

W. H. Marshner, STD
Professor of Theology

Theology Department, Christendom College
Front Royal, Virginia 22630

October 13, 2011

Mr. Paul Rondeau, Executive Director
American Life League

Sir:

Last week, you expressed the wish that a moral theologian review your "Investigative Report on the Catholic Campaign for Human Development's Grants for the Year 2010-2011," prepared this July; and I volunteered to do so. My [academic credentials and publications](#) are available for inspection on the website of Christendom College, where I have taught for over 30 years. I should confess at the outset that, before turning to the academic life, I worked for several years in journalism and was published in periodicals distinctly critical of what many churchmen accepted as "renewal" in the decade after the close of Vatican II. Since then, I have come to accept the pastoral wisdom of the Church's "preferential option for the poor," of which the CCHD is a striking expression. I therefore undertake this review with sincere personal sympathy for the Campaign and sincere respect for its guiding principles.

As you say on p. 3 of your well-organized Report, it is CCHD policy that "no grantee may participate in or promote activities that contradict the moral and social teachings of the Church." The moral basis for this policy is the fact that funding an organization is practical willing (as opposed to just wishing) that it succeed in what it regularly does. Hence the funding of an organization is formal cooperation in what it regularly does. But in Catholic moral theology, it is never licit to cooperate formally in an immoral project. Hence a CCHD grantee must not do or promote, as a regular part of its work, anything evaluated by Catholic doctrine as immoral.

Thus the CCHD policy is morally sound. But its implementation is another story. Your Report has documented at least 11 cases which, in my judgment, are cases in which *prima facie* the grantee has done or promoted an immoral activity.

These cases are:

- n Centro Campesino (granted \$35 K), which distributes condoms, as CCHD now admits; it claims to have defunded the group, but evidence for this correct decision is not yet forthcoming; the bishops are owed an explanation of what exactly has been done;
- n Somos un Pueblo Unido (granted \$45 K), which trains immigrant women to advocate "reproductive justice" (*i.e.* contraception and abortion) and which took from other sources at least two grants to do so; CCHD has yet to explain its lack of response to this information;
- n NY City AIDS Housing Network (granted \$30 K) which is listed on an NYC government website as a place to get condoms; CCHD has yet to explain its lack of response;
- n Southwest Organizing Project (granted \$ 45 K); which is involved in the Elev8 sex-ed program, which distributes condoms and IUDs and refers for abortions at Marquette Middle School in Chicago; CCHD was informed of this problem by its own regional director, Mr. Ray Florez; to date, CCHD has explained neither its lack of response nor its termination of Mr. Florez;
- n Desis Rising Up and Moving (granted \$ 35 K), which advocates and participates in groups advocating sexual "liberation" and abortion;

- n Michigan Interfaith Voice, A.K.A. Gamaliel of Michigan (granted \$ 25 K), which has taken grants from the pro-abortion and pro-homosexual Arcus Foundation to advance Lesbian-Gay-Bisexual and Transsexual (LGBT) rights, which include a “right” to be legally “married”;
- n Michigan Organizing Project (granted \$40 K), which has taken grants from the Arcus Foundation for the same purpose in 2007-2009 and in 2011;
- n Coalition LA (granted \$45 K), which produced a voters’ guide favoring same-sex marriage and telling people to vote NO on the ballot-measure to repeal it; the issue here is not just how the state will treat homosexual persons but whether state law will abandon the meaning of the word ‘marriage’, contrary to Catholic doctrine;
- n Women’s Community Revitalization Project (\$40 K), which sponsored a pro-abortion voter’s guide in Pennsylvania and took money from a feminist, pro-abortion organization called Women’s Way; CCHD was informed of this problem in 2009 but re-funded the group in 2010; since the bishops of PA have played an historic role in the pro-life cause, they are certainly owed a specific explanation of this payment to their declared enemy;
- n Philadelphia Unemployment Project (given \$25 K), which, despite its good work toward issues of workers’ compensation, sponsored the same kind of pro-abortion voter’s guide; in a state as heavily Catholic and Democratic as Pennsylvania, it passes belief that the Church cannot find a pro-labor organization that keeps fully clear of the culture of death;
- n Restaurant Opportunities Center of NY (given \$40 K), which produced “guidelines” telling businesses to make questionable accommodations to LGBT preferences, including permission to cross-dress during work-hours and to choose whichever lavatory suited the worker’s subjective preference.

In every one of these cases, the grantee has behaved in such a way that continued funding puts the Church in a position of formal cooperation (or in the apparent and proximate danger of formal cooperation) with moral evil.

The problems with United Workers Association, Intercommunity Justice and Peace Center, and Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights are addressed below in conjunction with organizations cited in the coalitions category of the Report.

Your Report also documents many cases which pose a lesser but still serious problem, namely, that of unwise material cooperation. These are cases in which a CCHD grantee has affiliated with (or become a member of) some broader organization (hereafter: umbrella group) which sponsors, advocates, etc., actions and positions of which the Church cannot approve. With commendable clarity about this problem, CCHD policy reads as follows: “CCHD will not fund groups that are members of coalitions which have as their organizational purpose or coalition agenda, positions or actions that contradict fundamental Catholic moral and social teaching.” Again, the policy is correct and seems straightforward, but its implementation is problematic. You list 13 umbrella groups; given your documentation of what appears on the websites maintained by these groups, it is *prima facie* the case that CCHD grantees belonging to them violate the policy just stated. They ought to be defunded, and yet they are not.

I see only two ways to explain this situation. Either the policy is not really adhered to, or else its wording is a work of the lawyer’s art, in which ‘organizational purpose or coalition agenda’ is a technical expression meant to exonerate umbrella groups whose immoral activity is not their sole or primary public purpose. In that case, the policy is too tightly drafted, in my judgment. It fails to secure the moral good for whose sake one avoids material cooperation with evil wherever possible: the moral good of giving no appearance of evil.

You also provided for my review some recent correspondence of yours with the Campaign. It is good to see that a dialogue has been begun. Still, I cannot be satisfied with CCHD’s blanket dismissal of much of your Report, on the ground that your information is taken from websites. Everyone knows that websites can be in error or out of date. But why would a grantee or umbrella group post and maintain on its own

website false or obsolete information? To say the least, one needs to see **specific** explanations. Perhaps providing such explanation would require man-hours of work to which the CCHD does not think ALL, as an outside group, is entitled. But the bishops of the United States are most certainly entitled.

With hope that these reflections may be of use to you and to the Church, I am

Yours in Christ,

W. H. Marshner,
Professor of Theology
Christendom College