use television to spread bigotry toward those who choose to follow Christ. There is no room for anti-Christian programs just as there is no room for anti-semitic programming.

Fairminded people of all faiths agree with that premise.

Don

Prohibition on funds to teach secular humanism ended

Utah Senator Orrin Hatch's amendment to the Education for Economic Security Act, which bars federally funded magnet schools from teaching secular humanism, is dead. Congress quietly excised Section 509 from the bill before voting to renew it for another year. President Reagan signed the revised bill into law.

Hatch forced inclusion of the anti-humanist clause in 1984. A 1985 news story made the amendment public. Reaction from the humanist community was swift. Isaac Asimov and a coalition of other humanists filed a lawsuit. The government responded to the pressure by dropping the language with almost no public comment.

Adoption denied—couple too "religious"

Liberty magazine recently carried a story about a couple in the Los Angeles area who wanted to adopt a 14-year-old girl. The girl's father had committed adultery and a divorce resulted. Both her father and mother remarried. The young girl did not want to live with either her mother or father and ran away from home. She became a ward of the court and eventually ended up in the home of the couple who wanted to adopt her.

When the couple told the girl they wanted to adopt her, she put her arms around them and told them how much she wanted to live with them. Both parents of the girl agreed to the adoption, but her mother later changed her mind stating that adoption would make it "too easy for her father. He should have to pay for what he did."

When the case came to court, the judge told the prospective parents that he had already made up his mind.

"But, Your Honor," the couple's attorney protested, "the case has not been heard." The judge was adamant. The case was over before it had begun. Their petition for the girl was denied.

A few days later the couple received a letter from the judge, telling them why he had decided against them, even without hearing the case. Their home, the judge said, was "too religious." Neither the judge nor the case worker had visited their home. They had asked no questions concerning their religious beliefs. They only knew that the prospective parents took their Christian faith seriously and that was, in the opinion of the judge and case worker, enough to disqualify the couple as adoptive parents!

NFD JOURNAL

Volume 10 Number 3

A publication of the National Federation for Decency. Published monthly except May/June and November/December combined editions. Mailing address is Post Office Drawer 2440, Tupelo, MS 38803. Phone 601/844-5036. Subscription rate $15 per year.

Executive Editor: Donald E. Wildmon
Editor: Randall Murphree
NFD STAFF
Donald E. Wildmon, Executive Director
Larry Durham, Data Processing Manager
Randall Murphree, NFD Journal Editor
Forrest Ann Daniels, Executive Secretary
Sid Garner, Coordinator of Local Chapters
Allen Wildmon, Director of Public Relations
Secretarial Staff: *Tamra Durham, Sharon Cole, Mickie Wildmon, Kellea Creely, Kay McCarter.*
Part Time Staff:*Jessica O'Callaghan, Nathan Lowe*

The National Federation for Decency is a Christian organization promoting the Biblical ethic of decency in the American society with primary emphasis on television and other media.

Coca-Cola ceases porn venture in Australia

In response to letters concerning Coca-Cola's distribution of pornographic films in Australia, Coca-Cola Chairman Roberto Goizueta writes that a member of their joint venture, without Coca-Cola's knowledge, distributed an "adult" film but ceased as soon as Coca-Cola learned of it and since then that activity has stopped completely.

Coca-Cola had been involved in a partnership with RCA to distribute the porn films in Australia. Coke's address is: Chrm. Roberto C. Goizueta, P.O. Drawer 1734, Atlanta, GA 30301.

Playboy says porn efforts hurt, then changes mind

Playboy magazine is becoming somewhat uneasy about giving out information on how badly they have been hurt by the NFD and other groups in efforts to persuade stores to stop selling pornographic magazines.

The *New York City Tribune* did an interview with *Playboy* to assess the damage done the magazine by loss of sales. Saul Stone, national advertising director of *Playboy*, in the interview said that the publication has been damaged financially by the efforts of NFD and other groups. "Yeah, they've hurt us, but not to a great extent." He said the number of advertising pages in the magazine has dropped by about 20 percent in the last two years. Retail sales have gone down about 18 percent.

However, a short time later, Stone called the paper to reverse his position. "They have not had any effect on us," he said.

7-Eleven pushes legalized gambling in Florida

7-Eleven, the leading retailer of porno magazines in America, has joined the effort to bring legalized gambling to Florida. 7-Eleven is helping lead the push to legalize gambling in the Sunshine state, offering petitions for a statewide lottery in their local outlets. According to the Bradenton, Florida, *Herald*, "7-Eleven stores in Manatee County and thoughout the state held a signature drive in November to gain support for a state lottery."

County Commissioner Ed Chance thinks the liabilities of a lottery outweigh its benefits. "A state lottery is the first step to casino gambling. I don't see where it can do any good and I don't think we need it. The stores that would sell it stand to gain. They have a vested interest. It will mean someone can walk into a 7-Eleven and get a *Penthouse*, a six-pack of beer and a lottery ticket all at the same time."

Rep. Peggy Simone of Bradenton said her studies have shown that people who are least able to afford the lottery ticket are the people who buy them.

Doug Reed, media relations manager for 7-Eleven, the company which evidently thinks there aren't enough Christians in the country who care to make a difference, said the company is performing a "public service" by providing a place to collect signatures. "Also, if a lottery does come...we would request to be an outlet. It would be a good deal for 7-Eleven too."

W.T. Huntley, owner of 200 Jiffy stores in Florida, said he is morally opposed to the lottery. Huntley, a United Methodist layman, said: "It might be good business, but there's a point in time when we ought to think about things other than good business. It's morally wrong and I don't think it makes for a healthy state."

Florida governor joins child abuse effort by 7-Eleven

Florida Gov. Bob Graham has thrown his support behind a campaign by Southland Corporation to combat child abuse in the state.

Southland, owner of the 7-Eleven convenience store chain, is the leading retailer of porno magazines in America. Estimates say that 7-Eleven makes as much as $30,000,000 a year from their porn sales. The company has pledged $200,000 to help fight child abuse. Many in the public feel that much of the child abuse is a result of the 7-Eleven sold pornography. Southland had a similar campaign earlier in the state of Texas. A seminar in Houston sponsored by 7-Eleven was picketed by the Houston Federation for Decency because of 7-Eleven's porn sales.

Many people feel that the child abuse effort by Southland is a public relations effort to cover up negative publicity the company has received from their lucrative porno magazine sales.

Avon aids porn sales

Avon Products, Inc. has decided to get into the porn for profit business by way of their subsidiary, Greater American Magazines. Greater American is a subscription mail order service which offers *Playboy* magazine for sale.

Judith Reisman, in a study funded by Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention in cooperation with American University in Washington, D.C., found that of 2,016 cartoons portrayed in the three leading pornographic magazines, *Playboy* had the highest percentage of child sex cartoons.

Depicted in the cartoons were children having sex with older people, gang rape of little children, fathers sexually abusing their daughters, and Santa Claus murdering a child. Seventy-five percent of the cartoons involved children in violent or sexual acts. The address: Chairman Hicks Waldron, Avon, 9 W. 57th St., New York, NY 10019.

TV industry calls decency supporters "fanatics"

Mimi Jaffee of Montebello, California, recently called television station KTLA in Hollywood to complain about a program. In the course of the conversation, Mrs. Jaffee was told that people who are mem-

Your opinion counts

What effect would a Pat Robertson race for President have on the political process?

Our question this month: Would our political process be helped, hurt, or unaffected should Pat Robertson run for President? Please understand that we are not asking if you would vote for Mr. Robertson. We are simply asking, in your opinion, what effect his candidacy would have on the political process should he decide to run.

We want your opinion. Clip the form below and return it to us, or simply write your answer on a sheet of paper. We will print the results in the next issue of the *NFD Journal*.

We will publish what we consider to be the best replies pro and con. Please keep your comments to 150 words.

Because of a short press deadline, not enough responses had come in from last month's question to print the results. We will carry the results in the next issue.

Your Opinion Counts Response Form

Would the political process be helped, hurt, or unaffected should Pat Robertson run for President?

( ) Helped ( ) Hurt ( ) Unaffected

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ *State* _____ *Zip* _____

Return to: Your Opinion Counts, NFD, P.O. Drawer 2440, Tupelo, MS 38803.