



The Caleb Report

July-August 2001

Life Decisions International

vol. ix • no. 4

In this Issue: *Stem Cell Experimentation / Boycott Update / Quotable Quite / College Students Under Siege / Bush on Abortion / The Nazi "Solution" / Australian Leader Seeks Ban / Bearing False Witness / The Dancing Condom / Deadly Alliance Formed / The Prayer Project / "Youth Manifesto" From Hell / Communist Oppression / Economical Long Distance / Action Speaks Louder*

STEM CELL EXPERIMENTATION

While the Bush Administration may make its decision on whether the Federal Government will fund human embryonic stem cell experimentation before you receive this edition of *The Caleb Report*, some important points cannot go unstated. There are two key problems facing pro-life activists: the weakness of President George W. Bush on the life issues and the unfounded traitorous actions of some members of Congress who had heretofore been seen as strong pro-lifers.

Republican Senators Trent Lott, Miss., Strom Thurmond, S.C., Orrin Hatch, Utah (bolstered by the spineless decision of the Mormon hierarchy to take no stand on the tragedy), and William Frist, M.D., Tenn., have spoken in favor of the horrific experiments. All claim there is no inconsistency in their position on life issues and that such experimentation shows "great promise." (Everyone who wants to do any kind of experimentation with government funding uses the "great promise" excuse.) What we have here is a perfect example of ignorance and/or political cowardice.

Vice President Dick Cheney, interviewed on "The NewsHour with Jim Lehrer," was asked how the President sees the issue. After touting his pro-life voting record as a member of Congress, Cheney distinguished between those human beings who would be destroyed anyway and those who would not. He said there are "important questions being asked about embryonic stem cells derived from embryos that would otherwise be disposed of, embryos that were developed through in vitro fertilization, and the suggestion was that those embryos ought to be used as the basis for stem cell research with federal funds used to support that research." Similarly, Frist said the embryos in question would be destroyed anyway so we should make some use of them, but he does not support the creation of embryos for the expressed purpose of experimentation.

Using this line of thinking, Cheney and Frist would surely have had no problem with the Nazi Regime doing experiments on Jews before or after their deaths. After all, the "cells in question would be destroyed anyway."

Life begins at fertilization. This is not a belief. This is not an opinion based on questionable theology. It is an indisputable, provable fact. This being the case, there can be no justification for abortion, stem cell experimentation or anything remotely related to the ungodly use of the child in the womb. Senator Sam Brownback, R-Kan., has eloquently stated what should be obvious and basic to any true pro-lifer—we are talking here about the life and death of an individual human being.

There is surely some reason why pro-abortion advocacy groups so strongly support doing experimentation on embryos. (They would support such research on human beings even once they become fetuses.) It further

dehumanizes the child in the womb. It sets a standard that the unborn child can be used at will to “improve” the lives of those out of the womb. In addition, this issue points to the failure of pro-life organizations to consistently and actively fight the killing of embryos at fertility clinics and other places.

Some may seek to defend the hypocritical senators. After all, they may claim to oppose *Roe v. Wade*. The politicians know that there will be little if any political fallout. Pro-life leaders may be critical of their actions, but there will be no real penalty. Just how far are we willing to let politicians go before we begin to say they are not pro-life and therefore unworthy of our support?

Couple the statements of the “pro-life” senators with a shaky President who may be seeking a way out of a delicate situation and you potentially have serious political, legal, and moral danger. If Bush makes the right decision, he should be highly commended. But if he wavers, seeks some sort of “compromise,” or allows funding of such research (with or without “limits”), it is once again time to reevaluate our standards. And any organization or pro-life leader offering these men cover should be ashamed.

BOYCOTT UPDATE

Bank of America is claiming that its support of Planned Parenthood has *primarily* been through a matching-gift program. Since LDI does not track such programs, we sought clarification of the rhetoric used. LDI wrote to Bank of America to ask some basic and point-blank questions: Has Bank of America directly supported Planned Parenthood over the past five years (not through matching-gift programs); and does it plan to support Planned Parenthood in the future? We are *still* awaiting a reply. In the meantime, Bank of America remains a boycott target.

Wachovia and **First Union** are merging. Since both are boycott targets, there is no substantive change to *The Boycott List*.

West Coast Life is no longer a subsidiary of **Nationwide Insurance**. Consequently, the former is no longer a boycott target.

ELECTION 2001

In 1989, pro-abortion candidates were elected mayor of New York City and to governorships in New Jersey and Virginia. Planned Parenthood and the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL) hailed the victories as a referendum on abortion. The same elitist groups had little to say when their pet candidates lost every key post in the Virginia election of 1997. This year offers a clear choice in the two states.

In New Jersey, strongly pro-life Republican Jersey City Mayor Bret Schundler is in an uphill battle against pro-abortion Democrat Jim McGreevey for the governor’s mansion. McGreevey has effectively been running for governor for nearly five years.

Democrats are making abortion a key issue in the campaign. McGreevey has released several 60-second radio commercials denouncing Schundler’s position on abortion. In the ad, a woman says, “This year, I just can’t vote for Bret Schundler. He’s too out of step on things I care about.”

Schundler, if elected governor, would seek to enact a state constitutional amendment requiring parental notification before minors could get abortions and would seek to ban partial-birth abortions. Schundler is confident that most New Jersey residents support both plans. A parental notification amendment passed the

state legislature, but since it did not garner the required two-thirds majority, it must now be passed by a simple majority of voters in two consecutive elections before it can be enacted.

Elizabeth Volz, head of the New Jersey chapter of the National Organization for Women, said Schundler intends to “impose” his pro-life views on the state if elected. We sure hope so. Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI, met Schundler when they both worked on behalf of Steve Forbes’ presidential campaign. “The Mayor is incredibly skilled and dedicated,” Scott said. “I urge him to continue standing tall and to expose McGreevey as an extremist who is out of step with the majority of New Jersey voters on the abortion issue.”

In Virginia, polls show Republican Attorney General Mark Earley trailing Democrat Mark Warner. Earley would be a welcomed successor to Governor James S. Gilmore III, who supports first-trimester abortion. (Gilmore will continue to be trouble as President George W. Bush’s pick to head the Republican National Committee.) Warner is militantly pro-abortion.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

“You’re alive at this tiny moment in this vast span of eternity. You have the incomparable privilege to exist. Don’t waste it.”

— “god” character, played by Ann-Margaret, speaking to a teenager who was contemplating suicide, in the television program “Popular”

PETITIONING FOR EXCOMMUNICATIONS

WorldNetDaily reports that some Catholics are calling on Pope John Paul II to excommunicate so-called “Catholic” politicians who embrace abortion. Using a procedure called “A Canonical Petition to Excommunicate Culture of Death ‘Catholics,’” 46 Democrats and five Republicans are named as “defendants,” including Senators Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., Tom Daschle, D-S.D., Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., Governor Gray Davis, D-Calif. and Governor Tom Ridge, R-Penn.

Plaintiffs state that they are professed Catholics who bring the petition on behalf of themselves as members of the Catholic Church. Non-Catholics have also signed a “friend of the court” brief as members of other faiths “who are stricken by the scandal of notorious Catholics who relentlessly distort the most basic teachings of Christ in their pursuit of a Culture of Death.”

“Be it the Defendants enabling of the genocidal attack of the abortionists upon our Black and Hispanic population or the acquiescence to, or promotion of, anti-family homosexual movements, the result is the same: a great loss of faith, the diminution of the Catholic Church in the eyes of both Christians and non-Christians, and the unspeakable spiritual and physical woe of living in a society formed in law by the Defendants,” the unprecedented complaint petition reads.

The Catechism of the Catholic Church states that, “Formal cooperation in an abortion constitutes a grave offense. The Church attaches the canonical penalty of excommunication to this crime against human life.” The complaint argues that since the defendants create and enforce laws that support abortion, they are guilty of violating Church law.

In Pope John Paul II’s “*Evangelium Vitae*,” he noted that “the Church makes clear that abortion is a most serious and dangerous crime, thereby encouraging those who commit it to seek without delay the path of conversion. In the Church the purpose of the penalty of excommunication is to make an individual fully aware of the gravity of a certain sin and then to foster genuine conversion and repentance...No circumstance,

no purpose, no law whatsoever can ever make licit an act which is intrinsically illicit, since it is contrary to the Law of God which is written in every human heart, knowable by reason itself, and proclaimed by the Church.” Abortion is a crime “which no human law can claim to legitimize,” he wrote.

The American Life League notes that pro-abortion “Catholics” are running the United States Senate. These include: Majority Leader Tom Daschle, D-S.D., Patrick Leahy, D-Vt. (chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee who has said he will use his position to block the appointment of pro-life judges to federal courts), Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass. (chairman of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee), and Joseph R. Biden, D-Del. (chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee). All are extreme pro-abortion activists.

For a lesson in one way these kinds of situations may be handled before excommunication, we turn to a Massachusetts congressional campaign. The decision by State Senator Brian A. Joyce to abandon his opposition to abortion has led his pastor to speak out. Rev. Thomas Foley, pastor at St. Mary of the Hills Catholic Church, where Joyce was once an altar boy, criticized the politician in a newsletter distributed to parishioners. Foley reprinted an opinion column from *The Pilot*, a publication of the Archdiocese of Boston, which accused Joyce of demeaning the Catholic faith by suggesting that “deep consideration” allowed him to “move beyond Catholic teaching” on abortion.

All we can ask is: Where are the pastors of the Kennedys, Leahy, Dashle, Biden (who had the audacity to attend a pro-life rally run by Catholic leaders as though he were with them on the issue), and the many other pro-abortion “Catholics?” Their pastors should be doing the same thing.

WHERE’S A MILLSTONE?

When it was announced that the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the country’s ban on child pornography in January, the obvious question had to be asked. Who would challenge such a law?

“If God didn’t mean children to have sex, then why does puberty happen so early?” asked John Robin Sharpe who challenged the ban after being charged with possession of and possession with intent to distribute child pornography. “Why [are] kids capable of sexual urges and sexual fantasies from at least the age of 11 in boys, probably earlier in girls? Did God goof?” Sharpe refuses to say whether he has personally had sex with a child.

Sharpe, 67, from British Columbia, successfully convinced the provincial Supreme Court to nullify the law. But the federal Supreme Court reversed the decision. “In broad impact and general application, the limits [the law] imposes on free expression are justified by the protection the law affords children from exploitation and abuse,” wrote Chief Justice Beverley McLachlin. (Both courts are rabidly pro-abortion.)

Sharpe claims that one reason he challenged the law was to help Canadians to be “more free” and that somebody had to do it. He is now writing a book about the case.

It seems that Planned Parenthood should have no problem with Sharpe’s position. After all, in its summer 1996 *Bulletin*, Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada wrote: “The solution [to ‘negative’ early sexual experience]...is to teach young people how to experience sexual pleasure, instead of teaching them to not have sex.”

NEW PRO-ABORTION LEADER

Shortly after taking office, the new president of the pro-abortion National Organization for Women (NOW) said her first priority would be to block efforts by President George W. Bush to nominate Supreme Court justices opposed to abortion. Kim Gandy said NOW will see to it that the United States Senate, which must confirm Bush's choices, understands the importance of the abortion issue.

"They have more to fear from women's votes than they have to fear from right-wing political and religious zealots," said Gandy. (Is Jesse Jackson a left-wing political and religious zealot?)

"We are concerned that Gandy is going to make abortion her top priority. She is on the wrong track," Feminists for Life President Serrin Foster told the Associated Press. Foster said NOW should combat domestic violence and seek ways for women to combine their jobs with their families.

If a Supreme Court nominee who opposes *Roe v. Wade* is confirmed, Gandy said the senators who voted for that person "are going to be put out of office." But the leaders of pro-life organizations say "the bark is bigger than the bite."

"NOW has not been successful in the past and it is a dying organization...But they will try to neutralize nominees or scare off nominees that [sic] are pro-life," said Wendy Wright, communications director of Concerned Women for America. "Like the way we did with the Ashcroft nomination, we will support and educate people on the nominees who do not just make laws from the bench. We will tell the people about what NOW and their left-wing cohorts are lying about," she said.

Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI, said NOW and its legions are not to be taken lightly. "The confirmation process will not be about truth or educating senators. It will be about public perception and 30-second sound bites. We need to be prepared for a costly and time-consuming battle." Naturally, this assumes President Bush will nominate an anti-*Roe* justice.

Patricia Ireland expressed confidence in her successor. She said that under Gandy's leadership, NOW will continue to enact more groundbreaking laws that guarantee unrestricted access to abortion, elect more pro-abortion candidates at various levels of government, and prevent "the packing of courts with anti-women's rights nominees." Ireland had served as NOW president for the past decade.

Gandy has been involved with NOW since 1973 and served as vice president for the radical feminist group during Ireland's years at the helm. Gandy also worked as a senior assistant district attorney in New Orleans before opening a private practice focusing on "women's rights issues."

THE RIGHT *NOT* TO BE BORN

Agence France Presse reports that France's highest court of appeal has ruled that disabled children are entitled to compensation if their mothers were not given the chance to abort them. (Of course, it is the *families* who will receive and control the money.) The court was ruling on a case brought by the families of three children aged between nine and eleven. One has a malformation of the spine and the other two have only one arm. The families argued that if doctors had detected the fetuses' disabilities, they would have aborted the children.

Doctors and advocates for the disabled reacted angrily, describing the decision by the Cour de Cassation as a step toward eugenics. The ruling was surprising because it upheld a widely condemned landmark decision, known as the Perruche case, which awarded damages to a mentally retarded boy because he had not been aborted. The case was widely described as establishing in law a disabled child's "right not to be born." Judges at the Cour de Cassation decided that the Perruche precedent remained "as long as a causal link can be established with an error committed by a doctor."

“This is a real act of phobia,” said the Collective to Stop Discrimination Against the Disabled, which was established after the Perruche case. “Now parents are going to be attacked and seen as irresponsible because they gave birth to a handicapped child.”

Doctors say the fear of being sued for a misdiagnosis would encourage them to recommend abortions at the smallest hint of a disability. “The ruling means that the handicapped have no place in our society,” said Yves Richard, a lawyer representing the medical profession. “There is a real risk of this starting a process that ends with the search for the perfect child.”

Was France freed from the Third Reich so it could begin its own tyrannical attack on the weakest members of society? Given that similar laws and rulings exist in the United States, we are in no position to talk.

THE PRAYER PROJECT

The Prayer Project encourages prayer for those in the Pro-Abortion Movement and those who have not been strong in their claimed pro-life convictions. Join us in daily prayer for: July—First Lady *Laura Bush*; August—Rev. *R. G. “Pat” Robertson*; September—Rev. *Edmund J. Dobbin*, president of Villanova University; October—Senator *Trent Lott*, R-Miss.; November—Senator *William Frist*, M.D., R-Tenn.; December—Senator *Orrin Hatch*, R-Utah, and January—Senator *Strom Thurmond*, R-S.C.

CANADIAN GROUPS WANT DRUGS

The *National Post* reports that a drug company and a group of doctors will formally ask Health Canada to permit sales of the “morning after pill” (MAP) without a prescription. An Ontario study has supposedly found that women are eager to get the drug quickly without having to see a doctor. An effort to make the drug available over the counter in British Columbia has also proven popular, and the province of Quebec is taking similar steps.

According to Dr. Sheila Dunn, not having to see a doctor before buying the pills is often crucial if women are to get them in a timely manner. “If they had to go the traditional route, they might not have got them [sic],” she said. “If you think of someone who is working, who’s got kids at home, who might be a single parent, who is probably up to her eyeballs with things to do, this is one more thing to do—to get in to [see] a physician.” Dunn supervised the study.

As part of the study, selected pharmacists were allowed to issue MAP prescriptions on the spot without doctor involvement. With virtually no advertising and only a handful of druggists involved initially, 200 doses of the pill were given in the first three weeks of the study.

The Ontario Medical Association and the Canadian Pharmacists Association are among the groups that have advocated making the drugs available over the counter. The provinces of Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia allow at least some pharmacists to issue prescriptions, eliminating the doctor.

Paladin Labs Inc., a Montreal company that distributes one brand of MAP called Plan B, and the Society of Obstetricians and Gynecologists are preparing an application that will ask Health Canada to eliminate the requirement for a prescription entirely. France and Britain have already done so, said Dr. André Lalonde, a Society spokesman. Health Canada officials have indicated privately that they favor making MAPs available over the counter, he said. This is not surprising given the rabidly pro-abortion Federal government.

The *National Post* describes the MAP as “a form of regular contraceptives that act to prevent pregnancy after intercourse, not abortion pills like the controversial RU-486. They are most effective in the first 72 hours after unguarded sex.” In reality, the pills are usually abortifacient, preventing implantation of a developing baby.

MORE DRUG PROPAGANDA

Just as the Canadian *National Post* and other media giants seek to print untruths about how the morning after pill (MAP) works, the Advertising Standards Agency (ASA) said it has upheld complaints against the United Kingdom Life League (UKLL) over two advertisements placed in religious newspapers in England. The UKLL is based in Scotland.

One ULKK poster is headlined, “Abortion by Tablet.” The text says the MAP works as an abortifacient. It is called “a silent and efficient killer of the unborn.”

The ASA disputes the claim. It said the ad is misleading because British law states that pregnancy begins at implantation, not fertilization, and a pill which acted to prevent implantation is, therefore, not abortifacient. (There have been similar attempts to redefine “pregnancy” in the United States. Such efforts accelerated under the Clinton Administration.)

The UKLL, an extension of Precious Life Scotland, said it will continue to run the ads and dismissed the ASA as a “toothless quango.” The UKLL should merely be relying on the fact that the MAP ad is truthful.

"EDUCATION" INCREASES UNSAFE SEX

The more homosexual men learn about so-called “safe sex,” the more they have unsafe sex. Such is the conclusion of researchers at London, England’s Royal Free and University College Medical School.

A total of 343 homosexual men who had experienced a sexually transmitted disease (STD) unrelated to the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) were sent to a 20-minute counseling session on “safe sex.” Of this group, 175 were also sent to a daylong session on “safe sex.”

In the year following the counseling, 31 percent of the men who attended the longer meeting contracted another STD, while 21 percent of those who went only to the short session did so. The results of the study appeared in the June 16, 2001, issue of the *British Medical Journal*.

Interestingly, a United States Government report concluded that there is insufficient evidence that condoms prevent the spread of most sexually transmitted diseases. *The Washington Post* notes that the finding will provide “fresh ammunition for advocates of ‘abstinence-only’ sex education...”

“SAFE SAX” AND THE SPERM GAME

Planned Parenthood of Southwest and Central Florida Inc. (PPSCF), is sponsoring “Safe Sax at Sunset” fund-raising programs. Attendees gather for a party that features saxophone music. The next program is scheduled for November 11, 2001, at the Phillippi Mansion.

The list of program sponsors includes: Cannons Marina, *Circle* magazine, Serbin Printing, Nuovo Salon & Spa, Comcast Cable, Home Resource, Dynamic Fitness, FlagShip National Bank, Sound Advice, Bennington

Tobaccoist, playview.com, *Sarasota* magazine, Three Olives Vodka/Diva Liqueur, *Weekly Planet*, IOPTICS, Sarasota Mitsubishi and *Downtown* magazine. All will be notified that they risk becoming boycott targets. Persons residing in the southeast and central regions of Florida are urged to immediately contact these companies to express their displeasure.

PPSCF's website includes "the Spermulator" online game. The objective is to destroy sperm before they reach the female egg. Of course, if you miss just one sperm, you lose. The game is located at www.safesaxatsunset.com/flash.cfm.

IS A MASSIVE CONVERSION LOOMING?

Many months ago, LDI suggested a way to put then-President William Jefferson Clinton, pro-abortion groups, and homosexual organizations in a quandary. What if Congress, which at the time was controlled Republicans, had passed a bill declaring that abortion would be unlawful if done on the belief that the child would be homosexual? What if a genetic marker were discovered that showed a predisposition toward homosexuality? Clearly, many parents would abort a child that would be homosexual and they would give a myriad of excuses for doing so.

Passing such legislation would have been a nightmare for pro-abortion activists and politicians alike. If Clinton vetoed the bill, he would have angered his homosexual constituency. If he had signed it, Clinton would have angered the abortion industry. Moreover, Clinton would be admitting that there are some abortions that just should not be committed. Since most homosexual activists are pro-abortion, they, too, would find it difficult to not make an about-face. And since pro-abortion and pro-homosexual groups have worked closely together in the past (with the former usually "using" the latter but offering little in return), the relationship would have become quite strained.

Agence France Presse reports that a homosexual judge in Australia recently called for the passage of laws to prevent the abortion of embryos and fetuses with what are perceived to be genetic "defects." Australian High Court Judge Michael Kirby told an ethics forum that some parents in the future may choose to abort children carrying genes for schizophrenia or early baldness because they considered them to be disabilities. Kirby, who has publicly disclosed his homosexuality, said some people might even abort to ensure their child is not homosexual, if it could be genetically determined.

"Although I do not regard my sexuality as a disability, there is no doubt that some people would do so," Kirby said. "Indeed, the hate mail I have received since publicly disclosing my sexuality indicates that this view is not at all uncommon, even in relatively enlightened Australia."

Kirby said that in many countries, including Australia, unborn children are checked for evidence of genetic conditions such as mental retardation. "Termination decisions are regularly made" for such reasons," he said. "Apparently, they are condoned by law in most jurisdictions and certainly by medical practice." Kirby said that without new laws, complex ethical questions would be turned over to parents and doctors. "Social forces, public opinion and even economic considerations may then influence the determination of where the line is drawn," he said.

Catholic moral theologian Father Kevin McGovern said he shares Kirby's concerns. "Pope John Paul II has warned that such practices are shameful and utterly reprehensible and open the way to legitimizing infanticide and euthanasia," he said. "The Church condemns, and will never cease condemning, the taking of innocent unborn life."

Federal, state and territory governments recently agreed to examine uniform national laws on the use of reproductive technologies. But Queensland University genome researcher and professor John Mattick said he does not believe legislation is necessary as “ordinary people should be able to make up their own minds. It’s a minefield for the government to be involved,” he said.

LDI’s president notes that while in Florida he once heard a radio talk show host stating that the ability to determine sexual orientation prior to birth would put pro-life people in a horrible position since they hate homosexuality more than they do abortion. “The host is simply wrong. The right to life is inalienable,” Scott said. “And that goes for *every* unborn human being.”

ON PETITIONS

Some LDI supporters have asked why we do not initiate a petition drive to corporations that fund Planned Parenthood. Others have asked why LDI does not routinely support petition drives. There are several reasons for our policy.

Most petition drives are primarily fund-raising gimmicks. Those with access to the petitions have your name, address and phone number. You will surely end up in at least one fund-raising database.

LDI will support petition drives that meet the following criteria: 1) the petition drive ends at a specific date; 2) petitions are delivered to the intended recipient(s) within 60 days of the drive’s end; 3) there is strong reason to believe that a petition drive could help achieve the goal; and 4) no entity will use the information for fund-raising, it will not be released to another organization, and it will not be used for any other purpose unless a statement is clearly displayed on the petition notifying signers that it may be used in such a way.

If you want to test an organization, say you will send a donation once the petitions have been delivered to the intended recipient(s), if they were not used for fund-raising purposes, and the project has been proven effective. Chances are you will not get a reply.

We believe this policy respects the privacy of those who sign a petition. It seems that any group using a petition drive—if it is truly only interested in influencing the target of the petition—would agree to such a policy. Doing so would surely increase the number of signatures obtained. Generally speaking, however, LDI is not a fan of a petition drive as we believe they usually serve little value, just as preprinted postcards are ineffective.

SHAME vs. THANKS

LDI recently received the following e-mail:

I read in the Focus on the Family magazine *Citizen* about your organization. I wanted to learn more about how my family and I could support Christian companies and NOT support companies that funded un-Godly deeds. What I found on your web site really alarmed and concerned me. As a Christian and a father, I want to do the right thing both for God and my family. I logged on your site to look at the list of companies that I might or might not be doing business with. I am a strong believer in not funding un-Godly principles with my money. What I found was not a listing for Christians like myself to read, but an order form and for the fee of \$42 I could get a list. [Editor’s Note: Actually, an annual Partnership is \$42.00 online, while a single *List* is \$15.25.] I really think charging for such a list is outrageous!!! If this organization truly believes in the sanctity of life you would be doing all you could to get both your message out and the list of companies who support murdering America’s children. Shame on you for wanting to charge \$42 dollars!!!!

Respectfully,

DeWayne
Knoxville, Tennessee

While such e-mails discourage and disappoint us, we believe it would be useful to offer our friends some information in this regard. *The Boycott List* used to be available without a requested donation, but this practice changed when: 1) pro-abortion groups urged their people to obtain the information (which is expensive to gather and maintain) in an effort to bankrupt us, which they nearly did (pro-abortion groups sought our information free-of-charge, so we were essentially publishing a list for *them* to use, while we did all the work and incurred all of the expenses); and 2) it became clear that we had to ask for the gift or cease publishing *The List*.

The few people who complain about our system have no idea what is involved, including countless man-hours, phone calls, travel, letters, and so on. (This is one reason why our *List* is so well respected. We take care to do it right.) And our budget is less than \$100,000 per year—a small fraction of that of other nationwide pro-life groups.

Simply put, if we are to keep the lights on, pay our staff a salary (much less than \$50,000 for everybody—total), and do the job we are called to do, we need the funds to do it. Our Board of Directors will change the policy if and when it feels the time has come to do so. But one can expect that LDI will always ask for some kind of donation to discourage pro-abortion groups from seeking *The List*. (We already receive bad checks from pro-abortion people. We have also had persons make a donation via credit card who later claim the charge was fraudulently made after they receive the requested material. In both cases, we incur bank-related fees.) Thus, any suggestion that we are some “money-making operation” is ludicrous. (Either that or we are just very, *very* bad at it and we have been since our inception.)

We should note that the e-mail from DeWayne is atypical. Most people who initially raise questions make a kind and respectful inquiry. Once we reply, more than 95 percent understand the reasons for our practices and policies. In addition, persons who express a financial problem may receive the *List* at a substantial discount. (Partners may now order additional *Lists* for \$2.25 [\$2.50 by credit card]. They are no longer asked to donate \$14.00 for the first *List* with each order.)

Thankfully, we do not have to endure attacks on a daily basis. LDI also received the following e-mail, which we greatly appreciated:

Dear Doug [Scott], Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are a non-profit organization, which raises the funds to broadcast beautiful pro-life messages on major networks and cable stations in Colorado. I just read the e-mail message about your encouraging pro-life organizations not to use the services of American Express. With thanks to you for letting us know about companies, which support Planned Parenthood, we do not accept donations through American Express. When we have donors request sending gifts through this company, it gives me two open doors: 1) to explain why we do not do business with American Express; and 2) to encourage donors to contact you for your boycott list.

Be encouraged! Every one of the people I have told about the American Express boycott have said they would discontinue their credit cards through them.

Lisa Dotur
Life Education Fund of Colorado, Inc.

Scott chose not to comment on the fact that the writer listed him separately from the “gentlemen.”

HOW TO CONTACT US

LDI's mailing address: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161 (USA). Phone number: 202-347-2066. Fax number: 703-222-4346. Website address: www.fightpp.org. E-Mail Address (new): ldi@fightpp.org.

ACTION SPEAKS LOUDER

Please take the following steps:

- Write to four corporations on *The Boycott List*.
- See “The Prayer Project” on page five.

The Caleb Report, an official periodical of Life Decisions International, is published six times per year. Send changes of address to LDI at P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161. To schedule a speaker, call (202) 347-2066. Visit us on the World Wide Web at www.fightpp.org. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every member of LDI's Board of Directors, Board of Advisors, or staff. This publication may be copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation.

©2001 Life Decisions International.