

# PHONY ATTACK ON RYAN'S CATHOLICITY



Bill Donohue comments on an op-ed article in today's *New York Times* by Fordham theologian Michael Peppard:

Pro-abortion Catholics have long sought to equal the playing field with pro-life Catholics by arguing that there really isn't much of a difference between their side and the other. It never works. And it doesn't work for Michael Peppard as well.

Vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan is pro-life, and Vice President Joe Biden is pro-abortion. Biden has never found an abortion he couldn't justify, and Ryan would ban all abortions save for rape, incest and the life of the mother. In the mind of Peppard, there is no difference between the two: both depart from Catholic doctrine.

Not so fast. Pope John Paul II said it was acceptable for Catholics to vote for a pro-abortion candidate in a race against another pro-abortion candidate, providing that the former is less extreme and efforts are made to persuade him to adopt a pro-life position. In other words, Catholics who exercise the virtue of prudence have no problem voting for a man whose position on abortion would save the lives of over 1 million babies a year. This is especially true when compared to a man who would not save one baby out of the 1.2 million killed every year.

In Professor Peppard's vision, a driver who goes 56 in a 55 miles an hour speed zone is equally guilty of speeding as the

one who goes 106. Technically, that may be true, but in reality, only a fool would equate their culpability.

---

# LIBERALS GIVE THE LEAST TO THE POOR



Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on a new study on charitable giving released today by the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*:

Liberals are the least likely to help the poor. That's the inescapable conclusion of this new study: states where people participate in religion at a high rate are also the most generous; conversely, the least generous states are also the least religious. Importantly, nine of the ten least generous states voted for Obama in 2008.

This new study is consistent with previous research. Sociologists Mark D. Regnerus and David Sikkink looked at the data gathered by the Religious Identity and Influence Survey and concluded that the more religious a person is, the more likely he is to give to the poor; those who are nonreligious give the least. In his book *Who Really Cares*, Arthur C. Brooks, president of the American Enterprise Institute, examined this issue in depth. He concluded that "Religious people are far more charitable than nonreligious people." Similarly, in their book *American Grace*, David Campbell of Notre Dame and Robert Putnam of Harvard found that religious people are more generous than nonreligious people.

It is well known that liberals are far more likely than

conservatives to be nonreligious. It is also well known that liberals talk endlessly about poverty. Yet in their daily lives they do the least about it: they volunteer the least; they give less blood; they are less likely to help someone find a job; and they donate the least. Their idea of charity is to have the government raise taxes, i.e., take money from others, and spend it on welfare programs.

The data have grave implications this election season. Paul Ryan is being lectured by liberals—the most miserly people in the nation—for not being responsive to the poor. It doesn't get more absurd than this. Not until liberals catch up with conservatives in their charitable giving are they in a position to lecture anyone about the poor.

---

## CATHOLIC VP v. CATHOLIC VP



Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the two Catholic vice presidential candidates:

In many respects, the Catholic community today is divided into pro-life and social justice camps. That is unfortunate, and while this division can be overstated, it remains true that most Catholic activists sit in either one camp or the other; cross-over Catholics are a rare breed.

Paul Ryan represents the pro-life wing, and Joe Biden represents the social justice wing. Indeed, both exemplify the differences, and not just on the issue of abortion. For example, Ryan's idea of freedom of choice commits him to supporting school vouchers; Biden's notion of choice commits him to abortion rights. Ryan is opposed to reinventing the institution of marriage; Biden wants to expand marriage to

include two people of the same sex.

The Catholic Church opposes abortion and gay marriage. On both of these issues, Biden disagrees with the Church. Biden's defenders, e.g., Catholics who identify with social justice concerns, argue that Ryan's budgetary prescriptions make him the dissident Catholic; his ideas are said to hurt the poor. This assumes, however, that there is a clear Catholic teaching on what constitutes the best *means* to conquer poverty. There isn't. For instance, fidelity to the Church's preferential option for the poor can be realized by making a serious case to raise taxes, or to lower them. In effect, both Biden and Ryan can plausibly maintain that he is a champion of the poor. But only one, Ryan, can be identified as the champion of the unborn.

Not all policy issues are equal. Abortion is regarded by the Catholic Church as "intrinsically evil." Moreover, the bishops' conference has explicitly endorsed a constitutional amendment defining marriage as a union between a man and a woman. This puts Biden at a decisive disadvantage in making the case that he better represents Catholic teachings.

---

## GEORGETOWN'S CATHOLICITY



Nearly 90 faculty members and priests at Georgetown University have signed a letter criticizing Rep. Paul Ryan's visit to the campus tomorrow. They say his budget plan represents a "continuing misuse of Catholic teaching" because it allegedly hurts the poor.

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on this issue:

In 1999, hard-core pornographer Larry Flynt spoke at Georgetown. There was no letter of protest from the faculty. But the Archdiocese of Washington was not pleased, saying the decision provided “a platform which furthers the degradation of women, immoral behavior and the anti-religious opinions Mr. Flynt represents.” In 2003, 70 faculty members signed a letter protesting a speech by Cardinal Francis Arinze when he defended the traditional family at his commencement address; they were angry that he cited abortion, euthanasia, infanticide, fornication, adultery, divorce, pornography, and homosexuality as negative elements.

In 1997, the Washington Archdiocese publicly criticized Georgetown for refusing to put crucifixes in the classrooms. In 2010, years after the crucifixes were restored, the university hid them, as well as other religious symbols, at the request of the Obama administration; Obama’s advance team did not want the president to speak with Catholic symbols in the background.

Georgetown welcomes pro-abortion clubs on campus. There is “Hoyas for Choice,” and “Georgetown University Law Students for Reproductive Justice” (formerly run by Sandra Fluke). There have been no letters of protest from the faculty about the “misuse of Catholic teaching.”

Georgetown obviously has a curious understanding of what constitutes a “misuse of Catholic teaching.” It’s time they held a campus forum on their identity, inviting representatives from the Washington Archdiocese, alumni, and non-Catholics to participate. They can begin by stating what makes Georgetown University different from George Washington University.

---

# PRO-ABORT CATHOLIC LECTURES

## CARDINAL DOLAN



Rep. Rosa DeLauro has written to Timothy Cardinal Dolan asking him to mobilize the bishops in a campaign to combat poverty. Catholic League president Bill Donohue responds as follows:

Rep. DeLauro is the enemy of the poor, thus she has no moral leg to stand on. She has worked to kill school vouchers for children with disabilities and has voted against scholarship grants for African American students in D.C. But she is a big champion of abortion, including abortions where the baby is 80 percent born; she has even voted to fund abortion with federal dollars.

DeLauro's Catholic credentials include authoring a "Statement of Principles" in 2006, signed by 55 Catholic Democrats. The document made the argument that it is entirely legitimate to be a Catholic in good standing and promote abortion rights. In 2007, DeLauro was one of 18 Catholic Democrats to criticize the pope for his remarks on this subject.

Not signing DeLauro's letter, but signing a recent one in which they accused Rep. Paul Ryan of "distorting church teaching to give moral cover" to his proposed budget were Nicholas Cafardi, Daniel Maguire, Marie Dennis and Stephen Schneck. No sooner had Archbishop Charles Chaput moved from Denver to Philadelphia when Cafardi surfaced saying "Chaput would be well-advised to leave politics aside." But now Cafardi wants the pro-life archbishop to get involved in politics by lobbying for welfare. Maguire is so in love with abortion rights that he has condemned Mother Teresa for her yeoman work, branding her "a firm defender of male dominance."

Dennis is co-president of Pax Christi International, an organization that has blasted the pro-life work of the Susan B. Anthony List. And in 2009, Schneck signed a letter praising the nomination of Kathleen Sebelius (he has since called for her resignation).

We would be remiss if we didn't notice the curious relationship between DeLauro and the Catholic News Service which arranged the interview.

*Contact DeLauro's chief of staff, Beverly Pheto:*  
[beverly.pheto@mail.house.gov](mailto:beverly.pheto@mail.house.gov)