



The Caleb Report

September-October 2001

Life Decisions International

vol. ix • no. 5

In this Issue: *Compromising On Life / Quotable Quote / MasterCard, CVS And UNICEF / Lawsuit Filed / New Planned Parenthood Ads / American Red Cross-ing The Line / Jealousy And Whining Of The Rich / The Prayer Project / Euthanasia Kit / Support For Abortion Supporter / Support For LDI / Doing The Right Thing / "Refund For Choice" / We Wonder*

COMPROMISING ON LIFE

Washington, D.C.'s WTOP radio station summed it up best when it quoted Senator Edward M. Kennedy as saying that President George W. Bush's decision on stem cell experimentation "opened the door." Consequently, Kennedy thinks it may be premature for him to propose legislation on the matter as getting a "foot in the door" is good enough—for now.

Reaction to the decision ranged from relief to grave disappointment. Writing for the *New York Post*, Rod Dreher accused the President of lying to pro-lifers. "George W. Bush said during his campaign, and publicly reiterated as recently as May, that he believed using embryonic stem cells for research purposes are [sic] immoral," Dreher wrote. "Now, he has shown that he either has not the courage of his convictions, or has no true convictions. Pro-life social conservatives, who were told by the Bushies [Bush campaign leaders] during the fall campaign not to worry, he was really was one of us, despite his silence, have been betrayed."

Dreher referred to philosopher Michael Novak's take on the matter. Novak said fans of stem cell experimentation have seized an important moral beachhead. He said that despite Bush's attempt to limit such experimentation, the President yielded on the fundamental moral principle that would justify his action: That the deliberate destruction of innocent human life is never acceptable—no matter how good the end result. "Giving away the principle means the next surrender is much, much easier," Novak said. "There'll be enormous pressure now to widen this research."

While organizations supportive of experimentation were lukewarm to the President's announcement, they did see it as a foot in the door. "We think [the decision] is a victory for patients, and a confirmation of the hope that embryonic stem cell research brings," said John Rogers of the Parkinson's Action Network. "We've got a commitment to move forward with this research."

What is most troubling about the President's decision is the lack of unity among pro-life leaders. "We are delighted that [the] decision prevents the federal government from becoming a party to the further killing of human embryos for medical experimentation," said Olivia Gans of the National Right to Life Committee Inc. (NRLC). The NRLC Inc., hierarchy "mourns" the lives of the embryos who died to create the stem-cell line, but "nothing we or the president could do could bring them back."

NRLC Inc., is "delighted" with the decision and "mourns" the victims? Dreher said this about the group's spin: "[T]he ugly truth...is this: Under the watch of a supposedly pro-life Republican president, the United States government has given its imprimatur to strip-mining defenseless human life for the sake of the living."

But one person was more direct in her fire. In correspondence between pro-life leaders, one wrote that she is “not too impressed (to say the least) with NRLC’s spin on this. Was it really helpful to the pro-life cause to ‘[a]pplaud’ Bush’s decision; or was it merely helpful to NRLC’s ‘cause’ to retain its seat at the establishment’s table? It was a defeat; and no spin can define it otherwise—even if it ‘could have been worse.’”

The writer—the identity of whom we are withholding—offered an analogy: “Would it be acceptable to spend...taxpayer dollars to further expand on the Nazi’s horrific ‘research’ on preserved body parts of concentration camp victims since nothing the National Right to Life Committee or President Bush can do can restore the lives of those [Holocaust victims] who have already died?”

Another pro-life leader said, “This really has opened up a lot of people’s eyes to NRLC. People are wondering what they are really willing to stand for.”

Standing with NRLC Inc., is Focus on the Family’s Dr. James C. Dobson:

President Bush faced tremendous political pressure to betray his pro-life commitment. He has courageously upheld his promise protect unborn children. He deserves praise from citizens who understand that it is never justified to destroy one life in order to possibly save another.

We grieve for the lives of these embryos. But we are delighted that the government will not take part in killing any more. Americans who respect human life from conception understand that this type of research oversteps the bounds of morality and ethics. We breathe a sigh of relief that President Bush has upheld that pro-life policy, and trust that he will continue to do so.

We as a nation need to understand that we can be both pro-life and supportive of medical research. Federal funds should be directed toward funding research using non-destructive sources such as bone marrow, umbilical cord blood, placenta and fat.

We must never forget that we were all embryos at one time. The battle to protect innocent life is far from over. We call upon Congress to continue the ban on federal funding to protect these defenseless little ones.

The New York Times reports that Rev. Jerry Falwell and Rev. Pat Robertson also praised Bush’s decision. But negative reaction seemed to be the most common among the vast majority of organizations that actually work on pro-life issues on a daily basis. Ken Connor of the Family Research Council said:

We commend President Bush for drawing a clear line against future federal funding of stem cell research that involves the killing of human embryos. The President re-affirmed the fundamental moral principle that life is the sacred gift of the Creator and deserves protection at its very beginning.

The President was also right to reject a utilitarian ethic that holds it is right to do wrong in service of a greater good. As Mr. Bush rightly pointed out, even the most noble ends do not justify any means.

Even so, the President’s decision to allow taxpayer funded research to proceed on 60 existing stem cell lines is troubling. It is a basic moral principle that one cannot benefit by the wrongdoing of others. In law, this doctrine is known as the fruit of the poisonous tree. Courts have long held that to allow government to benefit from a wrongful act provides an unhealthy incentive to persist in such acts.

By permitting research on existing stem cells lines obtained by past killing of embryos, Mr. Bush attempts to put a redemptive gloss on previous bad acts and to distance himself from the immoral acts that resulted in the killing of embryonic human beings.

But by casting such research in a positive light, he will encourage members of Congress to advocate additional research which kills additional embryos so that even more stem cell lines can be created and even more people can be helped by such killing. [Editor's Note: There is no evidence that the killing will help anyone.] The President has by agreeing to underwrite such research embraced the logic of those who advocate such research. The issue will no longer be whether such research ought to be permitted, but rather how many cell lines are enough. Having introduced the camel's nose under the tent, soon we will have the whole beast...

This concession also puts the President on the wrong side of the principle. If 60 stem cell lines are morally acceptable, then why not 600 or 6,000? Furthermore, the President did not address the issue of unrestrained private-sector research. If killing embryos is unacceptable in publicly funded institutions, how can it be moral when carried out in private laboratories?

Moral principles are not divisible. Killing human embryos for research is wrong in every instance. The President is only stepping deeper into the moral morass.

The Christian Medical Association's David Stevens, M.D., issued a critical statement:

Like many who heard the President's decision, I came away both encouraged and concerned. I was encouraged to see our President commit to funding the tremendous promise of adult stem cell research—an alternative that may enable us to solve the problems of diabetes, Parkinson's and a host of other chronic diseases. And I was encouraged to hear of the formation of an advisory council that will continue to examine the important ethical aspects as well as the scientific progress of stem cell research. But as a physician who represents thousands of physicians and research scientists who find it morally unacceptable to destroy human embryos for the purpose of experimentation, I am also deeply concerned.

I am concerned that by funding research on stem cells taken from embryos who were previously destroyed, we are breaking down a vital moral barrier. This moral barrier is embodied by the longstanding ethical medical principle of "do no harm." This moral barrier is also embodied by the biblical principle, "Thou shalt not kill."

If it is wrong to destroy human embryos for research purposes, it is wrong to use human embryos who already have been destroyed for research purposes. It is simply wrong to destroy human embryos.

In light of this truth, I am concerned that this decision may encourage a view of human embryos not as a precious human life made in God's image, but as a commodity for our manipulation. I am also concerned that the decision will now begin to build tremendous pressure to take research even further down the road of using human life as commodity.

Such a view of human embryos flouts ethical principles contained in the Nuremberg Code and in the National Institutes of Health's "Guidelines for the Conduct of Research Involving Human Subjects". Both clearly express the fundamental principle governing human experimentation that "no experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur...

So we must ask ourselves, what kind of a nation will we build? Will we build a culture of life, based on the principle that "all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness"? Or will we allow ourselves to treat the most vulnerable members of the human race as a mere commodity? If we violate the protective medical ethic of "do no harm" and cross over into lethal human experimentation, what will the limits be?

Our nation as a whole and specifically our scientific community must address this moral question head-on and determine that we will value and protect human life in all its stages of development. To do any less than this will imperil not only the unborn, but all of us.

Bishop Joseph A. Fiorenza of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops issued a statement:

President Bush has reaffirmed his support for a ban on human cloning and other policies that deserve support in their own right. However, the trade-off he has announced is morally unacceptable: The federal government, for the first time in history, will support research that relies on the destruction of some defenseless human beings for possible benefit to others. However such a decision is hedged about with qualifications, it allows our nation's research enterprise to cultivate a disrespect for human life.

Researchers who want to pursue destructive embryo research and their allies in Congress have already rejected such limits, saying that these limits will interfere with efforts to turn embryonic stem cell research into possible medical treatments. The President's policy may therefore prove to be as unworkable as it is morally wrong, ultimately serving only those whose goal is unlimited embryo research.

We hope and pray that President Bush will return to a principled stand against treating some human lives as nothing more than objects to be manipulated and destroyed for research purposes. As we face a new century of powerful and sometimes even frightening advances in biotechnology, we must help ensure that our technical advances will serve rather than demean our very humanity.

Lutherans for Life had some criticism for the President:

Lutherans for Life commends President Bush for not allowing Federal funds to be used for embryonic stem cell research that destroys living human embryos and for promising to fund research on other sources of stem cells. However, we are disappointed that he will still allow Federal funds to be used on existing cell lines. Although no loss of life occurs, this process still takes advantage of the intentional destruction of life in the past. Can one be a part of the results of that destruction without condoning that destruction?

We are glad to hear the President say he wants to put a stop to the devaluing of human life in our country. However, his speech Thursday night could have done more to accomplish that. Blurred in his presentation was the fundamental biological fact that human life begins at conception. To destroy a human embryo for his or her stem cells is to destroy a human life. That devalues life. To use stem cells from that destruction even if it has already occurred, devalues life.

President Bush did not open the door to full funding of embryonic stem cell research, and for this we are thankful. But the door is not all the way closed. The crack that remains is a dangerous one. Christian should be watching this situation very closely.

For us as Christians, embryonic stem cell research strikes right at the heart of the truth that every human life is a gift from God with a soul from the moment of conception and is someone for whom Jesus died. It is crucial for Christians to stand up and defend this truth.

Thomas A. Glessner, J.D., of the National Institute of Family and Life Advocates said:

The decision of President Bush to fund stem cell research with restrictions is both disappointing and encouraging at the same time. The decision to allow research to continue using the stem cells of embryonic children who have already been killed legitimizes the destruction of these children and could foreseeably open the doors for the eventual use of living embryos for research. I fear that such a decision is a crack in a Pandora's box which, once opened, cannot be closed.

The decision is also disappointing in that it did not educate the public on the current successes of the use of adult stem cells and the possibilities that continued research in this area will bring major medical advances. However, President Bush should be praised for his strong opposition to human cloning and his refusal to allow funding to go forward on living embryos. By drawing the line in this way, the President is on record as acknowledging that life does indeed begin at conception and must be protected under the law.

"The president's position contradicts the Nuremberg Code," said Wendy Wright of Concerned Women for America. "We should be horrified at the prospect of participating in research on embryos who are

deliberately killed for the same reason that we are horrified that gold fillings were taken from the teeth of Holocaust victims.”

“I am ashamed of our president, who compromises and gives my generation the disposable human life mentality that human life can be picked apart, abused and destroyed,” said Lauren Newell of the Savior’s Alliance for Lifting the Truth (SALT), a Christian youth group. “If the president wants to be a strong man and a moral man, then I urge him to reconsider his decision.”

Other organizations to oppose the President’s decision are Human Life International, American Life League, Christian Legal Society, Traditional Values Coalition, and Eagle Forum. Former Ambassador Alan Keyes, columnist Cal Thomas, and Prison Fellowship’s Chuck Colson, among others, have also condemned the decision. At the same time, the highly respected conservative leader Paul Weyrich of the Free Congress Foundation supports it.

“Did it also disturb anyone that President Bush [in his speech] repeatedly referred to an embryo’s ‘potential for life?’” wrote Thomas L. Jipping, J.D., who works for Weyrich. “Isn’t that distinction—whether human life is potential or actual before birth—at the heart of the life issues?”

Is this really the limit for federally funded stem cell experimentation? Is government funding of human spare parts next? Are people acting as though some president or Congress will not someday throw all unborn lives to the wolves? The issue is government collusion, not banning experiments, which are currently done with private dollars. Why are we not concerned about banning such experimentation, period? Why are we not concerned about the millions of lives lost at fertility clinics?

“No wonder the Pro-Life Movement has not won,” said LDI’s Douglas R. Scott. “Its leaders cannot even agree on when human life begins and under what circumstances it is not worth protecting.”

“Almost everyone claims to have prayed about this issue—even the President,” Scott said. “Did God send conflicting signals to different people? Does God really have mixed feelings about what we can do to those He created? Or are some of us just not listening?”

ACTION: This is not over. Tell your members of Congress know how you feel.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

“When it comes to anti-abortionists, I respect only those who are in it 100%. If you think aborting a fetus is killing a human being, why look for loopholes?”

— pro-abortion *Los Angeles Times* writer Dana Parsons

MASTERCARD, CVS AND UNICEF

As first reported late last year, MasterCard International and CVS Corporation (a national pharmacy chain) have joined forces to raise money for pro-abortion United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). As part of its “Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF” campaign, children are urged to pick up a box, available at CVS and other locations, and ask for donations as they go trick-or-treating. The program has raised millions of dollars.

For its part, in 2000, MasterCard donated 25 cents to UNICEF each time a person made a minimum \$35 purchase on one of its cards in October. MasterCard had set a cap of \$150,000 in support.

In an article entitled, “A Halloween Trick,” Leo O’Drudy of the Free Congress Foundation, wrote, “Be wary of a trick this Halloween. A trick being played on many kids, and maybe on you.” The author discussed the unknown side of UNICEF:

Starting in the 1960s, UNICEF changed dramatically from a simple, uncontroversial charity that everyone could support into an aggressive provider of contraception and even abortion. UNICEF has even disturbed the innocence of schoolchildren by promoting these things in schools. Because of this and a number of high-profile corruption scandals, the United States Government withdrew its financial support for UNICEF over ten years ago. The Catholic Church and other major religious and charitable donors have dropped it as well. However, it remains very well funded.

UNICEF is notorious for going to refugee camps with enormous quantities of condoms, abortion kits and other tools to stifle and destroy life, even when the people there are in desperately short supply of water, food, shelter, medicine, and other tools to save life. In fact, UNICEF is so extreme that in 1974, its current chairman, then a New York senator, voted against declaring that a baby who survived an abortion and was born alive is entitled to the same care as other infants born alive.

Unfortunately, hard-core liberal billionaire and United Nations booster Ted Turner has been running ads on CNN and the other networks, especially those that children watch, trying to make “Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF” seem as American as apple pie and as normal as the Salvation Army at Christmastime. Don’t believe it.

What’s so ironic is that UNICEF views kids not as a blessing, but as a problem to be prevented (or eliminated). And yet it cynically and hypocritically exploits the good-heartedness of many kids and their parents to raise money for its destructive work.

UNICEF has been at the forefront of recent articles regarding the decision of the United States Government to send a low-level delegation to the United Nations Children’s Summit. The Associated Press reports that UNICEF’s chief, Carol Bellamy, assured President George W. Bush that the conference would not support abortion. “The (conference) document doesn’t refer to abortion,” Bellamy said. “This is a document about health of kids, education of kids, child protection, child soldiers, child labor, HIV/AIDS.”

The United States expressed concern that references to “reproductive health services” in the draft document are code words for abortion. But advocates say the concerns are baseless. Yet every pro-life and pro-abortion activist knows exactly what “reproductive health services” means and it includes abortion.

UNICEF’s Bellamy said there have been references to “reproductive health services” in United Nations documents for many years, including in material published UNICEF and the World Health Organization. “Abortion isn’t part of anything that UNICEF has been involved in,” she stressed. “We don’t recommend it. We don’t engage in it. We don’t offer it. We don’t tell people they should have it.”

Pro-life activists working inside and outside the United Nations know better. “It’s all a question of how terms are defined,” said Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI. “We know what they mean. We have had many years of experience dealing with their misleading rhetoric. We don’t lightly accuse organizations of being involved in abortion promotion.” Scott said that despite UNICEF’s denials, it is part of the United Nations and embraces that deadly agenda.

ACTION: We want to be sure CVS and MasterCard do not promote UNICEF this year and in coming years. Ask the two companies to avoid involving themselves in such a controversial issue: Mr. Robert W. Selander, President & CEO, MasterCard International, 2000 Purchase St., Purchase, NY 10577. Phone: (914) 249-2000; and Mr. Thomas M. Ryan, Chairman, President & CEO, CVS Corporation, One CVS Dr., Woonsocket, RI 02895. Phone: 800-666-0500 or 888-607-4287. Contact your local CVS pharmacy as well.

LAWSUIT FILED

The Associated Press reports that a Glendale, Arizona, teenager who underwent two abortions after being impregnated by an adult foster brother is suing Planned Parenthood. The 15-year-old, who was 12 when she first became pregnant, accuses Planned Parenthood of Central and Northern Arizona of having failed to give authorities required reports until after the second abortion.

The lawsuit, filed in Maricopa County Superior Court, contends that the girl was subjected to continued molestation and sexual exploitation because Planned Parenthood did not notify police or Child Protective Services of her November 1998 abortion. The lawsuit accuses Planned Parenthood of gross negligence, which led to the second abortion six months later. The foster brother was sentenced to five years in prison and lifetime probation.

NEW PLANNED PARENTHOOD ADS

Planned Parenthood has released a new public “service” announcement, which claims that women are being denied basic reproductive health care. “Dream,” the name given to the ad campaign, is sponsored by Planned Parenthood Global Partners.

The ad asks women in Western countries to visit its website to find out how to help millions of women around the world who do not have access to basic “reproductive health care.” The ad features women of several nationalities holding globes, while a female voice-over invites Western women to “dream of a time when everyone can be as fortunate as you” and “discover that millions of women are denied access to regular check-ups, tests and birth control.”

“Defy the voice inside that keeps you quiet,” the ad concludes. “Demand that everyone have vital reproductive health care. Millions of women around the world need you to make a difference.” The Pro-Choice Public Education Project has also released a new series of ads in a campaign called, “It’s pro-choice or no choice.” They are intended for use at college campuses. All of the ads are black-and-white photographs.

The first shows a dingy old car parked in a remote location with a big city in the background. On the car is a sign, which reads, “ABORTION CLINIC.” The second shows a filthy bathroom with a sign in the shower that reads, “OPERATING ROOM.” The third shows an alley with a huge garbage container in it. It is labeled, “PATIENT RECOVERY AREA.”

The ads include the following additional text: “Take away a woman’s right to choose and she’s left to take matters into her own hands. Please support keeping abortion safe and legal. 1-888-253-CHOICE. www.protectchoice.org. *It’s pro-choice or no choice.*” All three of the ads can be viewed at Planned Parenthood’s website: www.plannedparenthood.org/vox/pepphotos.html. Click on the “use these ads” link to view larger versions.

Mattei Radu of American Collegians for Life notes that the other side has a lot of money to spread its pack of lies, “but we have truth.” Radu says his organization will continue to spread the truth to counter the propaganda.

AMERICAN RED CROSS-ING THE LINE

What kinds of groups does the American Red Cross endorse? Here’s a partial list: Global Reproductive Health Forum at Harvard University, Children’s Defense Fund, Coalition for Positive Sexuality,

Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and SIECUS (Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States).

These groups are among those listed as resources on the American Red Cross website for those wishing to learn more about acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS). All are clearly pro-abortion and they send the wrong message regarding sexual activity.

ACTION: Ask the American Red Cross to stop referring people to these groups. Explain that doing so pulls the Red Cross into the abortion debate and the baggage these pro-abortion groups bring to the table: Dr. Bernadine Healy, President & CEO, American Red Cross, 430 - 17th St. NW, Washington, DC 20006.

JEALOUSY AND WHINING OF THE RICH

The Associated Press reports that Planned Parenthood of South Carolina has asked a federal judge to block the state from issuing “Choose Life” license plates, saying the new tags are unconstitutional. Planned Parenthood attorney Peter Murphy argues it is a violation of free speech for the state to provide a forum for one political view without providing a chance to express opposing views. “The fact that only one choice is being provided by the state is exactly what’s wrong,” Murphy said.

Attorney General Charles Condon said he would fight the suit all the way to the United States Supreme Court if necessary. “Just as the federal government can constitutionally place the message ‘In God We Trust’ on its currency, the state of South Carolina can place the message ‘Choose Life’ on its license plates,” Condon said. “This is a matter for the legislature, not the courts.”

“Choose Life” license plates have been challenged in Florida and Louisiana. South Carolina Governor Jim Hodges signed a law on Sunday allowing the state to issue the “Choose Life” plates as well as several other new specialty plates. Planned Parenthood attempted to get lawmakers to also offer plates saying something such as “Choose Choice,” but they refused.

“Chief among the principles upon which our country was founded is the freedom of political speech,” said Chris Jueschke, chief executive officer of Planned Parenthood of South Carolina. But Condon called Planned Parenthood “out of the mainstream” and added “a message upholding life is uplifting to all people.”

The lawsuit is “outrageous,” agreed Lieutenant Governor Bob Peeler, a strong supporter of the tags. “Sending a message that life is something that should be valued and celebrated is something I thought everyone else would agree with.” Peeler called on Hodges, a Democrat, “to join the attorney general and me to aggressively fight this lawsuit.” Condon and Peeler, both Republicans, are running for governor.

The fee for the plate is \$70 every two years along with the regular state motor vehicle registration fee. The extra money is to support private, nonprofit crisis pregnancy programs, but may not go to any agency or organization that “provides, promotes or refers for abortion.”

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: September—Rev. *Edmund J. Dobbins*, president of Villanova University; October—Senator *Trent Lott*, R-Miss.; and November—Senator *William Frist*, M.D., R-Tenn.

ACTION: Pray every day for these people.

EUTHANASIA KIT

During an interview on Australian television, euthanasia guru Philip Nitschke said many Australians who want to die are obtaining a mail order suicide kit. The ‘exit bag’ includes a customized plastic bag for suffocation and a guide to suicide drugs. A description of the kit offered by its maker is simple:

The customised “exit bag” is made of clear, strong industrial plastic. It has an adjustable collar with elastic front and back and a six-inch velcro strip in front for a snug but comfortable fit. It is extra large—22” by 36”—to reduce heat build up. It comes with a flannelette lining inside the collar so that the plastic won’t irritate sensitive skin and it comes with an additional separate terry-cloth neckband to create a turtleneck for added comfort and snugness of fit.

“It sounds a bit grim but...it is an effective death and it’s really people being driven out of desperation and the lack of access to decent legislation,” Nitschke said. “It’s very commonly used...I have people talk to me about it every day and I describe and give people information on the kit and so people very often follow up with that and go ahead and acquire such devices, and very often use them. So they’re very common.”

Nitschke explained that the bag is what ends life rather than a death from drugs:

[I]t’s not the death from drugs it’s the death from lack of oxygen. It’s a hypoxic death similar to a pneumonia and we all know that pneumonias used to be known as the “old person’s friend.” So it is a peaceful death. You don’t need drugs. People do take drugs to make them go to sleep so the process is a little bit more benign but the death is not from the drugs, the death is from lack of oxygen, low oxygen, inside the plastic bag.

The kits are made in Canada.

SUPPORT FOR ABORTION SUPPORTER

LDI recently received emails from supporters of Small Dog Electronics, a vociferous supporter of Planned Parenthood and its deadly agenda:

Thanks for making my choices easier. I just placed an order with small dog electronics [sic] due to your boycott. Have a nice day!

Note: any response to this message will be considered spam [sic—junk mail] and filtered immediatly [sic] to the trash. It will not be read.

The writer of the email included the “Note” because he apparently did not want to be challenged. Here is what another person wrote:

Instead of “Challenging the Culture of Death” [from LDI’s website] by targeting reproductive rights freedoms in America, perhaps you and your ilk could devote your energies to “Challenging the Culture of Death” at the Defense Institute for Hemispheric Security Cooperation (formerly named School of the Americas, but commonly referred to as School of the Assassins) in Georgia, or other institutions that promote and teach such atrocities as murder, torture, rape and other brutality against citizens of the world. You could really make a difference and help make the world a better place for a lot of people.

Regardless, I’m proud to be a Small Dog customer and a Planned Parenthood client, and I respect and thank Don Mayer and Small Dog for supporting Planned Parenthood and other important causes. I appreciate their commitment to social responsibility and I most certainly will not boycott this fine company, nor Whole Foods Markets. I already do my best to boycott Microsoft, but for their monopolistic business practices, not because they support Planned Parenthood and reproductive rights.

Doug G.

Telling LDI to take on other issues is like faulting the Humane Society for not fighting world hunger rather than working on the specific, narrow agenda for which it was created. Furthermore, it assumes one cannot be concerned about more than one issue. Planned Parenthood leaders often tell us to work on something else. Would not they benefit if we were to take their advice?

SUPPORT FOR LDI

In the July-August 2001 edition of *The Caleb Report*, LDI mentioned that some people have become irate over the fact that we ask for a donation for *The Boycott List*. We received several responses to the article, all of which were supportive. Here are two:

I was so saddened to read that people make a big deal about the cost of *The Boycott List*. I was encouraged by your response a while ago about the one guy who wrote in. It's funny, even if the lists were \$42.00 [each], they still would be priceless to own!!! It is my contention that we have saved at least that much in a month's time by purchasing generic products that worked as well as the brand name products that are on the list. (Sometimes you don't ask why things are the way they are!)

Chris

I'm sorry you got such an irate response because you charge for *The Boycott List*. Having been involved in the pro-life movement for almost 30 years I understand completely your position. You are of invaluable help to me, be assured of that.

Mary Ann

We want to thank you very much for the understanding, encouragement and support!

DOING THE RIGHT THING

Lake Ann [Michigan] Baptist Camp will not host a "health conference" for teens because the sex education component is "in conflict with the camp's biblical values," the Associated Press reports. Organized by the Midwest AIDS Prevention Project and the HIV/AIDS Resource Center of Ypsilanti, annual conference aims to train teens to be "peer educators"—a program embraced by Planned Parenthood.

Camp Executive Director Ken Riley said the teens would have been welcomed if sex discussions were limited to abstinence. The camp returned the deposit, despite the fact that it will lose substantial funds by rejecting the event.

Conference organizers placed their own spin on the camp's decision—implying that camp officials and Christians as a whole do not want to prevent the spread of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV). "We're disappointed that this camp would see our goal to stop the spread of disease as being in conflict with their religious mission," said Andrew Yee of the Midwest AIDS Prevention Project.

"REFUND FOR CHOICE"

Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) has a suggestion for that refund U.S. taxpayers recently received. Send it to them.

PPFA's "Refund for Choice" program is simple. "Make your 2001 Tax Refund a statement for reproductive choice!" the groups website suggests. "People from accross [sic] the country have called, written and e-mailed Planned Parenthood letting us know they plan to donate all or a part of their 2001 tax refund to PPFA. To make donating easier, we have created the Refund for Choice campaign...

Contributions made to the Refund for Choice campaign will be reported to the White House—a tangible demonstration of the public support for family planning and the right to choose.”

WE WONDER

Will Planned Parenthood denounce one of its own—comedian Paula Poundstone—now that she has accepted a plea bargain? Poundstone, who has played an active role with Planned Parenthood, had been charged with lewd behavior with a child and child abuse. The former charge was dropped as part of the plea bargain. So far, Planned Parenthood has not released a statement.

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. 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.