



# *The Caleb Report*

September-October 2002

Life Decisions International

vol. x • no. 5

*IN THIS ISSUE:* Is This The Price Of Freedom? / There Are More Teen Virgins / Just Like The Others / The Prayer Project / Care Net Official Expresses Anger / Quotable Quote / Two Great Resources

## **IS THIS THE PRICE OF FREEDOM?**

Marie Stopes International (MSI) has opened Afghanistan's first "reproductive health" facility. Bayard Roberts, the group's Afghanistan program manager, claimed the facility would remain sensitive to local conditions when it comes to abortion.

While abortion was banned under the Taliban, the interim Afghan government allows the deadly act throughout the first trimester in situations where the mother's life is in danger. Roberts said the facility would get involved in abortion only if women seek help after receiving a botched procedure. In such a case, the all-female staff will complete the abortion and provide basic health care, he told Cybercast News Service.

MSI and its competitor (except in philosophy), the International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF), have been giving birth control to Afghans living in Pakistani refugee camps. Steven Mosher, president of the Population Research Institute and a member of LDI's Board of Advisors, has said that pro-abortion agencies are aiming to "break down cultural resistance to abortion...within the refugee camps." He continued: "Afghan refugee women face a new reign of terror designed to violate their right to bear children."

Roberts said the Afghan government and the local community have consented to the facility. He noted that the majority of MSI's work in Kabul would be in the fields of training and mother-child care. "There's a huge demand for the most basic health care," he said. It seems that IPPF wants a piece (or more) of Afghani pie. It soon plans to return to the war-torn country.

The Afghan program was established with MSI discretionary funds but Roberts said the group plans to secure permanent funding. The United Nations, the European Union, the British government and several nongovernmental groups currently fund MSI and IPPF.

MSI plans to establish smaller-scale local facilities throughout Kabul, which will include a roving "clinic" and training facility to reach more remote areas. "Our goal is to set up Marie Stopes Afghanistan," Roberts said. "This is not just an emergency relief project. Eventually, it will be staffed and run entirely by local people." One may recall that Margaret Sanger, the founder of Planned Parenthood, also employed the strategy of using local people to do her bidding. Consequently, there was less fear that "outsiders" were trying to keep the women from having children.

"When Afghani children need food, MSI offers condoms. When the women seek freedom, MSI offers dead children. When the men need homes for their families, MSI offers sterilization," said Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI. "This is par for the course. When the newly freed people of Romania needed food, Planned Parenthood airlifted them condoms. As bad as the Taliban and the horrific dictator Nicolae Ceausescu were, I

wonder who will do the most overall damage to the lives of people: the dictators or groups such as MSI and Planned Parenthood?”

## THERE ARE MORE TEEN VIRGINS

According to 2001 federal data, virgins now outnumber sexually active teenagers. While some say abstinence education deserves the credit, others say teenagers are choosing to postpone sex because they fear contracting one or more sexually transmitted health conditions.

The Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) asked 14-18 year olds about substance use, unintentional injuries, diet, physical activity and sexual behavior. In 1990, nearly 54.3 percent claimed to have had sexual intercourse at least once. But in 2001, 54.4 percent said they had *never* been sexually active.

Peter Brandt of Focus on the Family said the turning point came around the time the federal government started funding programs that teach teenagers to save sex for marriage. “There is no doubt that kids are responding to an unambiguous abstinence message,” Brandt told the *Washington Times*. “The federal Title V [“five”] abstinence program is having a tremendous impact,” he said. LeAnna Benn, director of Teen-Aid and a member of the Abstinence Clearinghouse advisory board, agreed: “The only thing that changed in that time frame is the amount of talk and programming for abstinence until marriage.”

“I don’t think it’s [the decrease in teenage sexual activity] strong enough to be a u-turn,” said Kristin A. Moore, president of Child Trends. “It’s trending down, but even with improvements we have a lot of kids who are having risky sex.” It even appears that there could be two very different groups of teenagers—“some of whom are committed to abstinence to marriage and some of whom are really quite sexually active.”

William Smith of the Sexuality Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS) sees a different reason for the decline in teenage sexual activity. “I think that it coincides with the overwhelming number of young people who are reporting that they are getting HIV/AIDS education,” he said, noting that virtually 90 percent of high school students say they are learning about AIDS. “Sex is natural, healthy and great, but it’s also serious business, and I think some of the HIV/AIDS education out there are underscoring that [teenagers] don’t have to have sex, that it’s important for young people to delay sexual activity until they’re ready for it—emotionally or otherwise,” Smith said.

Congress created the Title V program for abstinence-only education. A House bill renews the program. A Senate bill renews it but adds funding for “abstinence-first” programs, which encourage teenagers to abstain from sex but also teaches about birth control and abortion. Proponents say this is what parents and teenagers want. Abstinence-only supporters say this is just the same old sex education that led to increases in teenage pregnancy and disease. “They all say wait until you get your condoms,” Benn said.

Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI, doubts the validity of any study on sexuality—especially those involving young people. “Very few teenagers tell the whole truth on such surveys,” Scott said. A former high school and junior high school teacher, Scott said he “can virtually guarantee that the statistics on the number of sexually active teens are greatly exaggerated.”

Scott said the young people he taught were pleased that someone was talking about the merits of chastity. “It’s as though they were hearing it nowhere else,” Scott said. “They were not getting it from their parents. They were not getting it at church. They were certainly not getting it from their peers, the movies, television or magazines. Yet they were starving for someone to say to them, ‘Yes, you’re doing the right thing and smart thing! You are normal and you are not alone!’”

Scott spends much of his time speaking with young people about chastity. “They are more receptive than one may think. It’s all in the presentation style and respecting their ability to make the right decision,” Scott said. “All they need is a little support, respect and a challenge to think things through for themselves.”

Scott has another theory as to why more teenagers are choosing to forgo sexual activity. “Maybe they are just tired of the hype and the lies they have been bombarded with by the media, Planned Parenthood, birth control companies, and so forth,” Scott said. “Maybe they are tired of being the victims. Maybe they have realized that everyone financially benefits from their sexual activity except for them and they’ve had enough. Maybe teenagers now realize they have been misled.”

Scott said that when William Smith calls sex “serious business,” it should be taken literally because it is very lucrative for corporations and organizations. “The last thing on earth these groups and companies want is a decline in teenage sexual activity. If all teenagers were to decide to wait until marriage, the companies would go out of business. These selfish groups and corporations actually want to increase teenage sexual behavior so they can provide the young people with even more of their so-called ‘care’—which mean more of their products. No wonder teenagers are feeling used,” Scott said.

## JUST LIKE THE OTHERS

We at LDI were thrilled when the son of Eunice Kennedy Shriver announced that he would run for Congress for she has been a vocal critic of abortion. Her son would surely hold the same views. Finally, one politician in the Kennedy clan would be willing to stand up for the most vulnerable among us in Congress.

Well, not so fast. Mark Shriver’s record as a member of the Maryland legislature shows that he has zealously supported abortion. This nephew of the slain President is just like the other politicians in the family—*ravidly* pro-abortion. How can this be? Did not Mark Shriver’s mother educate him on these critical subjects? Why is Eunice Kennedy Shriver actively supporting her son when he believes it is acceptable to kill children before they are born? Is it just another issue to her?

The candidate’s website reveals his allegiance to the pro-abortion lobby:

### Family Planning and Women’s Reproductive Health

*“If elected, I will continue to support efforts to ensure that women have access to the information, support and services they need to make safe and responsible decisions about their reproductive health.”*

By Mark Shriver

While access to affordable health care is a priority for all Americans, women have unique concerns. For example, family planning services and routine screening and treatment for breast and cervical cancer are health priorities for the women of our nation. Heart disease, diabetes, depression, violence against women and sexually transmitted diseases are just some of the health issues confronting American women. In addition, funding for medical research must include research on, and for, women, and must be especially attentive to the specific impact of medications and treatments on various diseases affecting them today.

Key to a woman’s overall health and well-being are issues related to her reproductive health. This includes access to safe and legal abortions.

With that in mind, if elected, I will continue to support efforts to ensure that women have access to the information, support and services they need to make safe and responsible decisions about their

reproductive health. If elected, you can count on me to protect women's rights to make decisions about their own bodies.

Let me make it perfectly clear, I support and will defend every woman's right to choose, consistent with *Roe v. Wade* and regardless of ability to pay. I believe it is a fundamental constitutional liberty that individual Americans—not government—can best take responsibility for making the most difficult and intensely personal decisions regarding reproduction. If a woman chooses to have an abortion, it is of utmost importance that a medical professional performs it in a safe and secure environment. In addition, important new medications, such as RU-486, which provides women with a safe, early alternative to surgical abortion, should be made available.

Unplanned pregnancies account for half of all pregnancies in the United States today, and assuring access to family planning services is the first step in reducing that number and ensuring that every child is a wanted child. That's why I have consistently worked to increase access to family planning services—the most effective way to reduce the need for abortions.

**Key facts concerning women's reproductive health today:**

- Public funding for family planning helps women avoid nearly 1.3 million unintended pregnancies a year.
- Every \$1 spent on family planning services saves \$3 in Medicaid costs for pregnancy-related health care.
- While 75% of American women rely on private insurance for their health care costs, most plans provide inadequate coverage for contraception. The unfair result is that women of reproductive age spend 68% more on out-of-pocket health care costs than do men.
- In fact, 39% of women between the ages of 55-65 have no health benefits at all.
- Domestic terrorism aimed at women's health clinics has become epidemic in the last 20 years. Clinics have been bombed causing injury to staff and practitioners, and numerous physicians have been severely injured or even murdered by anti-abortion advocates. This is completely unacceptable.

**The Republican Record**

President Bush and the Republican-led Congress are acting to reduce funding for family planning services. They are erecting barriers to contraceptive services, and restricting women's access to abortion facilities... bowing down to the extremist anti-abortion movement.

...Now...President Bush's many anti-choice actions and how they dramatically hurt women:

Appointing Staunchly Anti-choice John Ashcroft as Attorney General:

- Throughout his career, Ashcroft has worked tirelessly to restrict a woman's right to choose. Now, as Attorney General, he will have an even greater opportunity to continue his crusade to roll back women's constitutional rights, perhaps paving the way for the overturn *Roe v. Wade* itself.

Appointing Anti-Choice Tommy Thompson To Lead The Department of Health And Human Services:

- Thompson was one of the country's most anti-choice governors. Now heads up the very department that wields the greatest influence over policies affecting women's reproductive health.
- Upon taking office, President Bush issued an executive order to reinstate the global gag rule. The Republican House voted 218 to 210 to uphold President Bush's action, which prohibits funding to international family planning organizations; organizations that strive to prevent unintended pregnancies, reduce abortion, and avert hundreds of thousands of infant and maternal deaths worldwide each year.

...

President Bush eliminated the Office for Women's Initiatives and Outreach. Created under President Clinton, the office ensured that issues of concern to women had a voice within the White House walls.

### **Threatening Stem Cell Research**

Right-wing extremists are trying to convince President Bush to overturn the Clinton Administration's decision to fund groundbreaking stem cell research, which offers great promise for the treatment of many life-threatening diseases. President Bush appears to oppose such research and scientists fear he will bow to conservative wishes and restrict or even ban funding for it, holding America's health hostage to anti-choice politics.

### **"Reviewing" RU 486 Approval**

President Bush and Secretary Tommy Thompson have said they want to review the FDA's decision to approve Mifeprex (RU 486). This action could lead to greater restrictions on access to the drug or even a reversal of FDA approval.

### **Ending Contraceptive Benefits For Federal Employees**

President Bush's budget plan eliminates insurance coverage for contraceptives for federal employees.

### **Increasing Funding For Abstinence-Only Education**

The President's budget increases funding for risky abstinence-only education, while holding level funding for... the nation's domestic family planning program.

### **Bending Medical Privacy Rules**

President Bush says he will likely move to let parents obtain confidential information on the health services minors receive, including contraception and abortion.

If elected, I would:

- Protect a woman's right to choose a safe, legal abortion.
- Support efforts to ensure equity in insurance coverage for prescription contraceptives.
- Support FDA approval of Mifpristone, RU-486.
- Support medical research to benefit women's health.
- Increase funding for family planning—the most effective way to reduce the need for abortions—and support an increase in Title X, which has for nearly 30 years helped improve women's health by providing routine screenings for breast and cervical cancer, screening and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), and access to contraception.
- Protect and strengthen Medicaid, our nation's largest source of public funding for contraceptive services for poor women.
- Support legislation to protect abortion clinics, their employees, and their patients.
- Support research into microbicides development.
- Support increased funding to fight the spread of sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV.
- Support legislation to ensure health care benefits to more of America's women.

What do you think about my position on this issue? Feel free to let me know...I'd love to hear from you!

Why does this text read as though a professional pro-abortion apologist wrote it? If Kennedy wrote it himself, he *is* a professional pro-abortion apologist!

Shriver is not the only one of the Kennedy clan running for office in 2002. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, daughter of Robert F. Kennedy, is running for governor of Maryland. Patrick J. Kennedy, D-R.I., son of Senator Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., is running for re-election to Congress. All are *ravidly* pro-abortion.

**ACTION:** Mark Shriver would “love to hear from you.” Write to Mr. Mark Shriver, c/o Citizens for Mark Shriver, P.O. Box 342310, West Bethesda, MD 20827. E-Mail: mark@shriverforcongress.com. Please be polite but clear.

## 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. Please join us in daily prayer for the following individuals: *September*—European Development Commissioner **Poul Nielson**; *October*—Senator **Joseph R. Biden, Jr.**, D-Del.; *November*—**Hamid Karzai**, president of Afghanistan; and *December*—**Mark Shriver**, D-Md.

## CARE NET OFFICIAL EXPRESSES ANGER

Readers of the May-June 2002 edition of *The Caleb Report* learned that Care Net, parent group of several pregnancy help centers, is now doing business with the American Express Company. As a result of the article, LDI was the recipient of accusatory and biting words from Kurt Entsminger, Care Net’s lawyer.

Entsminger claimed it was unfair of LDI to classify Care Net’s reasons for doing business with American Express as “mere excuses.” He insisted that LDI explain Care Net’s position in detail. Consequently, what follows are quotations from letters Entsminger sent to LDI (as always, accuracy and proper contextual use are guaranteed). Since LDI supporters have read many form letters from corporations, we know that you have become skilled at analytically examining the use of rhetoric. We ask that you review what is written herein and come to your own conclusion.

LDI learned that Care Net had begun accepting the American Express card in late February 2002. The information came from a person who had financially supported both LDI and Care Net in the past. At the supporter’s request, LDI’s president wrote to ask Care Net to stop doing business with American Express. In response, Entsminger wrote:

We recognize that an economic boycott may be an effective and appropriate tool for bringing pressure to bear against a corporation that engages in offensive conduct. As a pro-life organization, we also agree that we should generally take into consideration the positions of our prospective vendors relating to abortion and matters of sexuality. However, upon reviewing the extensive list of services and products targeted by your boycott, we do not believe that Care Net could effectively fulfill its mission if we were to pledge to absolutely refrain from interacting with all of these named businesses.

Sadly, the list of corporations that support abortion in America extends well beyond those that contribute money to Planned Parenthood. We remain hopeful that all of these organizations will someday realize the wrong-headedness of their actions. We believe that Care Net can most effectively contribute to that outcome by continuing to support pregnancy centers and by promoting public education about the sanctity of human life. In some instances, fulfilling our pro-life mission may practically necessitate that we transact business with organizations [sic] that support Planned Parenthood or which otherwise promote positions on abortion that are contrary to our own.

Douglas R. Scott, LDI’s president, responded by saying that *none* of Care Net’s past leaders had ever said that refusing to do business with a boycott target hindered the group’s mission. In fact, each had signed on to endorse the Corporate Funding Project (CFP).

Scott said that if Care Net were to inform its donors that American Express is a boycott target because the company has funded Planned Parenthood, but the charge card will be accepted anyway, Care Net’s supporters would not accept any excuse. In addition, examples of other pro-life leaders who had once accepted American

Express, but who took immediate action to end their association with the company after learning of its status as a boycott target, were also proffered. Scott's letter concluded with these words: "While we are indeed surprised at your response, we also recognize your right to make the decision you believe to be...God-honoring..."

In an April 8, 2002, letter, Entsminger wrote:

[W]e are not making excuses. We are being honest about the impracticalities of your blanket boycott. To uphold the pledge you ask us to maintain goes far beyond accepting or refusing American Express cards. To comply, we would also have to discard all of our computers. We would be forced to refuse all electronic communications delivered in [Microsoft] Word format or otherwise supported by Microsoft software. We would have to forego reading any of the articles recently published about pregnancy centers in the New York Times. Can you confidently represent to us that all of the other [CFP] endorsing organizations are taking these and the many other steps that are necessary to fully comply with your boycott?

Furthermore, Planned Parenthood is not our chief enemy. Rather, Satan is, and he effectively uses many other instrumentalities besides Planned Parenthood. In this respect, we believe your boycott is too narrow since you target only businesses that financially support Planned Parenthood. What about businesses or individuals who support or promote other equally unholy causes? Is an entrepreneur that is actively funding NARAL's [National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League] ongoing campaign to destroy pregnancy centers any less deserving of boycott than the makers of Advil or Paul Newman's salad dressing? You say that you find it ironic that Care Net does business with American Express. However, one could find it equally ironic that you advocate boycotting children's programming on Disney while remaining silent about the blatantly and pro-abortion programming spewed on MTV.

Entsminger apparently does not understand the economic boycott as a strategy for achieving change. No one has ever been asked to throw away computers or refuse documents in Microsoft Word. In fact, LDI began using such products long before Microsoft became a boycott target. Throwing everything away would be a grossly wasteful use of God's resources. If a person purchased a new car today and the company was to become a boycott target in three months, would the owner be expected to destroy the automobile? Doing so would be ridiculous at best and downright stupid at worst. LDI simply has not purchased a Microsoft product since the company became a boycott target. The standard would also apply to any other non-returnable purchase. We want people to do their best, but we do not want them to do something silly.

LDI is not opposed to anyone reading *The New York Times*. We just do not buy it. It is readily available online and elsewhere without charge. The point is that once a company is identified as a supporter of Planned Parenthood, we do *nothing* that will result in it getting our money.

The fact is that LDI has often spoken out against MTV. LDI has also taken on magazine publishers that target teenagers with the pro-Planned Parenthood message. But even if LDI had not done so, would it justify Care Net's acceptance of the American Express card?

Entsminger had refused to boycott American Express, yet he complained that more corporations were not boycott targets. Entsminger actually states that he will not boycott American Express because the CFP is too narrowly focused.

Only those corporations that donate to Planned Parenthood were chosen as initial targets because:

- of the need to narrow our focus so as to not engulf pro-life people or LDI's limited resources;
- only Planned Parenthood actively advocates for *and* commits abortions;

- few corporations fund other pro-abortion groups and not Planned Parenthood as well; and
- Planned Parenthood is the strongest, most recognized and dangerous pro-abortion group in the world.

It was this letter from Entsminger that prompted LDI to use the “mere excuses” phrase. He attempts justify the decision and evade the subject as much as possible. This is a common rhetorical tactic designed to refocus the issue onto what may seem to be more comfortable ground. It dodges a direct answer to the matter at hand.

In a follow-up letter, Scott quoted from the book *Catholic Replies*, by James J. Drummeey:

It is always a sin to cooperate in evil, but the gravity of the sin depends on the nature of one’s cooperation. If the cooperation is formal and proximate (contributing money directly to Planned Parenthood), such an action would probably be a mortal sin. If the cooperation is material and remote (buying products from a company which contributes money to Planned Parenthood), such an action would *probably* not be a sin *if* one has a *good reason* for buying the products (they are necessary for one’s health and not available elsewhere) or if all producers of a given product do the same objectionable thing (emphasis added).

“To Drummy,” Scott’s letter continued, “‘good reason’ is just that; there is no room for excuses. The reasons must be compelling.” Drummy ends by saying that one should “certainly not continue to let [a corporation that supports Planned Parenthood] use some of the money from his purchases to help finance abortions.”

In an April 16, 2002, letter, Entsminger asked for a meeting with LDI’s president and board of directors “to explain” Care Net’s position. LDI’s president responded by saying that Care Net’s position was not unclear so there was no need further explanation. He said that such a meeting would be fruitless if it were merely going to be a rehashing of the reasons already given by Care Net.

Entsminger again wrote to LDI on May 20, 2002:

We are conducting an ongoing evaluation of the amount of donor and other income that we receive by accepting American Express cards. I can assure you that these amounts are not insignificant. Because we have an ongoing relationship with American Express, we have attempted to use this relationship to positively influence the giving patters of American Express. Not only have we contacted American Express...to address the concerns raised by your organization, but we have also initiated steps to persuade American Express to contribute monetary assistance to our cause as opposed to supporting causes such as Planned Parenthood...

In the meantime, we are having difficulty verifying that American Express has been a financial benefactor of Planned Parenthood... We would appreciate you sharing any specific information you have to verify this...

LDI responded by saying that American Express has supported a Planned Parenthood “peer counseling” group. It has also funded The Hub in New York City, which offers birth control and abortions to teenagers. Yet after the article about Care Net appeared in May-June 2002 *Caleb Report*, Entsminger called to say he had not been able to confirm any grants made to Planned Parenthood. When asked if he had simply telephoned American Express to inquire as to its giving practices, Entsminger’s answer was “no.” LDI found this interesting in light of Entsminger’s previous statement that he was working to change the company’s funding of Planned Parenthood—a practice Entsminger said he is not convinced even exists.

Entsminger followed up his phone call to LDI with another letter (dated June 24, 2002):

So now you have had the pleasure of sending out your newsletter openly ridiculing Care Net and me for what you characterize as “mere excuses” for doing business with American Express...

[W]e understand that you are disappointed that Care Net chooses to no longer remain in lockstep with your boycott. However, publicly criticizing our ministry for this decision is totally out of line. We attempted in good faith to explain to you the principles that have guided our thinking on these issues. While you may disagree with our positions, it is plainly unreasonable for you to presume that Care Net still owes some obligation to live up to your personal views. “Thou shall abide by Doug’s [Scott’s] boycott” is not the Eleventh Commandment.

Entsminger accused LDI’s president of refusing to “even listen to the real reasons” behind Care Net’s decision. His letter of June 24, 2002, continues:

It is true, as you have quoted me, that Care Net receives a significant amount of donor contributions through American Express cards. However, the main reason Care Net has decided not to sever our business relationship with American Express has nothing to do with credit card receipts. Rather, it is because Care Net’s retirement plan was put in place and continues to be managed by a Christian friend and [Care Net] supporter who works directly for American Express Financial Services. In looking at these circumstances, we decided that ending a positive business relationship with a Christian friend and replacing an existing and well-managed retirement plan was simply not justified. Our decision was further supported in that we can find no evidence that American Express has a current policy or practice of supporting Planned Parenthood or other pro-abortion groups.

A retirement plan? A Christian friend? A financial supporter of Care Net? An employee of American Express? This was all new to LDI. Up to this point, LDI had been given *only* the following reasons why Care Net could not stop accepting American Express:

- Care Net would have to throw away all of its computers and refuse to accept documents created in Microsoft Word;
- LDI is supposedly not speaking out against MTV, but is boycotting the children’s programming produced by The Walt Disney Company;
- Care Net is trying to get money from American Express (which, by the way, would not excuse the company’s support of Planned Parenthood);
- Support of Planned Parenthood by American Express could not be “verified” by Care Net even though LDI had provided the requested information;
- The boycott is “too narrow;”
- Care Net has to continue its business relationship with the American Express because it is trying to get the company to change its philanthropic practice; and
- Doing so would prevent the fulfillment of its mission;

Yet LDI is suddenly told that the “main reason” Care Net had refused to reject American Express is because of a personal *friend* and Care Net *contributor* who *works for* the company. In addition, this was the first time that LDI had been told that the relationship between Care Net and American Express went *far* deeper than just accepting the company’s charge card.

With this letter, Entsminger began to carbon copy two LDI board members in an effort to put pressure on LDI’s president. He later wrote directly to Michael Schwartz, a member of LDI’s Board of Directors, asking that Schwartz “and the rest” of the board “intervene to put an end” to Scott’s actions:

If Doug [Scott] continues to publish negative information about Care Net, as he apparently intends to do, he should be aware that he owes a legal (not to mention moral and ethical) obligation to get all of his facts straight. We are already losing donors because of the unfair shots that are being taken at our

ministry. In his recent newsletter and online press release, Doug chose to selectively ignore important facts relating to our relationship with American Express...

Entsminger again criticized Scott for choosing not to personally meet with him to hear the “explanations.”

Schwartz apparently did not feel it necessary to contact Scott. Nevertheless, Scott responded to Entsminger in writing, copying Schwartz:

I have known Mr. Schwartz for nearly 20 years. He is probably the man I most respect in this Movement. In many ways he has been my mentor. I would love to be more like him—also in many ways. However, you should be advised that never in the history of the Corporate Funding Project has any member of the LDI Board of Directors interfered in the administration of the boycott. I expect that this will always be the case...

The LDI Board will not “intervene to put and end” to what you characterize as “an unnecessary and destructive campaign against Care Net.” One of LDI’s chief policies, adopted when this organization was founded, reads as follows: “LDI will publicly but professionally challenge organizations that we believe are discrediting the Pro-Life Movement. We welcome challenges from anyone who can ever show LDI is doing so.”

You characterize the information we published about Care Net as “negative.” Yet we have only printed the facts. I am fully aware of the legal, moral and ethical issues involved and will continue to get the “facts straight.”

We did not print the full story about Care Net’s association with American Express because we had hoped the first article [in *The Caleb Report*] would be enough to achieve the goal (since bringing the matter to your attention beforehand was rebuffed)...

[As for Care Net losing donors], it is simply that Christian people are exercising good stewardship of their finances. We would not expect anyone to support LDI if we were involved in an unholy alliance either. I repeat the challenge: Inform your donors that American Express is the target of a boycott due to its association with Planned Parenthood, that you have chosen to accept the American Express card and do other financial business with the company anyway, and that Care Net has been dropped as a group that has endorsed the boycott. Offer all the rationale you wish—in your own words. See how it goes over...

Finally, if you think it will do any good..., I would be willing to meet with you in person. Please know from the start, however, that I am not willing to compromise on the truth. I trust you feel the same way.

Entsminger never responded to this letter. It is not known whether the meeting request was disingenuous from the start or if Entsminger changed his mind based on Scott’s statement that he had no desire to simply rehash the reasons why Care Net is doing business with American Express. While Scott agreed to a meeting, Care Net ignored the challenge that it tell donors of its extensive business relationship with American Express.

The only information given to readers of the May-June 2002 *Caleb Report* was that Care Net is doing business with American Express. How is this inherently “negative” unless there is some reason to be ashamed of it? Is the act of relaying information to people outside “the loop” what makes it negative or is it the natural response of people who learn what is going on that makes it “negative”? If doing business with American Express is something to be proud of, why has not Care Net accepted LDI’s repeated challenge?

After publishing the first article, LDI received other complaints about Care Net. One woman was upset that Catholics who wish to serve at Care Net-affiliated centers must sign a statement that declares the Protestant

*Bible* to be the only infallible Word of God. A document entitled, “Explanation of the Care Net Statement of Faith,” states that, “Care Net does not recognize the validity or truth of extra-biblical sources of revelation...or other so-called Scriptures. The 66 canonical books of the bible are our final authority (emphasis added). The Catholic bible has 72 books.

A key part of Care Net work is sharing the *Gospel* with its clients and it may not want the Catholic version to be presented. The woman was primarily upset because Care Net demands acceptance of their theology before they are allowed to help women in need but it does not require its workers to be pro-life. For example, she said that some Care Net workers are not opposed to fetal or embryonic experimentation. “Care Net can bar Catholics who refuse to sign their Statement of Faith if they want to but maybe they should at least require people to be [truly] pro-life,” she told LDI.

This article is published for two reasons. First, LDI pledged to follow-up on the previously published article (though we had hoped to be able to report that Care Net had ended its relationship with American Express). Second, we believe that knowing the truth and the full story is the right of those who fund pro-life groups. We do not believe that any group should be able to hide behind a wall of silence or secrecy, which leaves caring and sincere pro-life people in the dark.

It is important that five points be made clear above all:

- LDI does not question the use of boycotted products or services when they are absolutely necessary and no alternatives are available.
- The CFP began at Care Net, then-called the Christian Action Council (CAC), in 1988. At that time, American Express was one of the primary boycott targets. CAC’s president was interviewed on network news programs and its vice president for public policy (who just happens to be president of LDI today) appeared on the CBS network’s morning show where American Express was specifically discussed.
- If Entsminger has a personal American Express card, we believe that is his business and not subject to public discussion. But what we have here is an institutional decision, which is a very public matter.
- If Care Net leaders want to do business with any boycotted corporation they should just do so without attempting to justify the decision with excuses that clearly cannot be defended. Care Net leaders should also be *eager* to tell people of their decisions and the *truth* about how they were reached. After all, if the decisions are God-honoring, there should be nothing to worry about.
- LDI fully supports the work of pregnancy help centers and we ask that you do, too—even if the parent of some of those groups chooses to go down the wrong path. Few organizations have done more to defend pregnancy help centers and their employees and volunteers than LDI. This will never change.

While Care Net’s actions are indeed disappointing, we truly believe its leaders may make any decisions they choose. Moreover, none of us at LDI take pleasure in bringing this matter to the attention of pro-life people. Despite what Care Net’s lawyer writes, our goal is not to ridicule the group or its leaders, but to call Care Net’s leaders to accountability. We are not, however, calling on Care Net’s leaders to be accountable to LDI. First they are accountable to God. Second they are accountable to the good people who fund the Pro-Life Movement.

### QUOTABLE QUOTE

“My beliefs—my faith—the one thing that has forever and will forever remain constant.”

— “American Idol” contestant RJ Helton’s response when asked if there was anything he would *refuse* to change in order to win the very competitive singing competition

## THREE GREAT RESOURCES

There are several resources that we believe will be of interest to you. Please check them out:

- A new website documents violence by pro-abortion people. Prochoiceviolence.com uses material in the public domain to show abortion-related crimes. “We are merely educating the public as to the real stories surrounding abortion,” said Life Internet’s Ted Gerk, a member of LDI’s Board of Directors who founded the site. “The abortion industry has done a fabulous PR [public relations] job, keeping this information hidden. This web site will expose the truth, both of pro-choice violence but also of the media complicity in keeping this information hidden from legislators and the general public.”
- Another website of interest comes out of research done by Life Dynamics. Childpredators.com centers around the group’s research on how Planned Parenthood and the National Abortion Federation are refusing to report child sexual abuse.
- Life Advocacy Alliance is the best source of information on legislation. Life Advocacy *Briefing* is published weekly. For more information or to order, please visit LDI’s website at: [www.fightpp.org](http://www.fightpp.org).

*The Caleb Report*, an official periodical of Life Decisions International, is published six times per year. A minimum donation of \$38 (US) or \$94 (CAN) per year is requested. 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, please call 202-347-2066 or e-mail us at [ldi@fightpp.org](mailto:ldi@fightpp.org). Thanks for your support! 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.

©2002 Life Decisions International