

CHAPUT'S BRILLIANT NEW BOOK

Bill Donohue's review of Archbishop Charles Chaput's new book appears in the July-August edition of *Catalyst*. To read it, click [here](#).

CATHOLIC DEMOCRATS TRASH EWTN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on an article posted on Crux by the president of Catholic Democrats attacking the Eternal Word Television Network (EWTN):

Steven A. Krueger, president of Catholic Democrats, has lashed out at EWTN branding it a "Catholic-right media outlet" akin to the extremist outfit, Church Militant. The latter is a screwball website with little or no influence. EWTN is a well respected source of Catholic teaching and commentary, one that has won the plaudits of many bishops, as well as millions of Catholics, both at home and abroad. Founded by Mother Angelica, EWTN is the most influential Catholic media outlet in the world.

Krueger's occasion to smear EWTN is a column he wrote defending a poorly conceived, and wrongheaded, analysis of Catholic-Evangelical relations; it was written by Father Antonio Spadaro, editor of a Jesuit publication in Rome, and a Protestant minister. The co-authors argued that Church Militant was an example of why the alliance between Catholics and Evangelicals is troubling.

In point of fact, Church Militant has never been a player in this alliance, so the criticism is absurd, showing an ignorance of American political culture that is stunning. By

contrast, EWTN has certainly sought good relations with all religions, and for that it should be applauded. So what is Krueger's beef with it?

The best he could do—or is he plain lazy?—was to quote the titles of a few recent shows. As evidence of EWTN's nefarious agenda, he cites a show called, "Reality Check, The Last Four Things: Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell." Doesn't take much to scare this guy.

What is Krueger afraid of? Losing, that's what. One might have thought he would have become accustomed to it by now. After all, he's the founder of the disgraced Voice of the Faithful, the dissident organization that has less money than a homeless man in Peoria. A good Democrat, he defends *Roe v. Wade*, the decision that legalized abortion-on-demand, [a position most Americans reject](#).

Another Catholic teaching that Krueger rejects is the apostolic status of the bishops. He recently told his pro-abortion friends at the *New York Times* that "the centralized, institutional authority of the Catholic Church is often conflated by the general public to represent the views of all Catholics. However, Catholics in the pews cover the spectrum of political thought, as do our bishops."

Krueger is wrong. He does not speak for the Church. I do not speak for the Church. No one does but the bishops. Just as there are Catholic Democrats who are pro-life, they do not speak for the organization by that name: Krueger does. That's because he exercises an institutional authority that is centralized—in him.

There is another organization that "advocates and supports programs and policies that respect and promote life from conception to natural death. This includes, but is not limited to, opposition to abortion, capital punishment, and euthanasia."

That is not the mission of Catholic Democrats—Krueger would only agree on the sanctity of human life as applied to convicted serial murderers and rapists. The mission statement belongs to Democrats for Life. It exists because Catholic Democrats, like rank-and-file Democrats, are pro-abortion.

Krueger has every right to be worried about the Catholic-Evangelical alliance. It is getting stronger, led by a president who, unlike his predecessor, opposes child abuse in the womb.

God bless EWTN for trumpeting the truth, and for its inclusiveness—Evangelicals and Catholics work well together. No need to be scared, Krueger, just worried.

ABORTION ACTIVISTS LIVID AT DEMOCRATS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on why abortion activists are furious with the Democrats:

Rep. Ben Ray Luján, chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, told [The Hill](#) on July 31 that when it comes to abortion, “There is not a litmus test for Democratic candidates.” He made it clear that when it comes to funding, candidates who are not champions of abortion rights could still qualify.

The idea that a Democrat can be pro-life, even marginally, was enough to set off a firestorm of condemnation by abortion extremists. Spokesmen for Planned Parenthood, the All* Above Action Fund, the Women’s Health and Rights Project at the Center for American Progress, and EMILY’s List, hammered

Luján. No one went more ballistic than [Ilyse Hogue](#), president of NARAL Pro-Choice America.

Hogue noted with anger that Luján's position was previously voiced during the presidential campaign by Sen. Bernie Sanders, and more recently by Rep. Nancy Pelosi. She will have none of it. She stood by her gal, Hillary Clinton, saying she "ran the most progressive campaign on abortion rights ever." She certainly did.

Did Hillary lose because of abortion? It played a role: Who can forget her unbelievably cold response to a question about partial-birth abortion during one of the debates? Her lack of empathy for the child—not a trace was detectable—left most Americans uncomfortable, if not revolted.

Reading the accounts of Hogue, and the other fans of abortion, makes one wonder if they sincerely believe that women are a monolithic group, all committed to abortion rights. "Democrats can't fight Trump without women," Hogue writes. Reality check: Trump lost the women's vote and won the election.

Obama did better with women than Hillary did: he won the women's vote 55% to 44%; she won by a margin of 54% to 42%. Among white women, 58% broke for Trump; Hillary won only 39% of their vote.

Hogue lives in such a bubble that she cites the Women's March on Washington, held after the election, as proof that women are anti-Trump. She did not mention that pro-life women's organizations were barred from marching in this "inclusive" event.

The pro-abortion activists need not worry too much. The fat cats who work at Goldman Sachs, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Tides Foundation, the Arca Foundation, and the various entities run by Warren Buffett and George Soros, will always grease whoever pledges to go to the mat for abortion rights.

There is one problem, however: the [American public](#) does not support abortion-on-demand, yet the Democratic Party supports it for any reason and at any time of gestation. The leadership will have to decide who matters most: donors or voters.

If they lighten up a little, they will incur the wrath of the death industry. Just ask Rep. Luján. If they don't lighten up, they may wind up unemployed. Just ask Hillary.