

Dr. Stephen F. Schneck
Director, Institute for Policy Research and Catholic Studies
Catholic University of America
620 Michigan Ave., NE
Washington, DC 20064

Dr. Henry Potrykus
Dr. Patrick Fagan
Family Research Council
801 G St, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001
202-624-3023

October 4, 2012

Dear Dr. Schneck,

Thank you for your prompt response, which permits us to address the main issues of your argument:

Is it true, as you claim, that the poor have “a higher rate of abortion because they are poor”? In public policy one gives this question *focus* by asking what are the ways by which we might reduce poverty, and then asking what effects on abortions those means will have. You yourself listed *government* poverty programs and worried that “abortion rates would spike if proposed cuts to Medicaid, public housing, WIC, SNAP...were enacted.”

Given the empirical evidence, summarized in the table below, your worries are mis-directed. Your concerns are not founded in sound analysis; the weight of scientific evidence is contrary to your personal beliefs.

Government means for addressing poverty either increase the number of abortions or have no measurable effect:

Effect of Poverty Programs on Abortions

Program	Programmatic Analogs	Effect of Restriction of Program on Abortions
Medicaid (provision of abortions)	["Cost offsetting"] Affordable Care Act provisions	More than 10% <i>reduction</i> among eligible (poor) population ¹
AFDC, other welfare	["Income Supplementing"] TANF, WIC, SNAP, other Medicaid	None measured econometrically; some results suggest reduction ²
HHS and HUD grants	?	? ³

Increases to income-supplementing programs such as AFDC/TANF, WIC, SNAP, and public housing either have no effect or may increase the number of abortions. By contrast, state-level Medicaid funding *restrictions* have a large effect on reducing abortions.

Restating the issues central to your argument: Is poverty a cause for abortions? Do cuts to government poverty programs increase the number of abortions?

¹ Levine, Phillip B., *Sex and Consequences: Abortion, Public Policy, and The Economics of Fertility*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton. 2004, especially Table 6.2 and references there summarized.

² See references in our letter to you, dated September 25, 2012.

³ Grants not affecting marginal costs or benefits will have no predicted behavioral effect.

The second question – that which worries you – has been answered by studying “natural experiments” in changes of state-level policies. The natural experiments allow policy experts to *separate* two potentially simultaneous phenomena: 1) Does any *decrease in poverty* consequently decrease the demand for both AFDC and abortion? 2) Do *programmatically cuts* have any effect on abortion rates?

You posit that “...the Medicaid/AFDC population has higher rates of abortion because they are poor not because they are recipients of these programs.” Decoupling (1) and (2) allows one to determine whether program cuts affect abortion (among program recipients) in the direction of your fears.

Study of the natural experiments allows one to determine cause and effect by permitting the discrimination of the following:

- Regional differences in poverty rates and hence possibly higher demand for abortions and AFDC,
- State-specific policy changes (events) and their potential consequences.

It is these natural-experiment-policy-*changes* (that affect poverty programs) that have been analyzed for their effects on abortion. In this way (2) is decoupled from (1).

These studies also take into account changes in the economy that were occurring when these policy changes took place.

Your fear, quoted above, is that *programmatically cuts* would *increase* abortions (2). Analysis of the natural experiments shows this effect does not occur in reality.

This being the case, you cannot make the argument you have.

Given what is proved above, your position as Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Catholic Studies at Catholic University of America misleads many “on serious matters of morality and public policy.” Unless you concede the argument publicly, we will be compelled to take the argument-contents of these letters public (omitting the salutations, first sentences, this sentence, and names of all those who received copies of these letters).

Looking forward to this debate, required for the open-minded consideration of all involved parties,

Sincerely Yours,

Dr. Henry Potrykus, Senior Fellow, Marriage and Religion Research Institute
Family Research Council

Dr. Patrick Fagan, Senior Fellow and Director, Marriage and Religion Research Institute
Family Research Council