



The Caleb Report

March-April 2002

Life Decisions International

vol. x • no. 2

IN THIS *EXPANDED* ISSUE: More Attacks On Helpers Of Women / Pregnant? You're Fired! / Population Report Released / Irish Referendum Narrowly Loses / Being "In The Loop" / Quotable Quote / In The (E-) Mail / Canada Allows Human Experiments / The Prayer Project / Vatican Warns Democracies / Some Good, Some Not-So-Good / Condoms And Pro-Abortion Groups / Doing The Splits / Marching Trouble / Finally, A Good Portrayal / A Bad Betrayal / Boycott Update / Pro-Abortion Politician To Speak

MORE ATTACKS ON HELPERS OF WOMEN

Pro-abortion New York Attorney General Eliot Spitzer is using his office to settle a personal vendetta against pregnancy-help centers. Elected with the strong support of pro-abortion groups, WorldNetDaily reports that Spitzer, a Democrat, is "clearly engaged in abuse of his prosecutorial power for political reasons."

Spitzer's office began issuing subpoenas to centers in January. According to Cybercast News Service, the subpoenas stated that Spitzer's initial "investigation" (abortion industry accusations) revealed that the centers "may have violated one or more...statutes by misrepresenting the services they provide, diagnosing pregnancy and advising persons on medical options without being licensed to do so, and/or providing deceptive and inaccurate medical information." The subpoenas required centers to turn over copies of all advertisements, website addresses, services provided, a list of all persons who received any service, the names of staff members who provide services, blank forms, training materials and records of all agreements.

"This is not an effort to protect the public," wrote Michelle Malkin for Town Hall. "It's payback to the abortion monopoly. NARAL (National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League) wants the government to crush growing competition by private, faith-based pregnancy centers that are winning over women's hearts and saving babies' lives."

"What they really want us to do is to put crosses in our ads, say we are pro-life and [tell the public] 'don't call,'" Chris Slattery, founder of Expectant Mother Care (EMC), told Cybercast. "And if a woman does call, say 'don't come in because we don't offer abortions,' and if they do come in, then they want us to say 'please wait until we have a licensed professional to counsel you who will be morally neutral on abortion, who will give you non-directive counseling.' They seem to feel we are deceptive if we advertise under 'abortion alternatives,' that we offer confidential counseling, medical and safety information and free ultrasounds, when we do," Slattery said. EMC operates five pregnancy centers in New York City.

Pregnancy-help centers have not been without their political supporters. South Carolina's attorney general has called on his New York counterpart to end the harassment. Charlie Condon told the Associated Press that he believes the centers provide "outstanding" assistance to women facing unplanned, unwanted or difficult pregnancies. "The centers soothe the pain, relieve the suffering and ease the trauma of women who are hurting," Condon said in a letter to Spitzer. "Those who operate the centers freely give of themselves with a helping hand and a loving heart."

Spitzer's spokesman said his office asked Condon if the South Carolina prosecutor had information to share about pregnancy-care centers. "It became evident they did not; they admitted they did not," Spitzer's spokesman said. "It appeared to take on the dimensions of a political exercise rather than one law enforcement official trying to help another law enforcement official. That's a regrettable situation." Clearly, Spitzer should be seen as an expert in "political exercise."

Slattery told Cybercast that he believes a conspiracy exists between Spitzer and NARAL. This is actually proven fact. LDI exposed the genesis of the conspiracy in the Autumn 2000 issue of *Special Reports*. (Go to: www.fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=special_reports, and click on Autumn 2000.)

While Spitzer claims his actions are due to complaints by supposed “victims” of the pregnancy-help centers, this is merely an orchestrated part of the common pro-abortion scam. A booklet published by NARAL in 2000 identifies several ways to attack pregnancy-help centers. “Persuade state attorney general to bring litigation against targeted [centers]...,” it emphasizes.

“This attack, if successful, will have ripple effects nationwide,” Slattery said. “If they can successfully ban counseling by volunteer, lay people, this could spread across the country and literally cripple the volunteer movement that is the heart and soul of compassionate abortion alternatives counseling.”

“Pregnancy-help centers and those who support them need to understand something,” said Douglas R. Scott, co-author of “The Making of a Controversy: The History of the Conspiracy Against Pregnancy-Help Centers” and president of LDI. “This latest barrage is just another effort in the ongoing conspiracy. We should not be surprised. The goal is to close all pregnancy-help centers. Every one. And any means necessary will do. It is not based on truth. It is not based on reality. It is based on a political and diabolical desire to end life-affirming choices for women. Every time the life of a baby is saved, Planned Parenthood, Satan, and their legions, lose. They fail to destroy another of those created by God in His image.”

Malkin agrees with Scott’s analysis, but her blame is not reserved for the abortion industry alone: “[T]he abortion lobby will continue to drag...centers through costly court proceedings. Meanwhile, Planned Parenthood and the government-backed abortion empire continue their business of massive human disposal fraudulently marketed as a fully informed ‘choice.’ Where are those who pay lip service to compassionate conservatism when the movement’s foot soldiers need help?”

ACTION: Every pregnancy care volunteer should read LDI’s exposé on the conspiracy against their work. It can be found online at the address mentioned in this article.
--

PREGNANT? YOU’RE FIRED!

A recent segment on the “CBS Evening News” focused on the case of Nicole Thibodeau who was fired from her job at an architectural firm during her seventh month of pregnancy. She filed a lawsuit against Design Group One Architects after Connecticut’s Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities (CHRO) dismissed her wrongful termination challenge.

The CHRO and Superior Court Judge Carl Schuman both ruled that the state’s Fair Employment Practices Act “clearly exempts employers of fewer than three people from civil action for violating its provisions, including one that says it is discriminatory to terminate a woman because of pregnancy.” However, the state appellate court unanimously ruled last year that a state public policy against pregnancy-based discrimination preempts the provisions of the Fair Employment Practices Act.

Thibodeau, whose case was heard by a panel of the Connecticut Supreme Court, said she “couldn’t believe” that her employer essentially has “the freedom to fire her for being pregnant” with no state or federal discrimination penalties. CBS reported that most states exempt small companies from the “legal burdens” of discrimination cases. In eleven states, companies with up to 14 employees are defined as “small” and qualify for the exemption. The network also reported that the outcome of Thibodeau’s case “could affect millions of workers nationwide” who have no legal protection from pregnancy discrimination by their employers.

POPULATION REPORT RELEASED

The Planned Parenthood-funding *New York Times* occasionally gets it right. In March, the newspaper indicated that while many countries worry about an increase in the number of jobless young people, a United Nations report says the world's population is steadily getting older. "The changes that are going on are not paralleled in any [previous] century..." said Joseph Chamie, an American demographer who directs the UN population division. "We will see this trend accelerating in the 21st century." The figures show that an aging population is not limited to rich countries. Chamie said the trend is likely to have profound implications on economies in all regions.

If there were fears of instability generated by the idea of large numbers of unemployed young people becoming criminals or ready recruits for militancy, an older population raises different concerns. Pressures mount on health care systems, health insurance plans and social security as well as private pensions. In poorer countries, some of these safety nets do not exist. Sri Lanka, for example, has a rapidly aging population and free health care, but no social security and few pension plans outside government service.

The UN study found that in richer countries, people over 60 years of age now account for one-fifth of the population. Experts predict the figure will reach one-third by 2050. In poorer countries, only eight percent of the population is now over 60, primarily because of a shorter life expectancy. But that number is expected to rise to 20 percent by 2050. The fastest-growing age group in the world is people over 80, which is increasing 3.8 percent annually.

UN experts fear the statistic they call the "potential support ratio," which is the number of people between 15 and 64 years of age who are available as workers to sustain the retirees. In 1950, the ratio was twelve to one. In 2000, it was nine to one. By 2050, there may be only four working-age people for every person over 65 worldwide.

"This is evidence that the problem is not over-population, it is too few children," said LDI's Douglas R. Scott. "The question is this: Will we adopt programs to help us care for these older people or will we adopt policies to eliminate them so our costs are not increased and our standard of living is not diminished?" Scott said he fears that the elite will turn to killing of the "burdensome" elderly to deal with this social problem, just as they turned to killing of the "burdensome" unborn child to deal with other social problems.

IRISH REFERENDUM NARROWLY LOSES

A statement released by an Irish pro-life organization expresses "profound disappointment" at the rejection of Ireland's anti-abortion referendum. The result was described as a blow to pro-life movement worldwide. Yet Pro-Life Campaign (PLC) said the result was not a mandate for the introduction of abortion in Ireland. Polls have shown that most Irish people do not want abortion recognized by the law as a valid choice.

The referendum sought to resolve differences between Ireland's 1983 constitutional ban on all abortions and a 1992 Supreme Court ruling. The activist court ruled that abortion should be legalized for cases involving women whose pregnancies were threatening their own lives. The court specifically noted cases of threatened suicide. The subsequent referendum would have allowed doctors in Ireland to commit abortions if "necessary to prevent a real and substantial risk to the loss of the woman's life other than by self-destruction."

Why was the referendum defeated? "A cloud of confusion was created and fuelled" by those who opposed the referendum, PLC's statement read. Opponents needed to give every voter just one reason to justify a "no" ballot or to convince a citizen to stay away from the polls, even by making the choice should overly confusing. PLC said the results "could really only be cited as a victory for the confused."

One reason for the loss of the referendum was a split in pro-life ranks. The statement said that those who call themselves pro-life but opposed the referendum “would be taken to task and would have to bear the consequences of siding with pro-abortion” groups. The referendum, submitted to voters by the Irish Parliament, had the support of some pro-life groups and just as vehement opposition by others. Consequently, those who believe the referendum did not go far enough were allied with those who strongly support legal abortion.

Irish Catholic Bishops and Pope John Paul II said it was acceptable to vote in favor of the referendum, but it was not exactly a resounding endorsement. Ireland’s Catholic bishops gave a grudging blessing to the referendum, saying they believe it “is essentially an anti-abortion measure.” They said that “Catholic voters should feel free in conscience to support this measure, even if it is viewed as less than might have been desired,” they said. But Church of Ireland Bishop John Neill opposed the referendum.

Prime Minister Bertie Ahern said the proposal had been “an honest and genuine attempt” to resolve the constitution’s abortion ban with the Supreme Court ruling. He vowed to press ahead with plans to form a pregnancy-help agency, which would aim to counsel many of the approximately 7,000 Irish women who travel to England each year for abortions to choose life. “We need to recognize and address the pressures which impel women towards seeking abortion. It is a significant challenge,” Ahern said.

The referendum lost by 10,500 votes. Consequently, a woman claiming to be suicidal may obtain an abortion in Ireland. Only 42 percent of voters went to the polls.

BEING “IN THE LOOP”

LDI Partners are so “in the loop” that they are privy to e-mails sent to its allies by the National Abortion Rights and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL) and Planned Parenthood. First, NARAL’s e-mail:

From: CAN [mailto:can@naralaction.org]
Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2002, 11:33 AM
Subject: Important Message from Kate Michelman

The Bush Administration recently proposed funding to recognize fetuses as children “from conception”—a step toward making abortion illegal. This is a clear message to women: a woman’s right to choose is not safe. Pro-choice Americans must not stand idly by.

Several NARAL donors have offered to DOUBLE every gift to NARAL (up to \$200,000) made between now and March 31st. Every dollar you give will be matched. To make a contribution that will be doubled, click here <<https://secure-net.com/naral/join.html>>...please forward this email to your friends.

NARAL needs your commitment to choice more than ever. *The Washington Post* reported on *Roe v. Wade*’s anniversary, President Bush told anti-choice groups, “Our nation should set a goal, that unborn children should be welcomed in life and protected in law.” Your contribution today will make a difference. Click here <<https://secure-net.com/naral/join.html>> to have your gift doubled by donors who recognize the urgency, and please help us protect choice by emailing this message to others.

For more information about national NARAL or your state affiliate, log on to <<http://www.naral.org>>. Please forward this message to pro-choice friends and family members. NARAL’s Choice Action Network (CAN) provides up-to-date information and easy ways to make a difference in protecting a woman’s right to choose. If this message was forwarded to you, subscribe <<http://www.naralaction.org/joinForm.asp>> to the Choice Action Network or send an e-mail with your name and address to can@naral.org <<mailto:can@naral.org>> with the text “subscribe CAN.”

•••

To see results of previous action alerts, go to <http://www.naralaction.org/webActionResults.asp...>
You received this message because roland.foster@mail.house.gov is a member of the mailing list originating from can@naralaction.org. To be removed from this distribution list please send an email to can@naralaction.org from roland.foster@mail.house.gov with the word "REMOVE" in the subject line. All other inquiries should be sent to can@naral.org <[mailto: can@naral.org](mailto:can@naral.org)>.

Now to the Planned Parenthood e-mail alert:

From: Planned Parenthood Action Network <actionnetwork@rc.plannedparenthood.org>
Date: Thu, 7 Mar 2002 11:58:43 -0800 (PST)
Subject: Update: Pickering nomination delayed yet again

The Senate Judiciary Committee vote on Judge Pickering's nomination scheduled for today, March 7, has again been delayed for another week at the request of Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT). Once more this means that anti-choice forces have additional time to gather support for Judge Pickering, who has demonstrated to have deep-rooted opposition to reproductive rights and hostility toward other civil rights. President Bush is making a last-minute push to pressure Democrats into sending Pickering's nomination to the full Senate, where it probably would be confirmed. It is essential that the nomination be voted down in the Senate Judiciary Committee. You can continue to take action on these and other issues by visiting the Planned Parenthood Action Network at <http://www.plannedparenthood.org/action>.

For more up-to-date information about the Pickering nomination and other possible controversial judicial nominations, please visit our new website at <http://www.saveROE.com>.

Be sure to forward this email to your friends, family and colleagues and urge them to take action on these important issues!

Encourage others to promote and protect reproductive health rights by joining the Planned Parenthood Action Network at www.plannedparenthood.org/action.join.asp.

Isn't it nice to be in the loop? The key is to act accordingly to counter the pro-abortion messages.

ACTION: There is still time to let your views be known on the Bush Administration's proposal to include unborn children in the definition of those eligible for care through government programs. In commenting, refer to file code CMS-2127-P. Mail comments (one original and three copies) to: Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, Attention: CMS-2127-P, P.O. Box 8016, Baltimore, MD 21244-8016. Please allow sufficient time for mailed comments to be received in the event of delivery delays. The deadline is May 6, 2002.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

"The evil of abortion has crept out of the womb, just as Francis Schaeffer and C. Everett Koop said it would, to threaten all of us with euthanasia. It's now being followed by a whole new set of evils. For the bio-tech firms have plans for us—patenting our genes, cloning us so they can experiment on us and use 'us' in our own treatment, improving us and letting us choose what kind of kids we want to have. What Aldous Huxley called the Brave New World and C.S. Lewis the Abolition of Man, has arrived. All of a sudden, there is a lot more on the agenda than most of us ever realized. Our march for life just got longer, the road steeper, the challenges greater than we ever imagined."

— Nigel Cameron in Charles Colson's *Breakpoint* commentary, as quoted in *Life Advocacy Briefing*

IN THE (E-)MAIL

The following correspondence was received by LDI:

After reading your “information”, I will do whatever I can with all of my power to ensure that companies continue to support Planned Parenthood. I wish all of you people would just pull your heads out of your asses and get real jobs!!!

– Megan M.

CANADA ALLOWS HUMAN EXPERIMENTS

Canada has proposed rules permitting experimentation by government-funded scientists on embryos left over from fertility treatment or abortions. The guidelines give researchers more sources of human embryos than are available to their counterparts in the United States. The rules came from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR).

“I think it would be fair to say that at least much of that which you find in the guidelines will in some fashion be reflected in legislation ultimately passed by this government,” Health Minister Anne McLellan told the Associate Press and Reuters News Agency. While allowing experimentation, the guidelines ban cloning embryos specifically for research, which is allowed in Great Britain. The U.S. government is currently considering such a ban as well.

“The committee was not persuaded by the perspective that (an embryo) is a human being with an inalienable right to life,” said Francoise Baylis, a member of the CIHR committee. But Campaign Life Coalition (CLC), the premier national pro-life organization, condemned the guidelines as “inhumane and presumptuous.”

“The use and killing of human beings for the purpose of scientific research was condemned at Nuremberg after the actions of Nazi doctors were revealed,” said CLC’s Mary Ellen Douglas. “The scientists of today know...that adult stem cell research has a proven track record and does not kill a human being. Yet the opportunity of having available victims, human embryos, appears to be too tempting to pass up.”

Maureen McTeer, a “pro-choice” lawyer who has written a book on ethical issues such as embryonic research, said human embryos should be protected, just as a severely handicapped child is protected from being killed to harvest his or her organs. “We do that for a purpose because...we believe that human life is important and that it has to be protected, and that the vulnerable among us need to be protected,” she said. “Embryonic life deliberately created in the lab is valuable as human life. It doesn’t have to be a person with legal rights in order for us to know that it is vulnerable and in need of some protection.”

Like Douglas, McTeer made reference to Nazi atrocities. “Most of the laws that we have now and the rules that we have now flow from our attempt to ensure that these atrocities, these abuses, don’t happen again as they relate to research,” she told Canadian Press.

Michael Rudnicki, a molecular geneticist at Ottawa’s Children’s Hospital of Eastern Ontario, called McTeer’s remarks offensive. “I’m very surprised that she would say that,” he said. “It’s extremely offensive to equate stem cell research to the Holocaust. That almost suggests that researchers are Nazis, that we’re a bunch of Dr. Mengeles. Give me a break.” (Pro-abortion people commonly use the “I’m offended” response. Yet you will notice that Rudnicki failed to specify even one difference between the program of the Nazi and Canadian regimes in an effort to show the supposed absurdity of the comparison.)

The *Globe and Mail* reported that Roger Pierson, director of the University of Saskatchewan’s Reproductive Biology Research Institute, eventually hopes to work on stem cells from human embryos. But he suspects the

controversy will keep some scientists from pursuing this line of research. “Some very highly motivated people are not willing to expose themselves or their families to the [condemnation] of others,” said Pierson, adding that he would not want his name associated with stem cells from human embryos on the national registry that is to be created.

Several health-related organizations have endorsed embryonic research. Mary Jardine of the Parkinson Society of Canada said her group “applauds” the guidelines. “It all comes down to definitions, your definition of an embryo, your definition of when life begins,” Jardine said. (Strange, we always thought the definitions were basic biological fact, not a subjective political issue.) “But how do you define the sanctity of life when you are talking to someone with advanced Parkinson’s? If you are going to discard these embryos, why not put them to use?”

“Embryonic stem cell research offers great promise in advancing our knowledge of cancer,” said Julie White of the Canadian Cancer Society. Muscular Dystrophy Association of Canada’s Clairedeon Robicheau said people with progressive disabilities want the research to proceed. “As one with a neuromuscular disorder who can directly benefit from such research I applaud the initiative taken by the CIHR,” she said.

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: British Prime Minister *Tony Blair* (March), New York Attorney General *Eliot Spitzer* (April), Secretary of State *Colin Powell* (May), and Canadian Health Minister *Anne McLellan* (June).

VATICAN WARNS DEMOCRACIES

Pope John Paul II recently lashed out against abortion and warned that its practice could lead to the fall of democratic governments. “The church affirms the right to life to every innocent human being at the moment of its existence,” he told participants of the eighth general assembly of the Papal Academy. The pontiff warned against the “grave danger that the false interpretation of human rights poses in not taking into account the reality of human nature, which can drive democratic regimes to transform themselves into totalitarian regimes.”

“The distinction sometimes made...between a human being and a human person to then apply the right to life and physical integrity only to people who are already born is an artificial distinction without scientific or philosophical foundation,” the Pope said. “Every human being, from his conception to his natural death, has the inviolable right to life and deserves all respect due to the human person.”

SOME GOOD, SOME NOT-SO-GOOD

Some people have praised the nominations and appointments made by President George W. Bush, but they have made others uneasy. The President has nominated a senior scientist and administrator at the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine to become director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Dr. Elias Zerhouni, executive vice dean of the medical school and a “driving force” behind the university’s new cell engineering institute, is expected to win easy confirmation by the Senate. The selection of Zerhouni ends a process that had been colored by the “emotional debate over cutting-edge biomedical research and abortion politics,” the *Washington Post* reports.

Dr. Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Disease, was thought to be the front-runner for the position. But his chief proponent, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson, said the White House rejected Fauci because he is pro-abortion. Senator Sam

Brownback, R-Kan., a proponent of banning all forms of human cloning, reportedly “led the fight against Fauci” after the doctor failed to “offer vocal support for strict limits on research.”

Zerhouni may be acceptable to some, but the *Baltimore Sun* reports that he has been active in creating the Institute for Cell Engineering at Hopkins. Its mission is to “reprogram human cells and mold them into therapeutic transplants” to treat conditions such as Parkinson’s and Lou Gehrig’s disease. This includes research on stem cells from human embryos. Some of Zerhouni’s colleagues, states the *Washington Posts*, “speculated he would want to pursue stem cell research beyond the tight parameters set by Bush in August,” which limits federally funded research to the estimated 60 stem cell lines developed before the president’s announcement. In addition, Zerhouni told a Hopkins publication last year that research utilizing cells as therapeutic agents has “enormous untapped potential to treat incurable diseases.”

Myron Weisfeldt, chairman of medicine at Johns Hopkins, said that Zerhouni made the decision to “put significant resources into understanding stem cell biology...with the understanding” that eventually researchers could use adult stem cells instead of relying on embryos. Deal W. Hudson, publisher of *Crisis*, said that, “As long as [Zerhouni] is not party to any effort to go beyond the existing stem cell lines, then he is well within the president’s guidelines.”

Before becoming Bush’s choice, Zerhouni assured leading social conservatives that he opposed any type of research on cloned human embryos, reports the *Washington Post*. Congressional Republicans and some conservative activists said the White House expressed confidence that Zerhouni supports a bill sponsored by Brownback that outlaws not only reproductive cloning, but also cloning of microscopic embryos to obtain stem cells for therapeutic purposes. “He’s one of us,” said a congressional Republican who is working to enact the anti-cloning legislation. “He supports Brownback and we support him.”

Zerhouni’s reported ideological views, whether written or verbal, are significant for both political and policy reasons. By clarifying his views on cloning, he appears to have won over influential conservatives. “We can be sure there will be no subversive effort coming from him or his colleagues” on emerging research involving human embryos and stem cells, Hudson said.

In another Bush nomination, LDI President Douglas R. Scott called “grossly shameful” the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee’s rejection of the President’s nomination of Charles Pickering, Sr., for a seat on the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals. The committee’s decision came on a 10-9 party-line vote. Committee members also rejected two Republican attempts to send the nomination to the full Senate.

“Pro-abortion forces targeted Pickering for defeat. They sent many e-mail alerts to their supporters. Now the U.S. Senate’s Democrats on the Judiciary Committee have done their bidding,” Scott said. The full Senate would surely have confirmed the Bush nominee. Scott also said this was a case of the Democrats flexing their muscle and their commitment to abortion and other leftist causes. “It was clearly not about justice or truth.”

Scott chastised Republicans as well. “Republicans confirmed countless numbers of rabidly pro-abortion Clinton nominees...when they were in power,” he said. “When are Republicans going to ‘fight fire with fire’? When are they going to learn that pro-abortion politicians will use every means, be them moral or not, to achieve their goals? And when are Republicans going to do what it takes to counter those moves?”

“Our greatest concern is that President Bush will fear another defeat,” Scott said. “We urge the President to continue nominating candidates like Pickering. The President should never let Senate Democrats dictate the kinds of people he should nominate. Let the Senate reject everyone if it so chooses, but do not give them the sort of candidates a pro-abortion president would have nominated.” Scott said he hopes Bush will take an increasing

role in pressuring Democrats to confirm his nominees, “even if it means taking his case to the people, over the heads of the Senate’s pro-abortion political machine.”

Pro-life leaders who dismissed concerns about Bush’s appointments are now seeing the danger. Key pro-abortion officials, such as Christine Todd Whitman, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Secretary of State Colin Powell, have spoken out on major issues, making a mockery of several Bush Administration policies.

“It is important that the whole international community come together, speak candidly about it [condoms and sex], forget about taboos, forget about conservative ideas with respect to what you should tell young people about,” Powell told an international MTV audience. Powell’s comments came in response to a question from a young woman in Milan, Italy, who identified herself as “Catholic.”

Powell said he respects the opinion of the Church (whatever that means) but that he does not agree with it. “I certainly respect the views of the Holy Father and the Catholic Church,” he said. But, he added, “in my own judgment, condoms are a way to prevent infection...I believe condom use is part of the solution to the HIV/AIDS crisis, and I encourage their use by young people who are sexually active. You’ve got to protect yourself. If you don’t protect yourself, who is going to protect you?”

In response to Powell’s comments, a Bush spokesman said the President “continues to believe that abstinence and abstinence education is the most effective way to prevent AIDS, to prevent unwanted pregnancy.” Bush is seeking a 33 percent increase in funding for abstinence-only programs in the 2003 budget.

Groups such as the Feminist Majority Foundation urged people to thank Powell “for taking a stand for responsible, comprehensive AIDS prevention.” They were told to “encourage him to support increased research for new methods in HIV prevention that will help women negotiate new ways to protect themselves against infection.”

The *Washington Blade*, a newspaper catering to homosexuals, published a cartoon ridiculing those who disagree with Powell. It depicts him pointing to and laughing at three groups: the Bush Administration (a man in a suit), the Catholic Church (a bishop holding a *Bible*), and conservative groups (a man in a suit carrying a sign reading “Abstinence”). Each person being laughed at by Powell has a condom over his head with a caption that reads, “Our Secretary of State Demonstrates Effective Condom Use...”

CONDOMS AND PRO-ABORTION GROUPS

On the eve of World AIDS Day (December 1, 2001), “Catholics” for a Free Choice (CFC) began an advertising campaign designed to draw attention to the Catholic Church’s opposition to condom use. The group’s president said the Church’s opposition to condoms is contributing to AIDS-related deaths.

“The Vatican and the world’s bishops bear significant responsibility for the death of thousands of people who have died from AIDS,” Frances Kissling, CFC’s president, told the *Washington Blade*. “For individuals who follow the Vatican policy and Catholic health care providers who are forced to deny condoms, the bishops’ ban is a disaster.”

Cardinal Theodore E. McCarrick, Archbishop of Washington, D.C., defended the Church’s position in an interview with a Washington, D.C., television station. “We believe that if you want to practice responsible parenthood, there’s a way to do it. It’s by practicing abstinence outside of married life,” he said. “I think that what has happened is that we have found that condoms have not worked. They haven’t worked in Africa. They haven’t worked in a lot of countries. Abstinence is really the only way that really works.”

CFC's campaign consists of ads on bus stops, billboards, and in newspapers that say: "Catholic People Care. Do Our Bishops? Banning Condoms Kills." Supporters of the \$250,000 campaign plan to erect billboards with this message in Belgium, South Africa, Kenya, Zimbabwe, Bolivia, Chile, Mexico, the Philippines, Canada, and Italy.

The Cardinal described the ads as part of "hate literature" from "people who want to single out a group they don't like." He also disputed a statement on the ad that indirectly accuses bishops of banning condoms. "Bishops can't ban condoms. That's a crazy thing that they put in there," he said.

CFC leaders said bishops worldwide ban education about and distribution of condoms in the 100,000 hospitals and 200,000 Catholic social service agencies they oversee. They also said U.S. bishops have lobbied to ban condom distribution and education programs in public schools and in public service ads proposed on television networks. In addition, the CFC said Catholic leaders have spoken out against the use of condoms at United Nation meetings and in parts of the world where HIV/AIDS is rampant, such as Africa and Honduras. But that is a far cry from "banning" the product.

McCarrick predicted that the controversy over the ads will soon pass because people are aware of the Church's successful work at hospitals, schools, welfare agencies, and Catholic Charities organizations it operates. "This kind of dumb hate is not going to turn anybody's mind," he said. But Marianne Duddy, executive director of Dignity/U.S.A., a national group of homosexual Catholics and their supporters, shared another view. "The Church has not officially changed its position on this issue but there are many priests, nuns and Catholic ministers on the front lines who understand what science is saying [about the use of condoms]," she told the *Blade*, "and will provide this information in pastoral counseling."

Duddy said the Vatican has had to work hard to persuade bishops in Africa and Asia to support the Church's stance against condoms. "By stimulating public debate on this, it's really only a matter of time before a number of bishops and other church leaders of conscience say that the Church's official policy needs to be revisited," Duddy said.

Douglas R. Scott, LDI's president, wonders about such major dollars for advertising. "We often see television spots from the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League. We see newspaper ads from Planned Parenthood and 'Catholics' for a Free Choice." One has to wonder where all of the pro-life money is going? If I ran a pro-life organization with a multimillion-dollar budget, you can be sure that much of the money would be spent trying to reach the public. We can learn a lot about strategy and changing public opinion from our enemies, but when will we choose to pay attention and act accordingly?"

DOING THE SPLITS

The American Life League (ALL) has strongly criticized the Virginia affiliate of the National Right to Life Committee Inc., (NRLC) for refusing to take a position against the abortifacient "morning after pill." ALL was successful in convincing the Virginia Legislature to defeat a bill that would have made the chemicals available over-the-counter, but without the help of the Virginia Society for Human Life (VSHL).

"The problem is that everybody knows that this combination of pills...in fact works to abort children," ALL President Judie Brown told CNSNews. "The 'morning-after pill' regimen, which consists of a mega dose of the birth control pill, is a form of abortion. It prevents a newly conceived human embryo from implanting in her mother's womb. Every group that claims to be pro-life must raise its voice to oppose the killing of human embryos at their earliest stages of life. Failure to speak out is incomprehensible," Brown said.

“It seems appalling to us that...[VSHL] has taken no position on something as clearly as abortifacient in nature as these pills...Their lack of a stance is a problem because if you are pro-life and you are against abortion, you can't take a no-position position when it comes to abortion, even if you are aborting children as young as a day old,” Brown said. “Abortion is abortion is abortion and you cannot selectively choose which abortion you are going to oppose...Personhood is personhood, whether you are a single-celled zygote or a 58-year-old woman like me.”

VSHL issued the following statement in response:

The Virginia Society for Human Life (VSHL) is opposed to abortion, euthanasia and infanticide. VSHL takes no position on the prevention of fertilization, i.e. the union of the sperm and the egg cell. Once fertilization has occurred, a new human life has begun and VSHL is opposed to destroying human life.

By not taking a position, VSHL severely compromised ALL's efforts because pro-abortion members of the Legislature could argue that neither VSHL Inc., nor NRLC Inc., opposed the bill.

MARCHING TROUBLE

Leaders of the Pro-Life Alliance of Gays and Lesbians (PLAGAL) were arrested at the annual March for Life on January 22, 2002. United States Park Police conducted the arrests at the request of March leader Nellie Gray.

PLAGAL President Cecilia Brown and Vice President Eric Jurek were at the March for Life “for the sole purpose of protesting the 1973 Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion-on-demand,” read a PLAGAL statement on the incident. They were carrying the PLAGAL banner, which states the group's name, a depiction of a fetus in a pink triangle, and the words: “Human Rights Start When Human Life Begins.”

The PLAGAL delegation was approached by the officers and ordered to drop the sign. “Consistent with their deeply held pro-life convictions,” the statement continued, “they refused.” Brown and Jurek were wrestled to the ground while some yelled, “Let them march!” There were mixed reactions from other marchers as well, ranging from a group of teenagers yelling, “That's not fair,” to a man saying, “That'll take care of them,” the *Washington Blade* reported.

“I believe everyone who is out here to support our cause should be out here,” said Elizabeth Plum, a mother from Silver Spring, Maryland, who witnessed the arrest. “We need people from all walks of life— we're here for the same thing.” Brown and Jurek were quickly taken to another area where they were handcuffed, transported, and booked.

“How can Miss Gray claim to stand for the dignity of all human life while at the same time denying gays and lesbians our dignity in openly defending the rights of all human beings?” asked PLAGAL's B. A. Keener. “Most every group that attends the March for Life openly identifies itself with signs and banners—be they feminists, Democrats, Catholics, etc. It seems that PLAGAL has been targeted by the leadership of the March for Life simply because of their sexual orientation. PLAGAL and its leaders have a long and solid history in pro-life activism.”

“According to Nellie Gray, in a meeting a few years ago, PLAGAL may participate in the March for Life so long as we do not identify ourselves as lesbians and gays,” stated Moses Remedios, PLAGAL vice president for media relations and former president of American Collegians for Life. “That's as offensive as telling an African American, ‘you can ride on the bus, but just sit in the back.’”

Prior to the arrest, Brown said that, “PLAGAL participates in the March because we believe in positive, life-affirming alternatives to the tragedy of abortion. To say that we have no place for open participation in the pro-

life movement is not only counter-productive, but is simply wrong.” She went on to urge Gray to “set aside her personal biases, and ‘free the March’ for Life by allowing all peaceful, pro-life groups to stand in solidarity with women and the unborn.”

“We are appalled that Miss Gray is incapable of setting aside her personal sentiments against gays and lesbians, thus prohibiting, with the use of police force, our open participation in the pro-life movement,” stated Keener. “By this malevolent act and to her detriment, Miss Gray has moved the focus of the March for Life away from the protection of the unborn—where it belongs—to the participation of lesbians and gays.”

PLAGAL’s position is supported by some pro-life leaders. Chief among them is Serrin Foster, president of Feminists for Life. “While we may disagree in this movement, we should never disagree over the right to life,” Foster told the *Blade*. “This is a day to come together. It is deplorable that [Gray] would exclude pro-life gays and lesbians.”

Yet some other pro-life leaders worry about where it will lead. Must other groups that want to carry signs based on their sexual activity be allowed to participate? Will there be an “Adulterers for Life,” or “Swingers for Life” or worse? Every other group is based on its region, political affiliation, religion or age group. Only PLAGAL is based on sexual orientation and/or practice. Yet other groups have also been banned, such as Wiccans for Life and segments of Rock for Life.

“We did not risk arrest only for PLAGAL, but for all non-traditional pro-life groups,” Brown told the *Blade*. “People who are not Christian feel alienated and pushed away [from the March.] We were there to show that there is diversity in the [pro-life] movement.” PLAGAL will now undertake a letter-writing campaign in an effort to bring “pro-life groups in solidarity. If we as a group can work with every group, the whole pro-life movement can,” Brown said, noting that the pro-life movement needs more diversity and that it is currently a “white Christian” movement.

PLAGAL was organized in 1990 to advance the pro-life message among homosexuals. Polls show that most homosexuals have embraced the pro-abortion opinion, yet they have never really been challenged to consider the pro-life position. PLAGAL was founded by Tom Sena, who was killed last year in a fall down the stairs of Mr. P’s, a Washington, D.C., bar that caters to a homosexual clientele.

There were other problems at the March. CNS reports that a handful of pro-abortion advocates waded into a sea of pro-life marchers in front of the Supreme Court carrying signs and trading insults. As the March for Life wound down, several pro-abortion picketers were seen carrying signs that read, “Keep Abortion Legal.”

“I’ve done this every year for the last twelve years. I feel it is important to have a pro-choice voice happening during their March for Life,” Polly Stamatopoulos, of Washington, D.C., said. “In my opinion, this is a celebration of an anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* and women’s right to legally choose whether they want to hold on to a pregnancy or abort it.”

Several confrontations occurred between the pro-life marchers and the pro-abortion advocates. “A lot of people want to be threatening and loud in your face just because they think they can sway your opinion in that way, but it doesn’t deter me at all. It doesn’t change my mind,” King said.

After every March for Life, LDI President Douglas R. Scott stands with the pro-abortion delegation in an effort to strike up a conversation. “It’s been great,” Scott said. “I have offered to take them to lunch and I listen to what they have to say. Everyone who is there has chosen to be an activist for a reason. I want to know the reasons and address them in a calm but thought provoking way.”

Scott says that he has a great relationship with several of the young pro-abortion demonstrators. “They even greet me with smiles on their faces when they first notice me at the March,” Scott said. “We have great talks and explore each other’s opinions. I prefer to make them think more deeply about their own experiences and arguments. They will eventually run into problems with their reasoning and logic. It is good to make them think it through.”

Scott said that while none of the protesters have accepted his invitation to lunch, he believes they will eventually do so. “They are probably still afraid,” Scott said. “While speaking to these men and women, I am fighting off pro-life people who believe that yelling at and condemning them to hell is going to change their minds. Some are even attacked by pro-life people. I remember chasing down one pro-lifer who attacked a pro-abortion protester and confronted him on his behavior.” Scott said that he can understand the emotions involved, but “we seek God’s intervention for these people and we are closing ourselves off from God who may want to use us to spread His message.”

Scott suggests that pro-life protesters go to the offices of their members of Congress rather than engaging counter-protesters. “I’ve seen far too many pro-life people trying to get on television and showing hatred of pro-abortion people. When I suggest that they go talk to their lawmakers, they are completely uninterested. After all, that’s not quite as exciting as yelling at pro-abortion people in front of television cameras.”

FINALLY, A GOOD PORTRAYAL

One of the best portrayals of a Christian on secular television is on the WB network’s “Maybe It’s Me.” Patrick Levis portrays Christian high school student “Grant Stage.” His goal is to be in a Christian band. Levis is a primary cast member.

In one episode, Grant’s sister, “Molly” (portrayed by Meagan Dale Neis), said she admires him. Grant explained that it is his relationship with Jesus Christ that makes him that way and she can have it, too. The point was also made that the Christian character is far from perfect and does not feel he is better than those who do not know God. While “Maybe It’s Me” is not perfect itself, this one scene was remarkable. It was superbly and respectfully done.

Maybe the fact that Levis is a committed Christian in real life played a part in the portrayal of Christianity in the best light. “I wasn’t worried about playing a character that gets made fun of but I was worried about Christianity, Jesus Christ, God and just Christians in general being put down,” Levis told Zap2it.com. “I didn’t want that to be the message of the character. When I read the character I was excited. My first response was really just excitement because I was like, ‘Wow, they’re actually writing a born-again Christian into a TV show on The WB.’ What a great opportunity for people to see that Christians are not these too out-there weirdoes.”

A BAD BETRAYAL

The *Columbus Dispatch* reports that pro-life advocates are upset that Republican Ohio Governor Bob Taft has chosen for his reelection campaign a running mate who supports abortion. Dawn Slike, director of operations for Lake County Right to Life, called Taft’s selection of Jennette Bradley “an outrageous decision.”

Taft claims to oppose abortion except in cases of rape, incest or if the pregnant woman’s life is in danger. “Governor Taft was elected to serve every Ohioan and to best represent their divergent beliefs. Jennette Bradley complements that responsibility,” said Ohio Republican Party spokesman Jason Mauk. Bradley, who currently sits on the Columbus City Council, said she will support Taft’s view on abortion as the official policy of their administration. Ohio Right to Life, which endorsed Taft in 1998, said that its “political action rules” prevent it from endorsing Taft-Bradley in 2002.

BOYCOTT UPDATE

LDI has been critical of magazines aimed at teenagers for their casual attitudes about sex. The March 2002 *YM* includes an article entitled, “Pregnancy Test.” The following text concluded the article: “Have questions about birth control, sexually transmitted diseases, or what to do if you’re pregnant? Call Planned Parenthood at 800-230-PLAN or It’s Your Sex Life at 899-BE-SAFE-1.” LDI officials are currently considering adding such magazines to *The Boycott List*. “This amounts to free advertising for Planned Parenthood,” said Douglas R. Scott, LDI’s president. “But we want to be consistent and wise, so we are just taking a look at the strategy for the moment.”

In a related matter, LDI’s requests that the Nevada Families Education Foundation/Nevada Eagle Forum (NFEF/NEF) cease selling See’s Candies as a fund-raiser have been rebuffed—again. The matter came to the attention of LDI when a Nevada pro-family activist requested that NFEF/NEF be asked to stop doing business with See’s Candies (a subsidiary of **Berkshire Hathaway**, which supports Planned Parenthood).

“Last year, we received the request and immediately contacted NFEF/NEF,” Scott said. “We provided ample information about See’s Candies, Berkshire Hathaway, and the rabid pro-abortion activities of Berkshire Hathaway’s chief executive officer, Warren Buffett.” Scott said the information and request was met with hostility. “LDI was scornfully told that if we would not investigate and suggest an alternate fund-raising plan that would be just as successful, we could essentially take a hike,” Scott said.

LDI received another request from the Nevada pro-family activist to try again this year. Scott wrote to Janine Hansen, head of NFEF/NEF in February 2002: “A supporter of your organization recently told us that... [NFEF/NEF] continues to sell See’s Candies as a fund-raiser. We are very disappointed to see that this is the case [again this year].” Scott reminded Hansen of the connection between See’s Candies and Berkshire Hathaway. He also mentioned the latter’s leader: “The company’s chief executive officer...is one of the world’s leading abortion proponents. He worked tirelessly to bring RU-486 to the United States.”

“We would like to respectfully request that you cease selling See’s Candies,” Scott’s letter continued. “If you decide to continue selling See’s Candies, we request that you be honest with those individuals who may sell or purchase the product. Please inform them that the parent company of See’s Candies supports abortion-committing organizations and that the chief executive officer is a rabid pro-abortion activist.”

In order to protect the integrity of the Corporate Funding Project, Scott said that he would be forced to remove Eagle Forum as an endorsing organization of the boycott if it is doing business with a targeted company. “Needless-to-say,” Scott wrote, “it would be amusing (at best) for Mr. Buffett if he were to learn that the Pro-Life Movement is so fractured that even an endorsing organization of the boycott is not doing the right thing. This greatly undermines our work.”

“May God bless you as you consider your options. In addition, may you choose a God-honoring solution, even if doing so is difficult. We have faith that making the right decision will lead to great blessings,” the letter concluded.

In her reply, Hansen made two key points:

* Hansen attempted to make a distinction between Nevada Families Education Foundation and Nevada Eagle Forum. Scott responded with several questions: If NFEF is not affiliated with Eagle Forum, why is the name Nevada Eagle Forum printed on the back of the material announcing the sale of See’s Candies? Why is NFEF listed as the state contact on the national Eagle Forum’s organizational website? Why does the NFEF website

include these words: “Support Eagle Forum and Nevada Families with the purchase of See’s Candies. Call Eagle Forum for prices and ordering?”

* Hansen repeated her demand that LDI come up with an alternate fund-raising program. “It is not our responsibility to find a substitute,” Scott wrote. “In addition, we do not have the staff to research it for you. In more than a decade of the Corporate Funding Project [boycott], no other individual has demanded that we come up with a substitute for a product sold by a boycott target before they would stop buying from of the Planned Parenthood supporter. Not even one.”

Hansen’s letter included a long discourse on her dedication to the Pro-Life Movement and questioned Scott about his position on doing business with Communist China, his ideas about the United Nations, and his possible affiliation with either of the two major political parties. Scott responded to each point and made it clear that he holds a strong, unwavering pro-life position and has the credentials that go with it. Scott also said that even if he had been weak in one area, it would not justify the selling of See’s Candies. Hansen made it clear to Scott that she had sent a copy of the letters to an attorney.

In her final letter to LDI on the matter, Hansen said, “We live in an imperfect world with imperfect choices...” She continued in her attempt to draw a distinction between Nevada Families Education Foundation and Nevada Eagle Forum, choosing to ignore the specific questions posed by Scott. “She also made many excuses for doing business with such horrible corporations,” Scott said.

“All we can do at this point is ask NFEF/NEF to reconsider its position,” Scott said. “It has so far rejected our challenge...It has ignored our request that those who sell and buy the product be told of the boycott and the reasons behind it. We are convinced that given the facts most pro-family people would refuse to have anything to do with See’s Candies. Why not give people informed consent? Otherwise, many good people will be buying and selling in ignorance. If NFEF/NEF will not do the right thing, we need to empower each individual to do so,” Scott said.

LDI has received messages of appreciation from several Nevada residents. “Please continue [to challenge NFEF/NEF],” one person wrote. Scott said he recognizes the right of NFEF/NEF to make its own decision, but LDI would be culpable if it did not encourage the group to do the right thing.

PRO-ABORTION POLITICAN TO SPEAK

Villanova University’s Office for Mission Effectiveness invited former Senator George Mitchell, D, Maine, to keynote a “modern peacemakers conference.” Mitchell, who claims to be a Maronite Catholic, co-authored the Freedom of Choice Act to federally legalize abortion. During all of his years in the Senate, he did not cast even one pro-life vote. According to *Ex corde Ecclesiae*, the Vatican document governing Catholic universities, “Any official actions or commitment of the university is to be in accord with its Catholic identity.”

“Villanova’s Catholic mission is rooted in faith and faith requires conviction. Does Villanova have the fortitude to tell a powerful ex-senator that his efforts toward peace in Ireland seem hypocritical in light of his vigorous defense of violence in the womb?” asked Patrick Reilly, president of the Cardinal Newman Society, a national organization advocating the renewal of Catholic higher education. “Wrapping this event in the cloak of ‘mission effectiveness’ is like the emperor parading his invisible clothes.”

The Center for Peace and Justice Education (TCPJ) and Theology and Religious Studies Department are cosponsored Mitchell’s speech. TCPJ hosted pro-abortion NOW (National Organization for Women) Legal Defense Fund board member Patricia Williams, and launched a campus UNICEF chapter. UNICEF raises

money to promote abortion. Last year the Center for Peace and Justice made national news when it launched a massive protest against plans to bring Charlton Heston to the University.

“When an administrative office of a Catholic university invites a well-known pro-abortion leader to speak on campus, regardless of the topic of his address, the university is clearly undermining its own Catholic mission. So much for ‘mission effectiveness,’” Reilly said. “Patricia Ireland [of NOW] has no business on campus, whether she’s addressing abortion or home economics; David Duke also doesn’t belong, whether he’s discussing the genetics of race or weather in Texas. Are we teaching students that public behavior is irrelevant, even when it counters fundamental truths and endangers lives?”

“As someone in the process of becoming Catholic, I am embarrassed at how hypocritical our administration tends to be,” said former student body vice president Peter Burchett.

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. Comments made herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every member of LDI’s Board of Directors, Board of Advisors, or staff. To schedule a speaker call (202) 347-2066. Thanks for your support! This publication may be printed and copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation.

©2002 Life Decisions International.