

## About Our Methodology

### ***Company Selection***

- We select companies from industries with the greatest potential to impact free speech and religious freedom, which primarily covers the largest financial service providers, social media platforms, providers of cloud services, and other companies providing important digital services.
- This focus means we score companies from the following Fortune 1000 sectors for the 2024 edition of the Viewpoint Diversity Score Business Index:
  - Business Services
  - Financials
  - Technology
  - Telecommunications
- Companies outside of the Fortune 1000 or our scored sectors may request to participate. While we cannot accommodate all sectors and companies, we are happy to consider the requests of companies who are:
  - headquartered in the United States;
  - employ at least 500 full-time staff members in the United States or have annual revenues of \$1 billion or more; and are
  - *not* subsidiaries (with some exceptions), government entities, or non-profits.

### ***Data***

- Data comes from the following sources:
  - voluntary disclosures made by responding to the Viewpoint Diversity Survey (these factor into many, but not all, indicators)
  - information available to the public online from July 2023 through April 2024, which includes company reports, filings, press releases, terms of service, community standards, general use policies, and third-party statements (this factors into many, but not all, indicators)
- Both voluntary disclosures and public information are used to varying degrees to score each indicator, with some indicators relying exclusively on one or the other.

### ***U, I, and N Scores***

- Many performance indicators have additional U (“Unresponsive”), I (“Insufficient Disclosure”), and N (“Not Applicable”) scores available as alternatives to simple numerical scores.
- U: Worth 0 points, a U score counts toward a company’s total points possible and influences their overall rating. Companies get “U” when information for a different score required a Survey response and the company did not respond.
- I: Worth 0 points, an I score counts toward a company’s total points possible and influences their overall rating. Companies get “I” when publicly available information or a Survey response was vague, unclear, potentially problematic, irrelevant, or incomplete.
- N: An N score means that the question’s possible points are exempted from the total points possible on the Index. N scores do not influence a company’s overall rating because they signify that the company does not engage in the activity in question.

## Market Performance Indicators

**Terms of Use/ Service Avoid Unclear or Imprecise Terms:** Do all product or service-related policies that pertain to 1) denial or termination of service, 2) restriction of digital accounts, or 3) content censorship avoid unclear or imprecise terms that are subject to different meanings and could be used to suppress particular viewpoints of customers, sellers, creators, users, or external stakeholders? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether such policies avoid these terms. See our [Market Resource](#) for details.

**Harmful Conduct Policies Apply Equally:** If any product or service-related policies prohibit legitimately harmful behavior such as “harassment” or “bullying”, do such policies 1) apply equally to everyone irrespective of personal traits or identifiers and 2) avoid restricting the expression of viewpoints based on subjective judgments about whether some members of a protected group may find an idea offensive, hurtful, misguided, or otherwise objectionable? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether such policies meet these criteria. See our [Market Resource](#) for details.

**Terms of Use/Service Avoid Viewpoint Discrimination:** Do all product or service-related policies that pertain to 1) denial or termination of service, 2) restriction of digital accounts, or 3) content censorship refrain from imposing viewpoint-based restrictions on speech? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether such policies restrict speech in this way. See our [Market Resource](#) for details.

**Public Anti-Viewpoint Discrimination Policy:** Does the company publicly disclose a policy that prohibits 1) discrimination, 2) denial or termination of service, 3) restriction of digital accounts, or 4) content censorship based on the religious and ideological viewpoint(s) of customers, sellers, creators, users, or other stakeholders? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on how well their policy reflects the elements and principles of our model [Product and Service Viewpoint Equality Policy](#).

**Notice of Content or Service Restrictions:** Does the company have a notice policy requiring the company to provide specific notifications to customers, sellers, creators and/or users affected by a decision to 1) deny or terminate service, 2) restrict digital accounts, or 3) censor content? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on whether they tell the user what is restricted, why it is restricted, and how long it will be restricted within 24 hours after censoring the customer’s content or restricting the customer’s access to services. See [Appendix A](#) for further guidance.

**CSR/ESG Reporting Includes Freedom of Expression and Belief:** If the company publicly issues one or more reports regarding its corporate social responsibility (CSR), environmental, social and governance practices (ESG), human rights, or civil rights, does the most recent report address the company’s efforts to protect its customers’, sellers’, creators’, users’, or other external stakeholders’ 1) freedom of expression and/or 2) freedom of religion or belief (FoRB)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on how many times the most recent reports reference free speech or free exercise of religion, with a full 3 points for 3 or more references.

**Respects Vendor Freedom in Hiring and Employment:** Does the company have a policy affirming that it respects the freedom of vendors, suppliers, and contractors to make determinations about their own hiring and employment policies consistent with their mission, values, and applicable laws? Companies

earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how well any disclosed policy reflects the elements and principles of our model [Third-Party Workforce Freedom Policy](#).

**Respects Vendor Freedom Concerning DEI Practices:** Does the company respect the freedom of third parties (e.g., vendors, suppliers, and/or contractors) to determine their own workforce policies or programming related to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) consistent with their mission, values, and applicable laws? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether adoption of such programming or policy statements is required to do business with the company.

**Prohibits Viewpoint Discrimination Against Vendors:** Does the company have a policy prohibiting discrimination against third parties (e.g., vendors, suppliers, or contractors) based on religion or ideology, and/or affirming respect for third parties' free speech or religious freedom? Company earns 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how many of the following elements are found within any disclosed policy: prohibiting discrimination based on religion, prohibiting discrimination based on ideology, affirming free speech, or affirming free exercise of religion.

**Criteria for Restricting Service or Content Disclosed:** Does the company affirm that all guidelines, policies, and standards pertaining to the following actions are accessible on its main public website: 1) denying or terminating service, 2) restricting digital accounts, or 3) censoring content? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they disclose all such things online.

**Corporate Blacklist(s) Disclosed:** Does the company disclose on its main public website the existence of A) any non-public internal list(s) or database(s) used or consulted to 1) deny or terminate service, 2) restrict digital accounts, or 3) censor user content, and B) the process governing how persons and/or groups are placed on such internal list(s)/database(s)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they make such a disclosure online.

**NGO Requests to Censor or Restrict Service Disclosed:** If the company receives requests or recommendations by (third-party) non-government organizations (NGOs) to 1) deny or terminate service, 2) restrict digital accounts, or 3) censor content, does it disclose the following about each request or recommendation: A) the name of the (third-party) NGO requesting or recommending action by the company, B) each action requested (1, 2, or 3), C) the rationale for the request or recommendation, and D) the company's response to the request or recommendation? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they make such a disclosure online.

**Government Requests to Censor or Restrict Service Disclosed:** If the company receives requests or recommendations by government entities to 1) deny or terminate service, 2) restrict digital accounts, or 3) censor content, does it disclose the following about each request/recommendation: A) the name of the government entity requesting or recommending action by the company, B) each action requests (1, 2, or 3), C) the rationale for the request or recommendation, and D) the company's response to the request or recommendation? Companies earn 0–3 points based on their Survey response and whether they make such a disclosure online.

## Workplace Performance Indicators

**Policy Promotes Respect for Diverse Beliefs at Work:** Does the company publicly disclose a policy aimed at ensuring that everyone is respected in the workplace, regardless of their religious or ideological beliefs? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on how well their publicly available, online policy reflects the elements and principles of our model [Viewpoint Diversity Policy](#).

**Career Webpage(s) Affirm(s) Viewpoint Diversity:** Do the company's career-related, public webpage(s) or blog(s) describe its workplace culture using one or more terms synonymous with 1) viewpoint diversity, 2) religious diversity, and/or 3) ideological diversity? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on how many times such resources reference these or synonymous terms from [Appendix C](#).

**DEI Reporting Includes Viewpoint Diversity:** If the company publicly reports on its performance and/or commitment to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) in the workforce, do the most recent reports reference 1) viewpoint diversity, 2) religious diversity, 3) ideological diversity, or synonymous terms? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on the number of references, with a full 3 points for 3 or more. See [Appendix C](#) for a list of synonymous terms.

**Workplace Policy Prohibits Religious Discrimination:** Does the company's primary non-discrimination or equal employment opportunity policy include "religion" as a protected category? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on whether it does.

**Policy Respects Exercise of Civil Rights Outside Work:** Does the company state in a policy that it respects the freedom of all employees to exercise their civil rights of freedom of speech, free exercise of religion, freedom of association, peaceable assembly, and protest outside of work? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how many of those civil liberties such a policy protects. See our model [Off-Duty Civil Rights Policy](#) for an example.

**No Undue Restrictions on Expressive Activity Outside Work:** Does the company refrain from imposing any significant restrictions on the religious or political expression or activity of employees outside of work, other than the acceptable limitations contained in our [Off-Duty Civil Rights Policy](#)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how many of the following civil liberties they restrict: free speech, free exercise of religion, free association, peaceable assembly, and peaceful protest outside of work.

**Firm-Wide Diversity Council Promotes Viewpoint Diversity:** If the company has a firm-wide workforce diversity board or council, does its mission statement or statement of purpose/objectives include encouraging or promoting one or more principles synonymous with 1) viewpoint diversity and 2) religious diversity? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and the degree to which their council's mission statement includes a commitment to viewpoint and religious diversity. See [Appendix E](#) for further guidance.

**Talent Acquisition Prioritizes Viewpoint Diversity:** In the last 12 months, has the company taken specific steps to enhance its external image as a respectful workplace that values its employees' diverse religious, political, and ideological views? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they held at least one specific recruitment initiative or event to attract employees

with diverse religious, political, and ideological views.

**DEI Training Promotes Respect for Different Viewpoints:** If the company offers or requires some form of diversity- or DEI-related training, does it encourage or promote the importance of respecting and learning from different ideological and religious viewpoints in the workplace? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how thoroughly such training covers respect for both religious and ideological diversity.

**Workforce Training Avoids Divisive Concepts:** Does the company refrain from teaching or advocating [divisive concepts](#) in employee training(s) or workplace-related material(s) that denigrate certain people because of their religion, race, or sex? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they teach or advocate such concepts to employees.

**Clear Process for Forming Employee Resource Groups:** Does the company disclose a written policy or process for employees to request and form Employee Resource Groups (ERGs)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they maintain such a policy.

**At Least One Faith-specific ERG recognized:** Does the company officially recognize one or more Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) specific to different religious faiths (e.g., Christian, Jew, Muslim, Hindu, Buddhist, Sikh, LDS/Latter-Day Saints, Jehovah's Witness) in the workforce? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they recognize at least one ERG specific to a religious faith, recognize an interfaith ERG, or are willing to form one of the two at employees' request.

**Each Religious ERG has Executive Sponsor or Champion:** If the company has one or more religious employee resource groups (ERGs), including interfaith ERGs, do some or all of them have an executive sponsor or champion (i.e., a sponsor or champion at the vice president level or higher)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how many of their existing religious ERGs have an executive sponsor.

**All Active ERGs Displayed on Company Website:** Does the company display all active employee resource groups (ERGs) on its website? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they maintain such lists publicly online.

**Equal Access and Opportunity for Religious ERGs:** If the company has one or more religious employee resource groups (ERGs), does the company ensure that religious ERGs have the same access to company resources and opportunities as nonreligious ERGs? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether existing religious ERGs have equal access. See [Appendix D](#) for a list of common resources and opportunities available to ERGs.

**Written Religious Accommodation Policy and Process:** Does the company disclose a written policy and process for employees to request religious accommodation(s) in the workplace? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and which of the following their policy includes: a commitment to religious diversity in the workplace, a definition of undue hardship, specific considerations to determine what is an undue hardship, examples or general types of religious accommodations, and a process for requesting religious accommodations.

**New Hire Training Covers Religious Discrimination:** Are new hires required to attend training that A)

clearly states that religion is protected by the workplace non-discrimination policy, B) includes specific guidelines and/or examples for avoiding religious discrimination and harassment at work, and C) covers the company's religious accommodation policy and procedure(s)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how many of elements A, B, and C their policy includes.

**Supervisor Training Covers Religious Discrimination:** Are supervisors required to attend training that A) clearly states that religion is protected by the workplace non-discrimination policy, B) includes specific guidelines and/or examples for avoiding religious discrimination and harassment at work, and C) covers the company's religious accommodation policy and procedure(s)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and how many of elements A, B, and C their policy includes.

**No Charity Excluded Based on Religious Status or Practice:** If the company provides an employee matching contribution program to facilitate financial or in-kind giving to 501(c)(3) organizations, do matching gift policies avoid language that expressly excludes or threatens to exclude nonprofits based on any of the following factors: 1) religious status, 2) use of funds for religious purposes, or 3) determining employment policies based on sincere religious beliefs? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether their policies avoid such language.

**No Charity Excluded Based on Religious Advocacy:** If the company provides an employee matching contribution program to facilitate financial or in-kind giving to 501(c)(3) organizations, do matching gift policies avoid language that expressly excludes or threatens to exclude nonprofits based on their advocacy for faith-based viewpoints on matters of public concern? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether their policies avoid such language.



## Public Square Performance Indicators

**Less Than 45% of Political Spending Undermined Free Speech:** Did 45 percent or more of the company's political contributions in the last election cycle go to U.S. House or Senate members who have a legislative record of opposing free speech or religious liberty? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on what percentage of their contributions to political campaigns went to such candidates, with a full 3-point score for having less than 45%. See [Appendix F](#) for a list of scored members of Congress.

**At Least 30% of Political Spending Supported Free Speech:** Did 30 percent or more of the company's political contributions in the last election cycle go to U.S. House or Senate members who have a legislative record of supporting free speech or religious liberty? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on what percentage of their contributions to political campaigns went to such candidates, with a full 3-point score for meeting 30%. See [Appendix F](#) for a list of scored members of Congress.

**No Support for Laws Harmful to Fundamental Freedoms:** Has the company refrained from publicly supporting legislation that undermines legal protections for freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief (FoRB) within the last ten years? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on whether they supported adverse legislation or opposed helpful legislation identified in [Appendix G](#).

**No Support for Litigation Harmful to Fundamental Freedoms:** Has the company refrained from publicly supporting any adverse judicial outcomes (court decisions) that undermine legal protections for freedom of expression or freedom of religion or belief within the last ten years? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on whether they have participated in or endorsed certain advocacy campaigns, signed or filed *amicus* briefs, made public statements relating to specific court cases, or provided other relevant support for a litigation outcome in [Appendix H](#)'s list of scored cases.

**No Opposition to Shareholder Action for Viewpoint Diversity:** Within the last five years, has the company refrained from opposing any shareholder action to promote viewpoint diversity, free speech, or religious liberty in either a proxy statement or in an official response to the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their response to such shareholder resolutions, including requests for no-action from the SEC and recommendations against voting for them.

**Firm Publicly Supported Freedom of Speech or Religion:** In the last year, has the company engaged in direct or indirect advocacy for the defense of free speech or freedom of religion or belief (FoRB)? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether, in the last year, they supported at least one campaign, initiative, research project, or media piece helping free speech or free exercise of religion, made a donation of \$1,000 or more to the same effect, adopted our [Pledge to Respect Freedom of Expression and Belief](#), or engaged in another qualifying activity.

**No Support for Non-Profits Hostile to Free Speech:** Within the last five years, has the company refrained from providing financial support or partnering with groups/causes that advocate for censorship, deplatforming, or the passage of legislation that would undermine free speech or religious freedom? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and whether they partnered with or gave money to any such groups. See [Appendix I](#) for a list of scored organizations.

**No Charity Excluded Based on Religious Status or Practice:** If the company makes charitable donations or offers non-profit pricing either directly or through a third party (excluding employee matching charitable contribution programs), do charitable giving policies avoid language that expressly excludes or threatens to exclude nonprofits based on any of the following factors: 1) religious status, 2) use of funds for religious purposes, or 3) determining employment policies based on sincere religious beliefs? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and on whether their policies avoid such language.

**No Charity Excluded Based on Religious Advocacy:** If the company makes charitable donations or offers non-profit pricing either directly or through a third party (excluding employee matching charitable contribution programs), do charitable giving policies avoid language that expressly excludes or threatens to exclude nonprofits because of their advocacy for faith-based viewpoints on matters of public concern? Companies earn 0–3 points depending on their Survey response and on whether their policies avoid such language.

**Viewpoint Diversity Survey Disclosures:** Did the company answer the current Survey? Companies earn 0–10 points depending on their response and what percent of the survey they completed.



## Appendix A: Responsible Customer/User Notification Practices

### A1: Types of Recommended Notifications

- A) Specific content/services affected by 1) denial of service, 2) digital account restriction(s), and/or 3) content censorship:
- “Content affected” includes, but is not necessarily limited to, posts or content posted/generated by a user, or expressive goods such as books sold on and/or transmitted electronically via a digital medium.
  - “Services affected” include all those listed as examples under the performance indicator.
- B) Specific reason(s) for 1) denial of service, 2) digital account restriction(s), and/or 3) content censorship:
- “Specific reasons” must directly reference the provision(s) of the terms of service or content moderation policy violated by the sanctioned party. General references to “terms of service” or “community standards” do not fulfill B.
  - Must include reference to violating content or action.
- C) Duration of sanction(s)/restriction(s):
- “Duration” must list a specific period of time during which the sanction(s) will be applied, as well as a specific end date for each sanction/restriction in question (unless the company notifies the affected party/parties that the action(s)/sanction(s) is/are permanent).

### A2: Example of Satisfactory VS. Unsatisfactory Notifications

Satisfactory Notification	Unsatisfactory Notification
<p>A) “[Company] is taking the following action(s)/restricting your account/organization.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “You will not be able to post new content for 48 hours.”</li> <li>• “Content you post after 48 hours of this notice until (date) will have its distribution/circulation decreased.”</li> </ul> <p>B) “We are taking the above action(s) because we detected content that violates one or more of the following policies:”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Cite specific policy(ies).]</li> </ul> <p>C) (If not specified above) “Each restriction/sanction specified above will remain in effect for the following period:”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [Restriction/sanction (time period/end date).]</li> </ul>	<p>A) “[Company]” is restricting your account/service...”</p> <p>B) “Because we detected content/activity that violates our terms of service/community guidelines.”</p> <p>C) “Your account/service will continue to be restricted until further notice.”</p>

## **Appendix B: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) References to Freedom of Expression and Belief in Market-based Impact**

### **1. Freedom of Expression Synonymous Term(s):**

- Speech
- Values
- Opinion(s)
- Freedom
- Liberty
- Idea(s)
- Communicate/communication(s)

### **2. Freedom of Religion Synonymous Term(s):**

- Belief(s)
- Faith(s)
- Religion(s)
- Religious Values
- Creed(s)

## **Appendix C: References to Diversity of Viewpoint(s), Ideology, and Religion on Career Webpage(s) and in Reports**

1. Viewpoint Diversity Synonymous Term(s): Diversity of/diverse/different/unique/a broad range of/ a wide array of/ a wide range of:
  - views/viewpoints
  - viewpoint diversity
  - thought(s)
  - ideas
  - opinion(s)
  - point(s) of view
  - way(s) of thinking
  - outlook(s)
2. Ideological Diversity Synonymous Term(s): Diversity of/diverse/different/unique/a broad range of/ a wide array of/ a wide range of:
  - ideology/ideological diversity
  - values
  - belief(s)
  - creed(s)
3. Religious Diversity Synonymous Term(s): Diversity of/diverse/different/unique/a broad range of/ a wide array of/ a wide range of:
  - religion(s)
  - religious diversity
  - faith(s)
  - freedom of religion
  - creed(s)
4. Words and phrases that do not count as terms synonymous to the above: Diversity of/diverse/different/unique/a broad range of/a wide array of/a wide range of:
  - perspective(s) (unless explicitly qualified with “religious,” “faith,” “political, or “ideological”—e.g., “political perspective”)
  - lived experience(s)
  - experience(s)
  - personal/my truth

## **Appendix D: Examples of Resources Relevant to Employee Resource Groups (ERGs)**

1. use of on-site facilities for meetings
2. use of on-site facilities for prayer and meditation
3. use of on-site facilities for religious study or discussion
4. use of internal email and messaging boards for announcements and internal advertising
5. inclusion on public website/ERG webpage
6. stipends/grants/financial support
7. community service under company name/volunteer program
8. opportunities to host and organize recruiting events
9. inclusion on the company's diversity board/council (if the company maintains one)
10. opportunities to speak into company decisions relevant to the ERG's members/communities
11. other resources/opportunities the company specifies

## **Appendix E: Workforce Diversity Board Mission Statement Encourages Viewpoint and Religious Diversity**

### ***Model Diversity Mission Statement Terms:***

1. Viewpoint Diversity: Diversity of/diverse/different/unique/a broad range of/ a wide array of/ a wide range of:
  - Viewpoint diversity
  - Ideological diversity
  - Diversity of thought
  - Diversity of belief
2. Religious Diversity: Diversity of/diverse/different/unique/a broad range of/ a wide array of/ a wide range of:
  - Religious diversity
  - Freedom of religion or belief

### ***Application:***

The workforce diversity board or council should periodically review its mission statement or statement of purpose and objectives to ensure that they are promoting a healthy workplace culture. The mission statement and objectives ought to promote diversity of viewpoint and religion by using terms above in lists 1 and 2.

## Appendix F: Scored Members of Congress

### ***F1: Members Who Sponsored or Co-Sponsored Legislation Harmful to Free Speech or Religious Freedom***

The following recent federal legislation was considered harmful to free speech or religious freedom:

1. For the People Act, S.1, 117th Congress (2021–2022)
2. Equality Act, S.5, 118th Congress (2023-2024)
3. Equality Act, H.R.15, 118th Congress (2023-2024)
4. Equality Act, S.393, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
5. Equality Act, H.R.5, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
6. Equality Act, S.788, 116th Congress (2019-2020)
7. Equality Act, H.R.5, 116th Congress (2019-2020)
8. Fairness for All Act, H.R. 1440, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
9. Fairness for All Act, H.R.5331, 116th Congress (2019-2020)
10. Do No Harm Act, S.1206, 118th Congress, (2023-2024)
11. Do No Harm Act, H.R.2725, 118th Congress (2023-2024)
12. Do No Harm Act, S.2752, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
13. Do No Harm Act, H.R.1378, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
14. Respect for Marriage Act, S.4556, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
15. Respect for Marriage Act, H.R.8404, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
16. Right to Contraception Act, S.4557, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
17. Right to Contraception Act, H.R.8373, 117th Congress (2021-2022)

In the table below, a red S indicates sponsorship and a black C indicates co-sponsorship of acts 1 through 17 as listed above:

Member of Congress	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
<b>Merkley, Jeff</b>	S	S		S		S				C		C		C		C	
<b>Klobuchar, Amy</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
<b>Schumer, Charles E.</b>	C	C		C		C											
<b>Durbin, Richard J.</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C			
<b>Leahy, Patrick J.</b>	C			C		C						C		C			
<b>Whitehouse, Sheldon</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
<b>Gillibrand, Kirsten E.</b>	C	C		C		C						C		C		C	
<b>Van Hollen, Chris</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
<b>Baldwin, Tammy</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
<b>Bennet, Michael F.</b>	C	C		C		C								C			
<b>Cardin, Benjamin L.</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C			
<b>Carper, Thomas R.</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
<b>Warren, Elizabeth</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
<b>Booker, Cory A.</b>	C	C		C		C				S		S		C		C	
<b>Murphy, Christopher</b>	C	C		C		C						C		C		C	
<b>Warner, Mark R.</b>	C	C		C		C										C	
<b>Wyden, Ron</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C			
<b>Murray, Patty</b>	C	C		C		C				C		C		C			



Menendez, Robert	C	C	C	C		C				C	C	C		C		C	
Peters, Gary C.	C	C		C		C								C			
Blumenthal, Richard	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Casey, Robert P., Jr.	C	C		C		C								C			
Feinstein, Dianne	C	C		C		C				C		C		S		C	
Sanders, Bernard	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Markey, Edward J.	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		S	
Smith, Tina	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Stabenow, Debbie	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
King, Angus S., Jr.	C	C		C		C								C			
Duckworth, Tammy	C	C		C		C				C		C				C	
Cantwell, Maria	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Kaine, Tim	C	C		C		C								C		C	
Reed, Jack	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Brown, Sherrod	C	C		C		C				C		C				C	
Coons, Christopher A.	C	C		C		C						C		C			
Heinrich, Martin	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Schatz, Brian	C	C		C		C								C		C	
Cortez Masto, Catherine	C	C		C		C				C		C		C			
Hirono, Mazie K.	C	C		C		C						C		C		C	
Rosen, Jacky	C	C		C		C						C		C		C	
Hassan, Margaret Wood	C	C		C		C						C					
Shaheen, Jeanne	C	C		C		C				C		C		C		C	
Tester, Jon	C	C		C		C											
Sinema, Kyrsten	C	C		C		C											
Hickenlooper, John W.	C	C		C						C		C		C		C	
Kelly, Mark	C	C		C										C			
Lujan, Ben Ray	C	C		C			C			C		C		C		C	
Warnock, Raphael G.	C	C		C										C			
Padilla, Alex	C	C		C						C		C		C		C	
Ossoff, Jon	C	C		C										C		C	
Sarbanes, John P.	S		C		C		C				C		C		C		
Pelosi, Nancy	C		C		C		C										
Lofgren, Zoe	C		C		C		C				C		C				
Hoyer, Steny H.	C		C		C		C						C				
Clyburn, James E.	C		C		C		C						C				
Schiff, Adam B.	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		
Smith, Adam	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		C
Espaillet, Adriano	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		C
Sires, Albio	C				C		C						C		C		
Hastings, Alcee L.	C				C		C						C				
Adams, Alma S.	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		C
Bera, Ami	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		C
Carson, Andre	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		
Kim, Andy	C		C		C		C				C		C		C		C

Levin, Andy	C				C		C							C		
Kuster, Ann M.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Eshoo, Anna G.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Foster, Bill	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Rush, Bobby L.	C				C		C						C			
Schneider, Bradley Scott	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Sherman, Brad	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Lawrence, Brenda L.	C				C		C						C	C		
Boyle, Brendan F.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Higgins, Brian	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Pappas, Chris	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Bush, Cori	C		C		C						C		C			C
Price, David E.	C				C		C						C	C		C
Scott, David	C		C		C		C				C		C			C
Trone, David J.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Phillips, Dean	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Haaland, Debra A.	C				C		C									
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Ross, Deborah K.	C		C		C						C		C	C		C
Kilmer, Derek	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
DeGette, Diana	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Beyer, Donald S., Jr.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Norcross, Donald	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Evans, Dwight	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Blumenauer, Earl	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Case, Ed	C		C		C		C				C		C			C
Connolly, Gerald E.	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Meng, Grace	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Jeffries, Hakeem S.	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Johnson, Henry C. "Hank," Jr.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Omar, Ilhan	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Raskin, Jamie	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Schakowsky, Janice D.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Golden, Jared F.	C		C		C		C									
Huffman, Jared	C		C		C		C				C		C			
Nadler, Jerrold	C		C		C		C				C		C		<b>S</b>	C
Cooper, Jim	C				C		C						C	C		
Gomez, Jimmy	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Panetta, Jimmy	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Courtney, Joe	C		C		C		C				C		C			
Morelle, Joseph D.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C
Beatty, Joyce	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		
Vargas, Juan	C		C		C		C						C	C		C
Chu, Judy	C		C		C		C				C		C	C		C

Brownley, Julia	C		C		C		C			C		C		
Kahele, Kaiali'i	C				C							C		
Clark, Katherine M.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
Castor, Kathy	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Manning, Kathy E.	C		C		C						C		C	S
Mfume, Kweisi	C		C		C					C		C		
Underwood, Lauren	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
Blunt Rochester, Lisa	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
Frankel, Lois	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Trahan, Lori	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Correa, J. Luis	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Dean, Madeleine	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
Kaptur, Marcy	C		C		C		C				C		C	
Newman, Marie	C				C						C		C	C
DeSaulnier, Mark	C		C		C		C			C		C		
Quigley, Mike	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Thompson, Mike	C		C		C		C			C		C		
Jones, Mondaire	C				C						C		C	C
Barragan, Nanette Diaz	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Williams, Nikema	C		C		C					C		C		C
Torres, Norma J.	C		C		C		C			C		C		
DeFazio, Peter A.	C				C		C				C		C	C
Welch, Peter	C	C			C		C		C			C		C
Jayapal, Pramila	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Krishnamoorthi, Raja	C		C		C		C				C		C	
Grijalva, Raúl M.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Kelly, Robin L.	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
DeLauro, Rosa L.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Gallego, Ruben	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Bishop, Sanford D., Jr.	C		C		C		C				C			
Jacobs, Sara	C		C		C					C		C		C
Casten, Sean	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Davids, Sharice	C		C		C		C			C		C		
Jackson Lee, Sheila	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
Cohen, Steve	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Horsford, Steven	C		C		C		C				C		C	C
Wild, Susan	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Lee, Susie	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
DelBene, Suzan K.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Bonamici, Suzanne	C		C		C		C			C		C		C
Deutch, Theodore E.	C				C		C						C	C
Leger Fernandez, Teresa	C		C		C						C		C	C
Malinowski, Tom	C				C		C				C		C	C
Demings, Val Butler	C				C		C				C		C	C
Escobar, Veronica	C		C		C		C				C		C	C

Clarke, Yvette D.	C		C		C		C					C			C
Lowenthal, Alan S.	C				C		C					C		C	C
Craig, Angie	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Brown, Anthony G.	C				C		C					C		C	C
Pressley, Ayanna	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Lee, Barbara	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
McCollum, Betty	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	
Keating, William R.	C		C		C		C							C	
Pascrell, Bill, Jr.	C		C		C		C					C		C	
Watson Coleman, Bonnie	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Maloney, Carolyn B.	C				C		C					C		C	C
Pingree, Chellie	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Houlahan, Chrissy	C		C		C		C					C			
Axne, Cynthia	C				C		C							C	C
Kildee, Daniel T.	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Davis, Danny K.	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Cicilline, David N.	C				S		S					C		C	
Dingell, Debbie	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	
Payne, Donald M., Jr.	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Ruppersberger, C. A. Dutch	C		C		C		C					C			
Perlmutter, Ed	C				C		C					C		C	
Johnson, Eddie Bernice	C				C		C					C			
Norton, Eleanor Holmes	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Swalwell, Eric	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	
Vela, Filemon	C				C		C					C			
Pallone, Frank, Jr.	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	
Napolitano, Grace F.	C		C		C		C					C		C	
Stanton, Greg	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	
Moore, Gwen	C		C		C		C							C	C
Cuellar, Henry	C		C		C		C								
Speier, Jackie	C				C		C					C		C	C
Hayes, Jahana	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Auchincloss, Jake	C		C		C							C		C	C
Crow, Jason	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Himes, James A.	C		C		C		C					C		C	C
McGovern, James P.	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Castro, Joaquin	C		C		C		C					C		C	
Harder, Josh	C		C		C		C								
Bass, Karen	C				C		C					C		C	C
Porter, Katie	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Schrier, Kim	C		C		C		C					C		C	C
Sánchez, Linda T.	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	
Veasey, Marc A.	C		C		C		C				C				C
Pocan, Mark	C		C		C		C				C	C		C	C
Takano, Mark	C		S		C		C					C		C	C

Scanlon, Mary Gay	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Doyle, Michael F.	C				C		C					C		C		C
Velazquez, Nydia M.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Tonko, Paul	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Tlaib, Rashida	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Ruiz, Raul	C		C		C		C					C		C		
Larsen, Rick	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Torres, Ritchie	C		C		C					C		C		C		C
Kind, Ron	C				C		C					C				
Carbajal, Salud O.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Maloney, Sean Patrick	C				C		C					C		C		C
Moulton, Seth	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		
Plaskett, Stacey E.	C		C		C		C									C
Lynch, Stephen F.	C		C		C		C					C		C		
Lieu, Ted	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		
Sewell, Terri A.	C		C		C		C							C		
Suozzi, Thomas R.	C				C		C					C		C		
Ryan, Tim	C				C		C					C		C		
Cárdenas, Tony	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Gonzalez, Vicente	C		C		C		C					C				
Scott, Robert C. "Bobby"	C		C		C		C			S		S		C		
Allred, Colin Z.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Lamb, Conor	C				C		C					C		C		
Soto, Darren	C		C		C		C					C		C		C
Butterfield, G. K.	C				C		C							C		
Stevens, Haley M.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
McNerney, Jerry	C				C		C					C		C		
Costa, Jim	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		
Langevin, James R.	C				C		C					C		C		C
Neguse, Joe	C		C		C		C					C		C		C
Garamendi, John	C		C		C		C					C		C		C
Larson, John B.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Yarmuth, John A.	C				C		C					C		C		C
Doggett, Lloyd	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
McBath, Lucy	C		C		C		C			C		C				C
Cartwright, Matt	C		C		C		C					C		C		C
Waters, Maxine	C		C		C		C					C				
Peters, Scott H.	C		C		C		C					C		C		C
Ocasio-Cortez, Alexandria	C		C		C		C					C		C		C
Kirkpatrick, Ann	C				C		C					C		C		C
Delgado, Antonio	C				C		C					C				
Bourdeaux, Carolyn	C				C							C		C		C
Crist, Charlie	C				C		C					C		C		C
Bustos, Cheri	C				C		C					C		C		C
Titus, Dina	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C

Matsui, Doris O.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Cleaver, Emanuel	C		C		C		C				C		C			C
Mrvan, Frank J.	C		C		C					C		C				
Meeks, Gregory W.	C		C		C		C				C		C			C
Bowman, Jamaal	C		C		C						C		C			C
Garcia, Jesus G. "Chuy"	C		C		C		C				C					
Fletcher, Lizzie	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Roybal-Allard, Lucille	C				C		C				C		C			C
Strickland, Marilyn	C		C		C						C		C			C
Levin, Mike	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Aguilar, Pete	C		C		C		C				C		C			
Khanna, Ro	C		C		C		C			C		C				C
Thompson, Bennie G.	C		C		C		C									
Schrader, Kurt	C				C		C				C					C
Neal, Richard E.	C		C		C		C				C		C			
Garcia, Sylvia R.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Rice, Kathleen M.	C				C		C				C					
Lawson, Al, Jr.	C				C		C				C		C			
O'Halleran, Tom	C				C		C				C		C			
Green, Al	C		C		C		C			C				C		C
Fudge, Marcia L.	C				C		C									
Slotkin, Elissa	C		C		C		C				C		C			
Gottheimer, Josh	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Wilson, Frederica S.	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Sherrill, Mikie	C		C		C		C				C		C			C
Murphy, Stephanie N.	C				C		C						C			
McEachin, A. Donald	C				C		C				C		C			C
Wexton, Jennifer	C		C		C		C				C		C			C
Spanberger, Abigail Davis	C		C		C		C			C		C		C		C
Luria, Elaine G.	C				C		C				C		C			C
Fetterman, John		C														
Butler, Laphonza R.		C														
Balint, Becca			C							C						
Brown, Shontel M.			C							C		C				C
Budzinski, Nikki			C													
Caraveo, Yadira			C													
Carter, Troy			C											C		C
Casar, Greg			C							C						
Cherfilus-McCormick, Sheila			C										C			
Crockett, Jasmine			C							C						
Davis, Donald G.			C													
Deluzio, Christopher R.			C							C						
Foushee, Valerie P.			C							C						
Frost, Maxwell			C							C						
Garcia, Robert			C							C						



Perez, Marie Gluesenkamp			C															
Goldman, Daniel S.			C															
Hoyle, Val T.			C															
Ivey, Glenn			C							C								
Jackson, Jeff			C							C								
Jackson, Jonathan L.			C															
Kamlager-Dove, Sydney			C															
Landsman, Greg			C															
Lee, Summer L.			C															
Magaziner, Seth			C															
McClellan, Jennifer L.			C															
McGarvey, Morgan			C							C								
Moskowitz, Jared			C															
Mullin, Kevin			C							C								
Nickel, Wiley			C															
Peltola, Mary Sattler			C															
Pettersen, Brittany			C															
Ramirez, Delia C.			C															
Ryan, Patrick			C															
Sablan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho			C		C		C			C		C						
Salinas, Andrea			C							C								
Scholten, Hillary J.			C															
Sorensen, Eric			C															
Stansbury, Melanie Ann			C							C		C		C		C		
Sykes, Emilia Strong			C															
Thanedar, Shri			C															
Tokuda, Jill N.			C							C								
Vasquez, Gabe			C															
Amo, Gabe			C															
San Nicolas, Michael F. Q.					C		C											
Collins, Susan M.							C								C			
Jones, Doug							C											
Harris, Kamala D.							C											
Udall, Tom							C											
Fitzpatrick, Brian K.									C	C	C							
Hill, Katie									C									
Brindisi, Anthony									C									
Cisneros, Gilbert Ray, Jr.									C									
Clay, Wm. Lacy									C									
Cox, TJ									C									
Cummings, Elijah E.									C									
Cunningham, Joe									C									
Davis, Susan A.									C									
Engel, Eliot L.									C									

Finkenauer, Abby							C											
Gabbard, Tulsi							C											
Heck, Denny							C											
Horn, Kendra S.							C											
Katko, John							C											
Kennedy, Joseph P., III							C											
Lewis, John							C											
Loebsack, David							C											
Lowey, Nita M.							C											
McAdams, Ben							C											
Mucarsel-Powell, Debbie							C											
Peterson, Collin C.							C											
Richmond, Cedric L.							C											
Rose, Max							C											
Rouda, Harley							C											
Serrano, Jose E.							C											
Shalala, Donna E.							C											
Torres Small, Xochitl							C											
Van Drew, Jefferson							C											
Visclosky, Peter J.							C											
González-Colón, Jenniffer							C	C										
Stewart, Chris								S	S									
Kinzinger, Adam							C											
Garbarino, Andrew R.							C											
Moore, Blake D.							C											
Owens, Burgess							C											
Gimenez, Carlos A.							C											
Upton, Fred							C	C										
Curtis, John R.							C	C										
Salazar, Maria Elvira							C											
Diaz-Balart, Mario							C											
Amodei, Mark E.							C	C										
Simpson, Michael K.							C	C										
Malliotakis, Nicole							C											
Stivers, Steve							C											
Reed, Tom							C											
Mace, Nancy							C											
Meijer, Peter							C											
Bishop, Rob									C									
Stefanik, Elise M.									C									
Joyce, David P.									C									
Portman, Rob																C		

## ***F2: Members Who Sponsored or Co-Sponsored Legislation That Would Strengthen Free Speech or Religious Freedom***

The following recent federal legislation was considered helpful to free speech or religious freedom:

1. Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, H.R.1750, 117th Congress (2021–2022)
2. Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, S.656, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
3. Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, H.R.897, 116th Congress (2019-2020)
4. Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act, S.274, 116th Congress (2019-2020)
5. Conscience Protection Act, S.401, 117th Congress (2021-2022)
6. Free Speech Fairness Act, H.R.837, 117th Congress, (2021-2022)
7. Free Speech Fairness Act, H.R.949, 116th Congress (2019-2020)
8. Free Speech Fairness Act, S. 330, 116th Congress (2019-2020)

In the table below, a red S indicates sponsorship and a black C indicates co-sponsorship of acts 1 through 8 as listed above:

Member of Congress	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Kelly, Mike	S		S					
Timmons, William R. IV	C		C					
Cloud, Michael	C		C			C	C	
Allen, Rick W.	C		C				C	
Lesko, Debbie	C		C			C	C	
Gaetz, Matt	C		C				C	
Weber, Randy K., Sr.	C		C			C	C	
Reschenthaler, Guy	C		C					
Grothman, Glenn	C		C			C	C	
Palmer, Gary J.	C		C				C	
Norman, Ralph	C		C			C	C	
Bacon, Don	C		C					
Babin, Brian	C					C		
Rice, Tom	C		C					
Scott, Tim		S		C	C			
Tillis, Thomas		C			C			
Cotton, Tom		C		C	C			
Hyde-Smith, Cindy		C			C			
Hawley, Josh		C		C	C			
Cramer, Kevin		C			C			
Risch, James E.		C		C	C			
Braun, Mike		C		C	C			
Sasse, Ben		C		C	C			
Blunt, Roy		C		C	C			
Lankford, James		C		C	S			S
Lee, Mike		C		C	C			
Cruz, Ted		C		C	C			
Ernst, Joni		C		C				

Daines, Steve		C		C	C			
Wicker, Roger F.		C		C				
Hagerty, Bill		C			C			
Cornyn, John		C		C				
Inhofe, James M.		C		C	C			
Scott, Rick		C			C			
Blackburn, Marsha		C		C	C			
Cassidy, Bill		C		C	C			
Kennedy, John		C		C	C			
Marshall, Roger		C			C			
Hoeven, John		C			C			
Boozman, John		C			C			
Peterson, Collin C.			C					
Aderholt, Robert B.			C			C		
Cole, Tom			C			C	C	
Hartzler, Vicky			C			C	C	
Biggs, Andy			C					
Carter, John R.			C					
Comer, James			C					
Duncan, Jeff			C			C	C	
Fortenberry, Jeff			C					
Flores, Bill			C				C	
Gianforte, Greg			C					
Gibbs, Bob			C				C	
Gohmert, Louie			C					
Hice, Jody B.			C			C	C	
Johnson, Mike			C			C	C	
Jones, Walter B., Jr.			C					
Lamborn, Doug			C					
Loudermilk, Barry			C					
Meadows, Mark			C				C	
Mooney, Alexander X.			C				C	
Posey, Bill			C					
Roe, David P.			C				C	
Rooney, Francis			C					
Smith, Christopher H.			C					
Stewart, Chris			C					
Walker, Mark			C					
Wilson, Joe			C			C		
Wittman, Robert J.			C					
Collins, Chris			C					
Rutherford, John H.			C					
Mitchell, Paul			C					
Budd, Ted			C				C	
Foxx, Virginia			C					
Banks, Jim			C			C	C	

Kelly, Trent			C				C	
Ratcliffe, John			C					
Williams, Roger			C					
Latta, Robert E.			C				C	
LaHood, Darin			C					
Calvert, Ken			C					
Schweikert, David			C					
Olson, Pete			C					
Johnson, Bill			C					
Chabot, Steve			C			C		
Smucker, Lloyd			C					
Long, Billy			C					
Estes, Ron			C				C	
Jordan, Jim			C				C	
Luetkemeyer, Blaine			C				C	
Marchant, Kenny			C					
Steube, W. Gregory			C					
Meuser, Daniel			C					
Enzi, Michael B.				S				
Loeffler, Kelly				C				
Portman, Rob					C			
Moran, Jerry					C			
Fischer, Deb					C			
Barrasso, John					C			
Thune, John					C			
Rounds, Mike					C			
Lummis, Cynthia M.					C			
Rubio, Marco					C			
Crapo, Mike					C			
Scalise, Steve						S	S	
Rouzer, David						C		
Good, Bob						C		
Massie, Thomas						C	C	
Franklin, C. Scott						C		
Keller, Fred						C		
Guest, Michael						C	C	
Smith, Jason							C	
Rogers, Harold							C	
Pence, Greg							C	
Hudson, Richard							C	
Green, Mark E.							C	
Turner, Michael R.							C	
Byrne, Bradley							C	
Wright, Ron							C	
Abraham, Ralph Lee							C	
Griffith, H. Morgan							C	

Conaway, K. Michael							C	
Brooks, Mo							C	
Womack, Steve							C	
Hern, Kevin							C	



## Appendix G: Scored Legislation

### ***G1: Legislation Harming Free Speech or Religious Freedom***

*For the People Act*, S.1 and H.R.1, 117th Congress (2021–2022): The Act imposes unworkable and invasive regulations on the ability of individual Americans and groups of citizens to discuss vital policy issues with elected officials or the public and to exercise constitutionally protected freedoms of speech, association, and religion. The bill also intrudes upon private financial decisions made by everyday citizens, subjecting them to harassment and intimidation simply for giving to causes they believe in.<sup>1</sup>

*Equality Act*, S.5 and H.R.15, 118th Congress (2023–2024); S.393 and H.R.5, 117th Congress (2021–2022); S.788 and H.R.5, 116th Congress (2019–2020): This legislation poses serious threats to religious freedom, free speech, and the progress women have made toward equality in law and culture. Among other things, the law would do the following:<sup>2</sup>

1. harm the over-400,000 children in our nation's foster care system by closing down faith-based adoption and foster care providers who believe children thrive best in a home with a married mother and father.
2. threaten the many faith-based social service organizations that receive federal grants to enable them to better serve the most vulnerable among us every day. These organizations would be prohibited from living out their beliefs about marriage or human sexuality as a condition of continuing to receive federal funding.
3. deny federal financial aid to students at faith-based colleges and universities unless those schools abandon policies and practices reflecting their sincerely held beliefs about marriage and sexuality.
4. nullify many of the opportunities previously guaranteed by Title IX, which provides women equal access to education opportunities on the same basis as men. It could mandate that men who identify as women be allowed to compete for spots on female sports teams, women's scholarships, and other academic and sports-related opportunities designed specifically for women.
5. violate the privacy and safety of women and force them to share sex-separated spaces, such as showers, locker rooms, and other private areas, with men.

*Fairness for All Act*, H.R.1440, 117th Congress (2021–2022); H.R.5331, 116th Congress (2019–2020): The Fairness for All Act poses the same threats to religious freedom, free speech, and women and girls

---

<sup>1</sup> [The Facts About H.R.1: The "For the People Act of 2021"](#), The Heritage Foundation (Feb. 21, 2021).

<sup>2</sup> Gregory Baylor, [Here's How the Equality Act Threatens Your Freedom](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (Feb. 18, 2021, last updated July 7, 2023); [Truth about the Equality Act](#), United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (last accessed May 13, 2024); ["What is the Equality Act"](#), The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission (June 27, 2023); [Heritage Explains: The Equality Act, How Could Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity \(SOGI\) Laws Affect You?](#), The Heritage Foundation (last accessed May 13, 2024); Nathan A. Berkeley, [Grounds for the Equality Act Are Simply Not There](#), Religious Freedom Institute (March 9, 2021).

as the Equality Act. However, it proposes narrow exemptions for some religious organizations. These “exemptions” do not fully protect these institutions, and strip fundamental rights from everyone else.<sup>3</sup>

*Do No Harm Act*, S.1206 and H.R.2725, 118th Congress (2023–2024); S.2752 and H.R.1378, 116th Congress (2019–2020): The Do No Harm Act would strip certain people of faith of the protections that the Religious Freedom Restoration Act provides for people of all faiths. It handpicks certain religious beliefs and practices—specifically those related to abortion, marriage, and human sexuality—and deprives them of the protection of federal law.<sup>4</sup>

*Respect for Marriage Act*, S.4556 and H.R.8404, 117th Congress (2021–2022): The Respect for Marriage Act would require the federal government to “recognize without limit any marriage definitions that a state adopts,” opening citizens and faith-based non-profits who make business or administrative decisions based on their religious beliefs to legal attack.<sup>5</sup>

*Right to Contraception Act*, S.4557 and H.R. 8373, 117th Congress (2021–2022): The Right to Contraception Act would give the Food and Drug Administration sole authority to redefine “contraceptives” to include abortifacients, require health care providers to offer abortifacients and information related to them alongside contraceptives despite state or federal laws like the Religious Freedom Act of 1993 (RFRA).<sup>6</sup>

## **02: Legislation Protecting Free Speech or Religious Freedom**

*Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act*, H.R.1750 and S.656, 117th Congress (2021–2022); H.R.897 and S.274, 116th Congress (2019–2020): This legislation would prevent federal agencies and state governments from discriminating against child welfare providers on the basis of their religious beliefs or moral convictions.<sup>7</sup>

*Conscience Protection Act*, S.401, 117th Congress (2021–2022): This legislation would protect healthcare professionals who refuse to perform, refer for, pay for, or otherwise participate in abortion.<sup>8</sup>

*Free Speech Fairness Act*, H.R.837, 117th Congress (2021–2022); H.R.949 and S.330, 116th Congress (2019–2020): This legislation would allow non-profit organizations to speak freely in the ordinary course of their business on all matters of life, including elections and candidates, if they choose to do

<sup>3</sup> Andrea Jones, [Misguided Fairness for All Act Would Undermine Religious Liberty](#), The Heritage Foundation (Dec. 7, 2019); [The Problem](#), Heritage Foundation.

<sup>4</sup> Matt Sharp, [“3 Reasons the Religious Freedom Restoration Act Should Be Preserved”](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (June 25, 2019).

<sup>5</sup> [83 groups to Leader McConnell: Stand firm against legislation attacking religious freedom, marriage](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>6</sup> [House passes contraception bill that threatens life and religious liberty](#), The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention (July 22, 2022).

<sup>7</sup> Natalie Goodnow, [The Role of Faith-Based Agencies in Child Welfare](#), The Heritage Foundation (May 22, 2018).

<sup>8</sup> [ERLC supports the Conscience Protection Act](#), The Ethics & Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention (Mar. 25, 2021); Melanie Israel, [What Congress and the Administration Can Do to Protect Conscience Rights](#), The Heritage Foundation (December 7, 2017).

so.<sup>9</sup>

### **G3: Religious Freedom Restoration Acts (RFRA) Enacted Since 2012**

1. Kansas Preservation of Religious Freedom Act, HB2203 (2013)
2. Kentucky Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB279 (2013)
3. Arkansas Religious Freedom Restoration Act, SB975 (2015)
4. Indiana Religious Freedom Restoration Act, SB101 (2015)
5. Mississippi Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB1523 (2016)
6. Georgia Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB757 (2016), *vetoed by Governor Nathan Deal*
7. Missouri Religious Freedom Restoration Act, SJR39 (2016), *defeated in a House committee vote*
8. An Act to provide protections for the exercise of religious freedom, SB124 (South Dakota, 2021)
9. Montana Religious Freedom Act, SB215 (2021)
10. North Dakota Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB1136 (2023)
11. West Virginia Religious Freedom Restoration Act, HB2474 (2023)
12. First Freedom Act, LB774 (Nebraska, 2022), *indefinitely postponed*
13. An Act relating to restoring religious liberty, SB180 and HB47 (Kentucky, 2024)

---

<sup>9</sup> [ADF joins letter to congressional leaders encouraging prioritization of Free Speech Fairness Act](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (June 22, 2017).

## Appendix H: Scored Litigation

*Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*: Penalty for supporting the respondent. In 2018, the Supreme Court ruled 7-2 that the Colorado Civil Rights Commission violated the free exercise clause of the First Amendment in assessing a cakeshop owner's reasons for declining to make a cake for a same-sex couple's wedding celebration.<sup>10</sup>

*Scardina v. Masterpiece Cakeshop*: Penalty for supporting Scardina. The case is currently active in the Colorado Supreme Court and stems from an additional discrimination complaint brought on the day that the Supreme Court ruled in the cake artist's favor in *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. v. Colorado Civil Rights Commission*. At issue is whether a cake artist can be forced to create expression that violates his beliefs.<sup>11</sup>

*Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*: Penalty for supporting the respondent. In 2021, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Philadelphia violated the First Amendment by conditioning a religious agency's ability to participate in the foster care system on taking actions and making statements that directly contradict the agency's religious beliefs.<sup>12</sup>

*State of Washington v. Arlene's Flowers*: Penalty for supporting the respondent. At issue was whether the state violated a floral designer's First Amendment rights to free exercise and free speech by forcing her to take part in and create custom floral art celebrating same-sex weddings or by acting based on hostility toward her religious beliefs. After lengthy litigation at the Washington Supreme Court and U.S. Supreme Court, the parties settled the case in 2021.<sup>13</sup>

*303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*: Penalty for supporting the respondent. In 2023, the Supreme Court ruled 6-3 that Colorado violated the free speech clause of the First Amendment by applying a public-accommodation law to compel a web designer to create speech inconsistent with her beliefs.<sup>14</sup>

*Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores; Conestoga Wood Specialties v. Burwell*: Penalty for supporting the petitioner. In 2014, the Supreme Court ruled that the government's application of the contraceptive-coverage Mandate of the Affordable Care Act violated the religious rights of the religious owners of a family business and their closely held, for-profit corporation.<sup>15</sup>

*Brush & Nib Studio v. City of Phoenix*: Penalty for supporting the respondent. In 2019, the Arizona Supreme Court ruled that Phoenix violated Arizona's free speech and religious freedom protections when it forced artists to create custom artwork conveying messages about marriage that violates their

---

<sup>10</sup> *Masterpiece Cakeshop, Ltd. V. Colorado Civil Rights Com'n*, 584 U.S. 617 (2018).

<sup>11</sup> *Scardina v. Masterpiece Cakeshop, Inc.* 528 P.3d 926 (2023).

<sup>12</sup> *Fulton v. City of Philadelphia*, 593 U.S. 522 (2021).

<sup>13</sup> See [Arlene's Flowers v. State of Washington / Arlene's Flowers v. Ingersoll](#), Alliance Defending Freedom (Nov. 18, 2021).

<sup>14</sup> *303 Creative LLC v. Elenis*, 600 U.S. 570 (2023); see [Won: 303 Creative v. Elenis](#) (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>15</sup> *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, 573 U.S. 682 (2014).

religious beliefs.<sup>16</sup>

*Groff v. DeJoy*: Penalty for supporting the respondent. In 2024, the Supreme Court ruled unanimously that Title VII requires employers to grant religious accommodations in the absence of substantial additional costs in relation to the business. The decision corrected many lower courts that held Title VII required the employer to show only a *de minimis* burden on the company to deny a religious accommodation request.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *Brush & Nib Studio, LC v. City of Phoenix*, 247 Ariz. 269 (2019).

<sup>17</sup> *Groff v. DeJoy*, 600 U.S. 447 (2023).

## Appendix I: Scored Causes/Organizations

*Amalgamated Foundation:* Through its Hate is Not Charitable campaign, the Amalgamated Foundation pressures banks and philanthropic institutions to use the Southern Poverty Law Center's Hate Map as a pretext to exclude individuals and organizations from the market and public square because of their viewpoints.<sup>18</sup>

*Center for American Progress:* Pressures companies to adopt standards/model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through co-authoring the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>19</sup>

*Center for Countering Digital Hate (CCDH):* Pressures social media companies and other big tech companies through public square and advertiser advocacy to restrict service to advertisers and other user groups that CCDH determines promote hate or misinformation.<sup>20</sup> Pressures companies to adopt standards/model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through publicly supporting the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>21</sup>

*Change the Terms:* Pressures companies to adopt standards/model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through creation of the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>22</sup>

*Color of Change:* Pressures companies to adopt standards/model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through co-authoring the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>23</sup>

*Georgia Prospers:* Advocates for the weakening of free speech and religious freedom protections in law by opposing Georgia's Religious Freedom Restoration Act.<sup>24</sup>

*The Gay and Lesbian Alliance Against Defamation (GLAAD):* Pressures companies to adopt standards and model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through publicly supporting the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>25</sup> They actively pressure social media companies to censor hate speech and disinformation through organized petitions.<sup>26</sup>

*Global Disinformation Index:* Pressures advertisers to stop funding disinformation by ceasing advertising on media platforms who disseminate false information according to the Index's standards

---

<sup>18</sup> [Hate Is Not Charitable](#), The Amalgamated Foundation (March 19, 2019).

<sup>19</sup> [Who We Are](#), Change the Terms (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>20</sup> [About](#), Center for Countering Digital Hate (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>21</sup> [Who We Are](#), Change the Terms (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> *Id.*

<sup>24</sup> [When Georgia Competes, Georgia Prospers!](#), Georgia Prospers (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>25</sup> [Who We Are](#), Change the Terms (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>26</sup> [LGBTQ Celebrities & Allies Call on Instagram, Facebook, YouTube, TikTok, and Twitter to Stop the Flow of Anti-Trans Hate & Malicious Disinformation About Trans Healthcare](#), GLAAD (June 27, 2023).



and definitions.<sup>27</sup> The Index utilizes the Southern Poverty Law Center's Hate Map to define "hate groups" and advocate for companies to adopt a terms of service policy excluding such "hate groups" from using their services.<sup>28</sup>

*Human Rights Campaign:* Advocates for the weakening of free speech and religious freedom protections in law through support of legislation like the Equality Act.<sup>29</sup>

*Free Press:* Pressures companies to adopt standards/model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through co-authoring the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>30</sup>

*Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law:* Pressures companies to adopt standards and model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through co-authoring the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>31</sup>

*National Hispanic Media Coalition:* Pressures companies to adopt standards and model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through co-authoring the Change the Terms model policy.<sup>32</sup>

*Southern Poverty Law Center:* Pressures companies to adopt standards and model policies that restrict or censor speech online in a discriminatory, ill-defined, or arbitrary fashion through co-authoring the Change the Terms model policy. Promulgated an arbitrary, discriminatory, and politically motivated "Hate Map" as a pretext to exclude individuals and organizations from the market and public square because of their viewpoints.<sup>33</sup>

*Stop Hate for Profit:* Pressures tech and social media companies through Stop Hate for Profit to restrict or deny services and/or censor content promoting "hate, bigotry, racism, antisemitism, and disinformation." To this end, Stop Hate for Profit partners with other scored organizations such as Color of Change, Free Press, and the National Hispanic Media Coalition.

---

<sup>27</sup> [Our Mission](#), Global Disinformation Index (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>28</sup> [Bankrolling Bigotry: An Overview of the Online Funding Strategies of American Hate Groups](#), Global Disinformation Index (Oct. 1, 2020).

<sup>29</sup> [Equality Act: 647 Organizations Endorsing the Equality Act](#), Human Rights Campaign (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>30</sup> [Who We Are](#), Change the Terms (last accessed May 13, 2024).

<sup>31</sup> *Id.*

<sup>32</sup> *Id.*

<sup>33</sup> *Id.*; see also [In 2021, We Tracked 722 Hate Groups across the U.S., Southern Poverty Law Center](#) (last accessed May 13, 2024).