



The Caleb Report

January-February 2000

Life Decisions International

vol. viii · no. 1

In this Issue: *Boycott Update / Abortifacient? / Endorsements Made / By the Way... / Thomas Pro-Adoption, But... / Quotable Quote / Did We Hear That Right? / Buchanan Explains Decision / The Prayer Project / Some Amazing Coincidence / More Free Advertising / We've Moved--Sort Of / Action Speaks Louder*

BOYCOTT UPDATE

The following corporations are no longer boycott targets and, consequently, do not appear on the newly released *Boycott List* (dated January 31, 2000): **Allstate, Bankers Trust, Cargill, Huntington Bancshares, May Department Stores, and Sunoco**. To date, 66 corporations have stopped funding Planned Parenthood.

The following corporations are new boycott targets and, consequently, appear on the recently released *Boycott List*: **Dallas Cowboys Football Club, Microsoft, and Schering-Plough**.

LDI's most recent investigation revealed some interesting and, in some cases, rather amusing information. As usual, a spokesman from **Tandy Corporation** seemed unable to speak about Planned Parenthood and our boycott without making rather odd comments about religion. LDI contacted Tandy when a supporter was told that the company had ceased supporting the abortion-committing organization. But the spokesman wanted to know to whom our supporter had talked because their official mantra is to neither confirm nor deny support of Planned Parenthood. (LDI has yet to receive even one response to our letters—in nearly a decade—about the matter from Tandy Corporation.) And what about the boycott against the company? “We’re just ignoring it,” the spokesman said. (Sounds to us like it is time to turn up the heat.) In any case, we told Tandy that it is the responsibility of the corporation to demonstrate that it qualifies to be removed from *The Boycott List*. Until its officials care to do so, we will continue to take our business elsewhere.

PNC Bank officials continue to tell customers that the company is not funding Planned Parenthood. Yet they do not have the courage to tell us the same thing. Why? We apparently ask too many specific questions. In LDI's letter to PNC Bank, we began by referring to the corporation's letter to us:

In the [PNC] letter you write, “the new community affairs manager in our Philadelphia market indicated that PNC Bank has given no support to Planned Parenthood in his tenure, and he doesn't anticipate supporting Planned Parenthood in the future.” We believe this text to be promising, but we have several of questions:

1. Would we be correct in assuming that under no circumstances will Planned Parenthood receive funding by PNC Bank or any related entities in the future?
2. You refer to the community affairs manager in the “Philadelphia market.” Would we be correct in assuming that grants to Planned Parenthood will not be made by any other person, department or other entity in the PNC Bank corporate family (in or out of the Philadelphia market)?
3. What was the date of the last grant to Planned Parenthood? How much was the grant? Was the grant restricted to any specific purpose?

We trust you will understand the need for us to be specific and clear about this matter so there is no room for misunderstanding or ambiguity.

Should the answers to questions one and two above be “yes,” we will discreetly remove PNC Bank from our boycott list. We look forward to your prompt reply. Thank you.

LDI has written to PNC Bank on several occasions, but a reply has not been received.

Our conversation with a **Hewlett-Packard** spokesman was interesting in that she kept saying, “Who are you to put Hewlett-Packard on a boycott list?” After all, we were told, the company is getting many calls and letters. “You can take us off the list now because it’s hurting our business,” she said. (Yes, that is the whole idea of a boycott.) We explained the situation several times, but continued to get the same “who are you” question asked of us. When we described how Hewlett-Packard could qualify to be removed from *The Boycott List*, the spokesman readily agreed to no longer fund Planned Parenthood. “Great,” we said, “so you’re going to tell all of your divisions that Planned Parenthood is not eligible for funding?” The spokesman replied with a fervent, “Yes.” (We found this hard to believe since the spokesman had just described a decentralized donor program.) Being skeptical, we asked, “Would you please put that in writing?” She agreed to do so. Despite follow-up calls, the letter was not received and our calls were not returned.

Several corporate officials specifically mentioned the many calls and letters they receive from pro-life activists. And most are getting tired of it.

Dr. Anton Kuerti, OC, of **Concertmasters Inc.**, wrote to LDI asking that we forward to one of our “fervent supporters” (who did not include a return address) a reply he had written. In the cover letter to LDI, Kuerti offered this analysis:

Just commenting on one of the remarks you made in your last letter to me, that a fetus has all the genetic information to become a human being. [Editor’s Note: LDI would never use the phrase “to become” a human being.] Indeed, this is so—but it is also true of the pieces of nail cut from the end of my fingers, the hair that is dropped on the barbershop floor, and certainly from scabs of skin that fall off after an injury heals. There is no near infinite number of potential human beings, but what makes them special is the consciousness which miraculously develops.”

There is no reason to assume that a human fetus is any more conscious than a calf fetus, and certainly much reason to assume that it has less consciousness than a year-old calf. (In fact, partly for that reason, I do not eat calves or other animals.) I remain totally convinced that your campaign causes far more abortions than it can prevent...And it ties up mainly well-meaning individuals in a quixotic—and hopeless—battle instead of getting them to spend their efforts to help save the 46,000 living children in this world who daily die of starvation, and untold others who are homeless, sick, beaten, neglected, exploited, uneducated and even murdered.

In the letter to our supporter, Kuerti writes that “abortion is not ‘killing babies’—a fetus is not a baby until it is born.” He continues:

The obsession with unborn fetuses...is really a mental disease. It is like going to a skin doctor for a wart when you are in the middle of a heart attack. What have *you* done to help the horrendous suffering of *born* children? Or do you consider them out of your jurisdiction once they are out of the womb?...

The runaway population explosion on this planet will eventually cause such a catastrophe that many people will wish they had been aborted before they become conscious to feel nothing but hunger, violence, pain and hate. This world has huge problems that well-meaning people should address. Anti-abortion fanaticism ends up being one of these problems.

Auteri closed his letter with these unfortunate words: “I am not a medical doctor, in case some of your friendly fellow anti-abortionists are looking for another decent father to shoot in front of his family.” (See “Prayer Project.”)

We want to offer this reminder of the note that appears under **Forbes Inc.**, on *The Boycott List*:

It is a sibling of Steve Forbes who insists on supporting Planned Parenthood. Steve Forbes would like to veto his brother’s actions, but he cannot do so. We urge you to boycott Forbes Inc., but do not assume that this says anything about the philosophy of Steve Forbes, who opposes Planned Parenthood’s agenda.

ABORTIFACIENT?

Pro-lifers do not just disagree with each other on political strategies. They even face off on issues as simple as whether or not the birth control pill can act as an abortifacient. Most Catholic pro-life leaders, but not all, say it does. Most Protestant pro-life leaders, but not all, say it does not. (Some are even using the Pill). There is only one truth and our religious affiliations should have nothing to do with this scientific question.

It is in the best interest of Planned Parenthood to tell women that the Pill is not an abortifacient. After all, some would refuse to take it. It is the same reason why “conception” is being redefined by pro-abortion activists as an event occurring at “implantation” rather than “fertilization.”

“The Birth Control Pill is a combination of low dose hormones [estrogen and progesterin] taken in the form of a pill every day,” reads Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada’s (PPFC) Website Website. “It stops the ovaries from releasing an egg every month.” This would not constitute an abortion, but, ah, there is more: “The Pill also stops a fertilised egg from implanting in the uterus.” Case closed. PPFC apparently did not get the “Don’t Tell the Truth About the Birth Control Pill” memo.

The “Mini-Pill” (progesterin only) is *more* likely to prevent implantation than the combination Pill. Some claim the Mini-Pill does not do so.

Women who are taking the Pill may be aborting their children. It is not known which mechanism is “working.” It is time we stopped fooling ourselves and accepted the truth. As usual, LDI is willing to tell the truth, even if we are not particularly “liked” for doing so. It is a shame that we must rely on a wayward Planned Parenthood to settle the debate. (For more information, visit: www.epm.org/~ralcorn. Click on “ProLife” and look for, “Does the birth control pill cause abortion?”)

ENDORSEMENTS MADE

Presidential candidate Steve Forbes has received the personal endorsement of Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI. Forbes has also been endorsed by several LDI Board and Advisory Board members, including the Honorable Penny Pullen, a former member of the Illinois State Legislature and now president of Life Advocacy Resource Project; Christopher P. Tyrrell, former president of American Collegians for Life; and James J. Giese of Dubuque County (Iowa) Right to Life.

In a press statement released by Forbes 2000, Scott urged pro-life Americans to support “an electable candidate we can count on to do the right thing. It is time that pro-family Americans took a hard look at the candidates for president. No longer are we willing to ‘settle’ for someone who claims to be pro-life, but who is unwilling to stand tall and proud on the issues important to us. Steve Forbes is a man of incredible integrity—a man who is unashamedly pro-life and pro-family. He has made specific pledges that will move the pro-life movement forward. I am doing all that I can to help him win the White House. Mr. Forbes is definitely ‘one of us.’” Scott noted that most pro-life leaders are getting behind Forbes.

Scott called on pro-family Americans to “first determine who is with us not just in stated policy, but also in the heart. Unless the candidate holds this critically important cause close to his heart, there will be no committed effort to push pro-family policies. If we determine that the candidate is truly committed, we must then ask ourselves, ‘Is he really electable?’ When we have a candidate who meets both qualifications, pro-family Americans need to do all they can to get that person elected. Mr. Forbes unquestionably passes both tests.”

Scott was initially a leading critic of Forbes, doubting his commitment to the pro-life cause. Yet Scott became a fervent Forbes supporter after learning more about the candidate and questioning him. “You can also tell a lot about a candidate by the kind of people who work on the campaign staff,” Scott said, “and most are pro-life activists to one degree or another. Many have actually been pro-life leaders at one time or another.”

Scott called on pro-family leaders to “stop providing cover” to candidates who, if elected, will disappoint pro-lifers. “It’s time we made candidates seek and earn our votes. We should not be begging them to embrace a little of our agenda. You don’t see...any other group employing such low standards. We need to stop shooting ourselves in the head. Mr. Forbes has sought our support and he has earned it. I have total confidence in Steve Forbes and I happily put my reputation on the line by personally endorsing him. Mr. Forbes is the man America needs. He is the man who those working for the unborn, the family and basic moral values we can support with great passion. We finally have a candidate who is with us *and* electable.”

“I am honored to have received the endorsement of Doug Scott,” Forbes said after learning of Scott’s decision. “His principled and effective leadership in the right to life movement has been essential to the movement’s growth. I look forward to working closely with Doug, as his grassroots expertise will be invaluable to our efforts to win the presidency and move our great nation towards the fundamental premise that every human life is precious and deserving of respect.”

The endorsements are personal because charitable organizations are prohibited from taking sides in a campaign. Consequently, as an organization, LDI endorses no candidates. We bring this report to you as a newsworthy item only.

BY THE WAY...

Presidential candidate George W. Bush has stated that *Roe v. Wade* was “a stretch” by the U.S. Supreme Court, but that abortion should be an issue decided by the states. Virtually all pro-life leaders oppose allowing states to decide that some of its children can be killed. It would make some states “free” and others “slave,” with those wishing to kill their children crossing state lines to do so—and groups such as Planned Parenthood would help them do so. No children would be saved.

As you know, Bush won the Republican caucuses in Iowa with 41 percent of the vote. Steve Forbes, the leading pro-life candidate, garnered 30 percent. While the media hailed the Bush win as a huge victory, totaling the ballots received for the three most pro-life candidates (Forbes, Gary Gary Bauer and Alan Keyes) means that 53 percent of voters wanted a candidate who stands tall on abortion and other moral issues.

It is common for candidates to attack those in the field just ahead of them in the polls. (McCain is attacking Bush. Forbes is attacking Bush—mostly on abortion. Bush is attacking McCain.) Yet Bauer and Keyes are consistently attacking Forbes. Even if Bauer and Keyes were to share Forbes’ votes, it would allow Bush or McCain—the weakest candidates on abortion—to win the nomination. We at LDI cannot understand the rationale of attacking those most like you—even if it is a rival candidate. While the positions espoused by Bauer and Keyes are virtually identical on every issue (why are both of these men running), they also differ with Forbes on very few issues, and abortion is not one of them. These three men represent rival campaigns, not rival causes, and the cause should always be put ahead of any one person.

THOMAS PRO-ADOPTION, BUT...

R. David Thomas has joined with Wendy’s, the fast-food chain he founded, and the United States Postal Service to promote adoption. Thomas himself was adopted.

Speaking at the National Press Club, Thomas said he was hurt and disappointed at age 13 after being told he was adopted. Thomas was so disturbed that he refused to discuss it. Not any longer. “Our major goal is to get every girl and every boy adopted,” Thomas said. There are 110,000 children available for adoption, but too much bureaucratic red tape delays the process. As many as 600,000 more children are in foster care. “These kids are losing their childhood,” Thomas said.

While Thomas is pro-adoption, he is not necessarily pro-life. A supporter of Planned Parenthood's population control agenda, Thomas was asked whether he believes the United States Supreme Court should overturn *Roe v. Wade*, given that so many people want to adopt newborn babies. As he approached the microphone to answer, Thomas initially said, "Probably," but then said, "I don't have an answer for that."

Thomas is not alone in his seemingly contradictory position. Actor and National Rifle Association President Charlton Heston is opposed to abortion, but he too embraces Planned Parenthood's population control agenda.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

"I'm not a major pro-lifer. My views on this are mixed. Still, I cannot look at this list of positions and conclude that this guy is anything but a weasel on this issue. What part of this is unclear to the pro-lifers who are backing Bush?"

— An "off the record" comment made by a professional campaign consultant after reading a comparison of the stands of presidential candidates on the abortion issue.

DID WE HEAR THAT RIGHT?

If you watched the New Year come in with Cable News Network, you heard Larry King interview evangelist Billy Graham. Everything seemed fine, but then Graham made reference to the huge problem of overpopulation. Graham has previously made statements that have justified some abortions.

The Christian Action Council, once the largest evangelical pro-life organization in the United States, was founded in Graham's home many years ago. Graham refused to take a stand at the organizational meeting because he believed doing so might hurt his "ministry."

BUCHANAN EXPLAINS DECISION

Presidential candidate Patrick J. Buchanan recently wrote to Colleen Parro of the Republican National Coalition for Life about his decision to leave the Republican Party. The text follows:

As there have been questions raised among loyal friends, as to the wisdom of my leaving the Republican Party, and how that might damage the cause of life, I thought a Christmas message in order.

Let me tell you why I left the party. High among the reasons is that I believe the party is consciously abandoning the cause of life. In 1992, the Buchanan Brigades fought to keep our party pro-life; and we did again in 1996. While all the other candidates endorsed Senator Dole before San Diego, we refused—until we were certain that both the platform and ticket would be pro-life. Only then did I endorse.

But no sooner had I done so, then Senator Dole announced he had not read the platform and would not feel bound by it. Others inside the party hierarchy declared their independence of the platform. While I was denied a speaking slot at a convention to which I had come with 3 million votes and 200 delegates, major speaking roles were given to Colin Powell, Susan Molinari, and Christie Todd Whitman. The life message was barely heard at the podium. In short, the message to those who had voted for us was: We accept your votes and your endorsement, but we don't want your ideas, and we don't want you.

As the 1999 year began, Gov. Bush and Sen. McCain made clear at every opportunity that they are not committed to appointing pro-life Justices to the Supreme Court, nor are they committed to selecting a pro-life running mate. The vigor with which they declare there is "no litmus test" for justices or running mates underscores that they are openly appealing to pro-abortion Republicans, saying in effect: We are not frozen in concrete on this issue of life.

Former First Lady Barbara Bush has gone further to say that right to life should not even be an issue in a presidential campaign. (Can any of us point to a single statement that ex-President Bush or Sen. Dole has made since losing, in support of the right to life of the unborn?)

In short, I concluded that the Right-to-Life Movement is being used by the Republican Establishment, and, frankly, is allowing itself to be used. It has been told to live with the hope, but not with any pledge, that its candidate will remain true to a platform Mr. Bush and Mr. McCain treat like an embarrassment or a nuisance. And pro-life voters seem quite content with these crumbs from the table; I am not.

So, we moved to the Reform Party which can give us leverage over the GOP, a chance for the Presidency, and the probability of being in national debates where we can put the issue of life on the table—for both major parties to address.

But what of the possibility, I am asked, that you will “drain off” pro-life votes from Mr. Bush and help elect Mr. Gore, who will appoint only pro-abortion justices like Ruth Bader Ginsburg? Here we come to the heart of the matter. A supposedly pro-life U.S. Senate voted 97-3 to confirm Justice Ginsberg, although her militant pro-abortion views were a matter of record. Sen. Hatch facilitated her swift and triumphant march through the Judiciary Committee.

If the Republican Party were truly pro-life and anti-judicial activism, neither Justice Ginsberg nor Breyer would have been approved. But a supposedly pro-life Republican Senate was unwilling to die in the last ditch for the right to life, although it is willing to do so to oppose a hike in the capital gains tax. Where your purse is, there your heart will be also.

Comes now the complaint that the Reform Party is indifferent to life, that I have the support of individuals like Lenora Fulani and of Pat Choate, neither of whom is pro-life. True; and they are aiding me as we advance on the Reform Party nomination.

But both they and all others who endorse me for the Reform Party nomination, do so in the knowledge that I will nominate only pro-life justices to the Supreme Court, that my running mate will be pro-life, that I will defund

Planned Parenthood and UNFPA, that I will reverse, on January 22, 2001, the five executive orders of Bill Clinton that made us an abortion-on-demand nation, that I will proscribe abortions at U.S. military hospitals, that I will ask the Congress for immediate passage of a law outlawing partial birth abortion, and, seizing on Daschle’s past statements, outlawing all abortions that take place after the viability of the unborn child. Moreover, I will use that Bully Pulpit for life as no president before me to wage all-out political warfare on behalf of the unborn child.

Now, is there a chance that my joining the Reform Party and my campaign may retard rather than advance the causes in which I believe, including life? Of course there is. That has always been true, even when I challenged President Bush in 1991. Indeed, that is why this was no easy decision; and that is one of the reasons I did not run as a Third Party candidate with Howard Phillips in 1996.

But, now, like many, I have given up on the GOP Establishment. I have reached a point of indifference as to whether Republicans or Democrats control Congress. It really does not greatly matter, as we have found out. Nor do I intend to spend the rest of my life using my God-given talents to resurrect milquetoast conservatism. For it is not only on the life issue where Republican presidents gave us such exemplars of traditionalism and judicial restraint as John Paul Stevens, Sandra O’Connor, Anthony Kennedy, David Souter and Harry Blackmun, but on so many other issues—neo-imperialism, NATO expansion, Big Government, sovereignty surrenders—that the GOP Establishment is in some cases more dangerous than the Clinton-Gore crowd whose globalist ideology is at least tempered by a lack of principle and a lack of courage.

Final thought, Colleen. You tell my friends out there, and the newly skeptical, that if Pat Buchanan wins the Reform Party nomination, the cause of life will never have had a better champion in the race for the presidency. Tell them I would rather lose the Oval Office than walk on the unborn. I pray I have done the right thing; one never knows till the end. But whether I have these are the reasons I did it.

Pat Buchanan

THE PRAYER PROJECT

Please join us in daily prayer for: January—Senator *Tom Harkin*, D-Iowa; February—*George Pataki*, governor of New York; March—actress and activist *Jane Fonda*; April—*Anton Kuerti* of Concertmasters

Inc.; May—*Preston Manning*, leader of Canada's Reform Party; and June—*Jesse Ventura*, governor of Minnesota.

SOME AMAZING COINCIDENCE

The Associated Press reports that the relocation of a Planned Parenthood facility in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, to a building across from a high school has angered many local residents, including Bishop Robert Carlson of the Sioux Falls Catholic Diocese who called Planned Parenthood's move "abhorrent and disturbing." But Planned Parenthood's Carolyn Woodley said the facility's proximity to the high school is just a coincidence "based on the availability of a lot and the accessibility of the location."

Bill Thimjon, chairman of the school board, is not concerned about the facility's location, but Faith Treague, who has a daughter at the high school, said, "I don't like it. I don't believe in abortion, and all of these kids having relations can look across the street and see how they can take care of it right there."

Amanda Hayward, a junior at the high school, told the reporter that she believes in abortion so she does not think it matters where the facility is located. "I think it is a good deal to have Planned Parenthood," she said. "Some kids can't talk to their parents about things like pregnancy, and this is a place to go." But will Hayward feel the same way when she has her own children?

MORE FREE ADVERTISING

In "The Love & Sex Report" published in the February 2000, issue of *YM [Young & Modern]*, a magazine that targets a female teenage readership, Planned Parenthood received more free advertising than ever. Not only does the magazine list the toll-free telephone number for Planned Parenthood, it also give the organization's horrific Website aimed at teenagers (www.teenwire.com.)

YM also offers contact information for National Women's Health Network, Sex, Etc., and Coalition for Positive Sexuality, Sex Ed for Teens. Do you know what the children you love (not only those God gave to you) are reading? It is time that we understood that such magazines and other media do as much to lead teenagers into sexual activity as does Planned Parenthood.

WE'VE MOVED—SORT OF

Since our current post office gives limited accessibility to the box, we have moved to a post office that gives us greater access. ***The new address is: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161.*** We still have many envelopes bearing the P.O. Box 907, Washington, DC 20044-0907 address, so we will continue to collect mail at that post office for the next six months. Therefore, you may use return envelopes as usual, but please use the new address when sending a personally addressed envelope. As of July 1, 2000, we will be fully transferred to the new post office and any mail going to the old address will be forwarded for one year. We hope this change will help us to serve you more efficiently.

ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER

Please take the following steps over the next two months:

- See "Prayer Project" above.
- Write to the three corporations newly added to *The Boycott List*. In addition, write to Tandy about its decision to "ignore" the boycott.
- Educate two people about Planned Parenthood, including at least one family member.

The Caleb Report is published six times per year. Subscribers also receive *Special Reports*, which is published quarterly. A minimum donation of \$38.00 per year is requested. Send changes of address to LDI at P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161.

To schedule a speaker call (202) 347-2066. Our e-mail address is: ldi-hq@usa.net. Thanks for your support!

This publication may be copied and/or distributed so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided.

© 2000 Life Decisions International.