



# The Caleb Report

July-August 2003

Life Decisions International

vol. xi • no. 4

*IN THIS ISSUE:* Warren Buffett Decision Angers Some / The Death Foundation / Feldt: Congress Acted Immorally / Terminator of Unborn Children / The Prayer Project / Pro-Abortion March Scheduled / Update: Corporate Funding Project / Your Thoughts / Quotable Quote / Extending The "Right To Privacy"

## WARREN BUFFETT DECISION ANGERS SOME

Pro-abortion activists and some Berkshire Hathaway (BH) shareholders were quick to criticize Life Decisions International for the decision made exclusively by Warren Buffett, the company's chief executive officer, to end its *entire* shareholder philanthropic program. An article that appeared on the Motley Fool website was authored by BH shareholder Bill Mann:

It's [the end of BH's giving program] a tragedy, for Berkshire Hathaway's charitable giving program stood out as unique. At the end of the day, Warren Buffett's vast holdings in the company will still go to the causes he sees fit...Some of the other 3,500 charities that have received donations in the last few years will, however, have to go without.

Mann's article included a link to LDI's website and was the impetus behind nearly 100 e-mails received by LDI. For example, John Kelley wrote:

As is often the case, you have killed donations to other worthwhile charities by your incessant complaining. Thank you from everyone who would have been helped, but now will not.

This is an article published on the Motley Fool.....go complain to them, maybe you can mess something else up.

It was Buffett alone who ended the *entire* program rather than simply make Planned Parenthood ineligible for funds. No amount of finger pointing will change that fact. Of the 92 corporations known to have stopped funding Planned Parenthood, only one took the drastic step of ending an *entire* program—Berkshire Hathaway.

If Buffett were to give every dollar of his personal wealth to pro-abortion groups, at least it would not go with a corporate endorsement, which is even more important to Planned Parenthood than the money itself.

We cannot influence where an individual sends his personal money (except through prayer), but we can impact the philanthropic behavior of a corporation.

Gregg Mead sent LDI the Motley Fool article with the e-mail addressed to the "Idiots at Life Decisions International." It ended, "You Morons." Bernier Huber was also upset by the Motley Fool piece that he turned his anger on LDI's leaders:

I just want you people to know that you are idiots...

You do real harm by using boycotts to promote your cause. But since you can end any argument with "God bless you" you are incapable of coming to terms with the harm that you do. Your actions cause real anger in others and we respond accordingly...

When you say "God bless you" what do you really mean? Until you answer that question for yourself, you will remain incapable of seeing the harm you...do...

Because of people like you, the only charity I continue to support is Planned Parenthood, which the last I checked [sic], does not participate in any boycotts.

...  
Apparently you are basically oblivious. I can only assure you that you have made enemies of all the charities you were instrumental in cutting off here...

Huber will be disappointed to learn that Planned Parenthood has embraced the economic boycott strategy in the past, as have countless other groups. And what we mean by "God bless you" is "God bless you." One must ask whether Huber is really upset with the boycott itself or LDI's fight against Planned Parenthood. After all, Huber seems to suggest that he selects charities to support based on whether or not they have encouraged a boycott.

Scott Isaacs claims to “lean” pro-life, but he puts “pro-life” in quotation marks:

I lean to the “pro-life” side of the debate but, I must say, your boycott of the Pampered Chef has made me positively nauseous...I believe that you have caused several new problems without resolving the problem that you set out to in the first place....

Isaacs later wrote to say that “rather than compromising the democratic basis of the program where each shareholder decides where their proportion of the charity money goes, BH closed it.” Isaacs supports BH’s decision to end the entire program, but he lays fault and responsibility at the feet of LDI’s leaders.

John D. Gretzinger’s e-mail began this way: “You are to be pitied.” He went on to say that LDI has “garnered a spot” on his “Do Not Support list.” Why do we believe LDI was not exactly at the top of his support list anyway? Moreover, what makes Gretzinger think that getting or not getting money from anyone would change our policies and practices?

A. Gibson wrote to say that, “The damage to education, hungry, needy and [the] homeless is on your shoulders.” And Scott Dodelson said LDI is mean:

Your boycott of Pampered Chef was cynical and mean-spirited or simply ignorant.

As you should know, they do not support Planned Parenthood. By hurting America’s business’s [sic] for no reason at all, you are doing damage to us in a time of economic downturn.

I sincerely hope that no people lost jobs due to your actions. A public apology from you is warranted.

“Mean-spirited” is one of our favorite leftist expressions. It is applied to every action with which they disagree. Dodelson chose not to be specific about what was “mean-spirited,” “cynical,” or “ignorant.” And LDI has been blamed for many things over the years, but never for a nationwide recession. We wonder why neither George W. Bush nor Alan Greenspan has called to beg LDI to end the boycott in order to save the economy.

Dave Trent had some “choice” words for LDI:

I guess the summary of my thoughts is “You idiots.”

...  
In protest of *your* actions, I am seriously considering a donation to Planned Parenthood—a donation I would not otherwise make.

Those who threaten to give money to Planned Parenthood because of the boycott are never persuasive and the tactic is overused. People are free to do whatever they want to do with their own money, but it will not stop the boycott. One person wrote to tell us that they were pro-life but now they are pro-abortion because of the boycott. She was either a very weak pro-lifer or she

was simply lying in an effort to discourage our work. We think it was the latter.

Trent was not finished with LDI quite yet. In an effort to make sure we did not misunderstand anything he had written, he sent another e-mail:

As an organization with integrity, Berkshire did the only thing it could do to: uphold the interests of its shareholders to ensure that negative press would not impact revenues and profits by cancelling [sic] the program instead of permitting special interest groups to dictate “acceptable” charities. This end result should not be surprising to anyone with a moderately strong ethics and business background who invested the time to think through the scenario. It was the only viable solution....

Yes, Trent actually argues that BH canceled the entire philanthropic program to avoid negative press. Well that is a new excuse.

Just when the e-mails began to subside, *Fortune* printed an article titled, “Berkshire Gives Up on Giving.” The author, Nicholas Varchaver, is a BH shareholder. *Fortune*’s editor, Carol Loomis, is a director of the Buffett Foundation. Did we expect impartial reporting?:

Warren Buffett has drawn criticism in the past for supporting pro-choice causes, but it never affected Berkshire Hathaway’s charitable giving...[but] the most powerful man in business has terminated Berkshire’s entire contribution program...

...  
Before this year, Berkshire seemed impervious to such pressures. Pro-life activists had picketed its annual meetings and boycotted it for years. Last year a shareholder resolution to cancel the charity program was soundly defeated, with 97% of shares voted against it. And Buffett defended the program in Berkshire’s 2001 annual report, saying Berkshire makes “no contributions except those designated by shareholders”...

So why did Berkshire abandon the program now? The company...said that “its ownership is now harming” not only a subsidiary, but also individuals. The board was willing to accept some damage from boycotts in the past because the cost was diffused across a giant corporation, but this was affecting Pampered Chef consultants, who had nothing to do with Berkshire’s policy.

Around the same time, *The Washington Post* published a commentary on the BH decision that berated LDI and its president. The deluge of nasty e-mail messages began all over again.

All you’ve done is hurt thousands of other charities with this boycott. Good job.

...  
You are as self-serving as any organization out there if you don’t care about anything or anyone else as long as you get what you want. That doesn’t sound very christian [sic] to me, but I’m sure you can find a way to jus-

tify it. People who are blind to anything but a single focus always can. And I don't want your blessing; it's not genuine.  
— Sheila A.

While Sheila seeks to tell us what is and is not "Christian," let us thank God that the abolitionists, suffragettes and the Apostles were of "a single focus." Take on too much and accomplish nothing. Take on too little and accomplish little. Take on just enough and accomplish much.

Damon Miller figured we would be interested in reading his unsolicited opinion:

As a patron of Berkshire-Hathaway, let me extend my most sarcastic congratulations to you for having pissed-off the CEO so intensely that he abruptly decided to cancel the *most effective charitable giving structure in the United States*. In yet another example of narrow-minded fools not being satisfied until they manage to completely \*\*\*\* [expletive deleted] up a good thing for everyone else, I take my hat off to you (collectively or otherwise). Thanks \*\*\*\*\* [expletive deleted],

...  
If I was [sic] in Buffett's position, I would have done precisely the same thing [end the entire program]. I agree with his actions 100%...

P. Gogia did not mince words:

Shame on you all. Your agenda has caused an end to an excellent non-partisan [sic] giving program at Berkshire Hathaway. "What you send out returns." You're agenda is mean-spirited and unethical...Do not e-mail me.

Do not e-mail you? You e-mailed us! Gogia wants to have the last word, but that does not make his points valid. Gogia resorts to the often-used "shame on you" line. A person who supports the killing of children before birth says that LDI should be ashamed. An interesting world this is—Biblical in fact—where good is called evil and evil is called good. And boycotting is neither "mean-spirited" (there's that phrase again) nor unethical. Just ask the countless number of leftist groups that have used the strategy.

Traci Lenzi chose to sarcastically mock LDI and its supporters:

could [sic] you help me here...I wore a condom the other nite [sic]...but in hindsight is that the same as committing abortion?...please help me with this perplexing problem...I'm way to [sic] stupid to figure this out on my own and need your expert guidance. Love...

Oscar said he hopes that LDI's leadership and their friends are stricken with an incurable disease:

It is interesting to me to see an organization like yours lying [sic] to people about pro life [sic]. Why don't you propose laws here like in Africa where if a woman gets pregnant out of wedlock she is stone [sic] to death after

the baby is born. That is the kind of antiquated barbaric ideas that people like your group propose. If you are so against abortion why don't you raise money to adopt & raise these children who are abused and have babies out of wedlock. I don't hear you speaking out against the Catholic Church who seem to protect their priest [sic] who abuse children. It is ashame [sic] with all of the problems in the world that your organization has nothing better to do. If there is one think [sic] that I wish for is that when any of you so called "Goodie Goodies" get sick with a disease that can't be cured just remember that maybe if you weren't also against stem cell research you may have been cured. Only you and God will know it at the time but i [sic] have to tell you that is my wish for all of you.

Maybe Oscar wants LDI's leadership and their allies to get such a disease because he views LDI in the same way that Lori Anne Franklin does. She compares us to the likes of Adolph Hitler, Joseph McCarthy and the Puritans:

Your group is obviously misguided. My only question is which political machine is behind this all out attack on Pampered Chef. Even your propaganda machine is not consistent. Million changed to Millions?...Money from Pampered Chef supports abortion? *Are you insane?????* But hey, at least you are following the lead of yet another great leader. Hitler employed the same tactics. Congratulations. Come to think of it...so did those peace loving early settlers at the witch hunts, and what about McCarthy—remember him?...you are in such good company.

And try this on for size, while you choose to attack Warren Buffett, why not take your heretic methods a bit further. After all taking *Birth Control* pills is a form of Abortion don't you think? Why not go after the Drug companies? Now there is an audience you can sink your teeth into. why [sic] waste your time on Pampered Chef—a little company that just wants to teach a few folks how to instill family values (you know, like abstaining from sex until marriage) from the comfort of their table...You could be reaching out to all of *America*...This could be big. The largest consumer of drugs in the world...Go Get EM [sic]!

As horrible as these comparisons are, at least she did not say we are like Margaret Sanger. Now that would have really made us mad.

Here are some additional examples of the e-mails:

You people make me sick. I hope you are happy cutting off funds to people who really needed this funding.

I wonder how many people you deal with have had decisions regarding abortions and pro choice [sic] companies and don't even know it. I hope that you researched your bank and it's [sic] employees as well as your government agencies and their employees. What about your

neighbors and your children's schools and parents. I'm sure you will find that there are more out there than you really know. Congratulations in helping to make life miserable for others.

— Susan Hansen

congrats, Your [sic] an all out \*\*\*\*\* [expletive deleted]

— David Bridburg

30 million people starve to death every year on this planet, the majority of those being women and children. Why don't you dopes turn your attention towards helping them instead of boycotting businesses and harassing people? Good Day Ladies!

— Freddie

I will give my time and my money to Planned Parenthood this year even though I never have in the past. Only because Im [sic] so disgusted by what you have done...

— Katie Flori

Organizations like...[LDI] make me sick to my stomach. You have no idea what it must be like to have a back alley abortion where you might die. This is America and we all have the right to choose what we want to do with our own bodies, that is why we fight to keep America free. Your organization twist [sic] the truth into some horrific act to satisfy your own agendas. You should not be allowed to add someone [a corporation] to a list just because they support pro-choice without their written permission.

— La Jeanna Holmes

LDI received a notable thoughtful comment from a person who would only identify himself as "Dave":

I learned about your organization via an opinion article in the *Washington Post*...Despite the fact that it was an opinion, I was rather disturbed by the way the author characterized you quite unfairly. I've included a copy of the letter I just sent to the author and the *Post*. I don't anticipate any response, but perhaps the gentleman will open his mind a little and opine more fairly in the future.

I wrote to you because I respect people who stand up for what they believe in and do so in a fair manner. I imagine you take a lot of abuse, so I hope this encourages you.

I don't care if you use this, but please don't use my name, address or email. I really don't want to be barged by a bunch of pro-abortion nuts because I dared to express an opinion that differs with theirs.

This is the letter "Dave" sent to *The Washington Post* and the author of the opinion (another BH shareholder):

You conclude your opinion by stating, "Standing on principle also has its place." You note in your piece that Doug Scott has refused contributions to his own organization given terms that the company may continue to also contribute to Planned Parenthood. You take it one step further by furnishing the quote "a group so *extreme* (emphasis mine) they would cut off their own funding to harm us." It would seem to the logical thinking person that Mr. Scott is indeed a per-

son who stands on principle. Yet, unless I read it wrong, your intention is to demonize him. Perhaps some organization will successfully boycott your books in the future. Then you can demonstrate to the world whether you are a person who stands on principle or takes the pragmatic approach. For now, I can only assume that, in your mind, a person can only be said to be standing on principle if you personally agree with the agenda.

I was also fascinated by your comment that, "Allison will not get her annual course in gift-giving." Perhaps a better lesson for Allison would be to understand the power of an economic boycott against corporate America that is organized by a person who has principles and is not afraid to defend them. Were it my daughter, I would tell her that if she really feels strongly about supporting the local animal shelter, she could routinely save some percentage of her allowance or earnings. Then once a year she could turn the cash over to me and I would write her a check for the animal shelter. But, perhaps you are someone who is only in favor of helping others as long as it is done with Other People's Money.

[M]y comments today are not a result of my affiliation with any group or my opinion one way or the other regarding abortion. I just feel that a writer who is capable of having more than one book published ought to be able to write a balanced analysis. Even though you didn't explicitly state your opinion on abortion, it seems fairly obvious that you allowed your personal politics to taint the piece. I realize that this is on the opinion page, but I believe that you could have opined in a much fairer manner and earned the respect of far more readers in doing so. Unfortunately, there is too much information being passed off as news these days when it is really little more than selective facts intertwined with personal politics.

After LDI's president wrote to tell "Dave" that his e-mail was indeed encouraging, the anonymous writer followed with a suggestion:

You might consider publishing the salaries for the officers of PP: Chief Executive Officer: Gloria Feldt, President Compensation: \$433,536 [7/1/00—6/30/01; compensation includes annual salary and, if applicable, benefit plans, expense accounts, and other allowances].

I am suspicious of any tax-exempt corporation where the officers pay themselves exorbitant salaries like this. Some people might think this salary is reasonable, but I think the majority of working Americans would consider it unethical and even obscene. I would also publish the IRS Form 990 or whatever the financial reporting document is. I assume that is public domain information. Of course, you should be prepared to publish similar information for your own organization so no one can call you a hypocrite.

Okay, we like the way this guy thinks. And speaking of tax forms, LDI received its share of threats. Terri Glass wrote:

I want to look at copies of your annual reports and exemption applications. Emailed in PDF format or a link to a web location where these items are available for public perusal will be fine...

P. Gogia, who was quoted in part above, also wrote:

Do not be proud of your position. I will be telling people to boycott all of your activities, and suggest to my Congressmen that your activities be investigated. No matter how pure you think your program is, the kinds of positions you have taken will turn back on you.

Well, maybe the e-mail from Glass is not an implied threat and the timing is just *very* coincidental. Maybe.

Now someone has decided to add harassment to their bag of tricks. LDI's e-mail address has been used to subscribe to a large number of corporate and pornographic mailing lists. We anticipate that bad checks (supposed donations) will be forthcoming because the senders know that our bank will charge us a fee. Pro-abortion activists routinely pull such stunts when LDI's successes make the news.

### THE DEATH FOUNDATION

The *Omaha World Herald* reports that "one of Nebraska's most widely known families is carrying out a low-profile international campaign to protect abortion rights and widen access to birth control and family planning services." The effort is financed by Warren and Susan Buffett through their family foundation.

This is no surprise. Pro-life activists have bemoaned the Buffett Foundation's rabid ties to the Pro-Abortion Movement for many years. Yet the newspaper reports that, "The Buffett Foundation quietly, almost secretly, has become one of the nation's most generous benefactors for organizations at work for abortion rights, population control and women's reproductive health." A secret? Hardly. But the newspaper was absolutely correct when it reported that, "The support is crucial to groups on the front line of the abortion struggle."

The Foundation has provided nearly one-third of the funding (\$4.7 million) for International Projects Assistance Services (IPAS), which provides equipment, facilities and training needed to commit what the newspaper calls "safer abortions" in developing nations. IPAS started its work nearly 30 years ago, partly to develop a portable suction device that is still being used to provide abortions in small community "health centers." IPAS now has offices in eleven countries. And this is just one example of Buffett's fanatical devotion to abortion.

In the previous decade, the Buffett Foundation spent millions of dollars in a successful effort to convince the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to approve mifepristone (formerly called RU-486). More recently, the foundation supported the Center for Reproductive Rights (\$737,000), which convinced a court to overturn Nebraska's ban on partial-birth abortion.

### CHIEF CONTRIBUTORS TO PRO-ABORTION GROUPS

The name of the source is followed by the amount of money (in millions of dollars) given to pro-abortion groups last year, the overall total given to all groups/causes, and the percentage of the overall total giving that went to pro-abortion groups.

<u>Private Family Foundation</u>	<u>Abortion</u>	<u>Total Given</u>	<u>%</u>
Buffett	21.9	29.1	75.2
William & Flora Hewlett	34.3	119.9	28.6
David & Lucile Packard	85.2	428.9	19.9
Bill & Melinda Gates	\$133.0	\$1,150.0	11.6
Turner	7.1	68.1	10.4
John D. & Catherine T. MacArthur	11.4	167.9	6.8
Ford	31.1	829.2	3.8

Other groups receiving Buffett Foundation money last year included: Planned Parenthood (\$2.1 million), the NARAL Foundation (\$1.5 million), Family Health International (\$1.4 million), the Population Council (\$3.5 million), Religious Pathfinder International (\$582,000), "Catholics" for a Free Choice (\$485,000), the Coalition for Reproductive Choice (\$700,000), the National Campaign to Prevent Adolescent Pregnancy (\$250,000), and the Access Project (\$496,000).

Duff Gillespie, former head of population programs for the U.S. Agency for International Development, told the newspaper that foundations such as those run by Buffett and other billionaires like Bill Gates and Ted Turner have altered world "health" programs. The foundations work more quickly than government agencies, Gillespie said, allowing Buffett or Gates or Turner to throw large amounts of money at problems and take more risks. Such independence also allows Buffett to fund pro-abortion groups without wading through the political and moral debate that faces politicians.

The Foundation operates almost totally on the work of Buffett's ex-son-in-law, Allen Greenberg. When an *Omaha World Herald* reporter called Greenberg for an interview, he said, "We just don't comment on anything the foundation does." Now why would that be the case?

Speaking at a 1994 dinner sponsored by Planned Parenthood, Buffett spoke of his ardent support of abortion. The world would be better off, he told the audience, "if you could make every child born in this country and this world a wanted child. Until women have that right to determine their reproductive destiny, we're in an unequal

society.” But the good news is that pro-abortion funding will no longer be done with corporate money.

Julie Schmit-Albin of Nebraska Right to Life told the *Omaha World Herald* that pro-life activists are becoming increasingly worried about what will happen as Buffett’s foundation grows. The Foundation will inherit most of the family wealth, possibly making it the largest philanthropic entity in the nation. To the surprise of no one, Schmit-Albin said the Pro-Life Movement does not “have a Warren Buffett.”

In an interview on public television, another multi-billionaire, Bill Gates, talked about involvement:

When I was growing up, my parents were always involved in various volunteer things. My dad was head of Planned Parenthood. And it was very controversial to be involved with that. And so it’s fascinating. At the dinner table my parents are very good at sharing the things that they were doing. And almost treating us like adults, talking about that.

My mom was on the United Way group that decides how to allocate the money and looks at all the different charities and makes the very hard decisions about where that pool of funds is going to go. So I always knew there was something about really educating people and giving them choices in terms of family size.

Bill Gates, Sr., directs the family foundation.

#### **FELDT: CONGRESS ACTED IMMORALLY**

President George W. Bush has signed a bill that will “recklessly ban abortions and jail doctors for providing what is in some cases life-and-death reproductive health care to women across America,” wrote Gloria Feldt, president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, in the *Columbia Daily Tribune*.

When Feldt testified against the legislation, she said that Congress should not practice medicine but should allow reproductive health decisions to be made by women with their families and physicians, not by government. She continued:

Distrusting women as moral decision makers, members of the U.S. Senate passed a broadly written ban that would outlaw some of the safest and most common abortion procedures. These legislators include Sen. Rick Santorum, R-Pa., who is in no position to be passing moral judgment on anyone. As part of his bigoted statement equating homosexuality with polygamy, he also took a swipe at reproductive privacy, telling an AP reporter: “It all comes from, I would argue, this right to privacy that doesn’t exist in my opinion in the United States Constitution, this right that was created, it was created in *Griswold*...—and abortion. And now we’re just extending it out.”

Santorum and his cronies in Congress are doing nothing to pass legislation to help real women who need to

make life-saving reproductive choices. Instead, these legislators are telling us whose conscience counts and—according to them—it’s not mine, it may not be yours, and it is certainly not those of the majority of Americans who support reproductive freedom.

Feldt also took on former Congressman Bob Barr, R-Georgia, who was instrumental in passing the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. “How can someone who advocates tirelessly to criminalize abortion rationalize paying for his second ex-wife’s abortion? The check he wrote was shown on national television,” she wrote. “I wonder what the Bob Barrs and Rick Santorums of the world really want when they question the moral integrity of women to make their own childbearing decisions. They can’t argue that they want improved lives for women and children.”

Referring to a study conducted by so-called Catholics for a Free Choice, Feldt said that members of Congress who oppose abortion are also more likely to vote against social programs that benefit women, children and families. “It is not an act of conscience to refuse to provide family planning and abortion services. It is an act of discrimination. Often it is an act of medical malpractice. Always it is a refusal to provide legal and medically appropriate options to a patient whose conscience should be considered above all others,” she said.

According to Feldt, what she calls the “draconian abortion ban bill” is unconstitutional because, according to the *Stenberg* decision, it does not have an adequate exception for the health of the woman. “Sens. Patty Murray, D-Wash., and Harry Reid, D-Nev., sponsored amendments that would have provided family planning initiatives to reduce unintended pregnancy and improve access to prenatal and post-partum care for women, only to have them rejected by anti-choice senators. How, I ask you, can senators who abhor abortion reject amendments that would reduce the need for abortion?”

Needless-to-say, Planned Parenthood is turning to its friends at the federal courts to throw out the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act on constitutional grounds. LDI leaders are on record as predicting that the Act will indeed be found unconstitutional because finding otherwise would fly in the face of the Supreme Court’s past decisions.

#### **TERMINATOR OF UNBORN CHILDREN**

Radio personality Rush Limbaugh has made it his personal mission to expose Arnold Schwarzenegger’s liberal politics. “To the extent that he said anything, he sounded not like a fiscal conservative but a moderate Democrat.” Schwarzenegger said he wants businesses to return to California so that the state government could collect enough tax revenues to provide social programs. “This is the sort of obtuse comment middle-of-the-road

Democrats always make, forgetting that businesses are leaving the state because they are tired of paying high taxes for those big government social programs,” Limbaugh said of the actor-turned-gubernatorial candidate.

Limbaugh said the candidate has told the press that he is “very liberal” on social matters, including support for abortion and homosexual adoption. Schwarzenegger “has complained openly about the party’s conservatism.” Limbaugh also pointed out that *Talk* magazine described the candidate as “impatient” with the religious right.

Schwarzenegger has “expressed disgust with the Republicans who impeached Clinton,” Limbaugh said. As Schwarzenegger put it: “That [impeachment] was another thing I will never forgive the Republican Party for. We spent one year wasting time because there was a human failure. I was ashamed to call myself a Republican during that period.” What was the “human failure” Oh yes, lying before a grand jury (also known as “perjury.”)

Limbaugh drew the obvious conclusion: “Does this sound like ‘the Next Reagan,’ as some people are calling Arnold? Hardly. This guy may be the next actor elected governor of California, but that’s where the similarity” between him and Reagan ends.

Former California governor Pete Wilson, who is outspokenly pro-abortion, is Schwarzenegger’s campaign manager. Interestingly, Berkshire Hathaway chief executive officer Warren Buffett has signed on to advise the candidate on economic issues. Elitists of a feather...

### 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: *July*—abortionist **Morris Wortman**; *August*—**Doris K. Christopher**, founder and chairman of The Pampered Chef; *September*—Congressman **Jerrold Nadler**, D-N.Y.; *October*—actor and California gubernatorial candidate **Arnold Schwarzenegger**; and *November*—leftist presidential candidate and former Vermont Governor **Howard Dean**.

### PRO-ABORTION MARCH SCHEDULED

The nation’s leading groups that advocate the killing of unborn children are organizing a march in Washington, D.C., on April 25, 2004. NARAL Pro-Choice America, The Feminist Majority, the National Organization for Women (NOW), and the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) call the event, “Save Women’s Lives: March for Freedom of Choice.” The effort to convince pro-abortion people to attend is already in progress.

“*Roe v. Wade* hangs by a thread,” said NOW President Kim Gandy, “and rumored anti-abortion replacements on the Supreme Court could serve for the next 40 years. In other words, the reversal of *Roe* would last for generations, and the entire reproductive life of my 10-year-old daughter hinges on what we do in the coming year. NOW will be mobilizing women and men across this country to March on Washington for our mothers, for our daughters, and for ourselves. There will never be a more important time to stand up for women’s lives.”

“Everywhere that I go in this country people come up and ask me: ‘When are we going to march again?’ said Eleanor Smeal, president of the Feminist Majority. “The time is now. We must sound the alarm that women’s fundamental rights are in danger. The overwhelming majority of Americans will not go back to the days of back alley abortions.”

“We have a simple message for anti-choice leaders who control the White House and Congress—don’t tread on us, don’t tread on our right to choose and don’t tread on our right to privacy,” NARAL President Kate Michelman said. “Americans will not stand by silently as our rights are trampled. Pro-choice Americans are on the move, ready to take to the streets to protect the health, lives and rights of American women.”

“Planned Parenthood is literally on the front line of a war on women being waged today here in Washington and in state capitals and in courtrooms across our country. We refuse to be the generation that both won and lost the rights to birth control and abortion. We stand for the principle that women—in consultation with their families and their physicians—should make their own reproductive and health decisions. Not politicians and not the government,” said PPFA President Gloria Feldt. Yet one can be sure a glut of politicians will attend to pay homage to pro-abortion leaders. LDI leaders will be in attendance as well, but not to pay homage.

The American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) was one of the first unions to endorse the march. Many more unions and groups are expected to follow suit.

### UPDATE: CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

**Schering-Plough** has a new president and chief executive officer. Fred Hassan previously served as chairman and chief executive officer of Pharmacia Corporation, which has been acquired by Pfizer Incorporated.

**Berkshire Hathaway**, including all of its subsidiaries, is no longer a boycott target.

### YOUR THOUGHTS

Ed Mahoney is upset with Senator Rick Santorum, R-Penn., again:

*Santorum Strikes Again!!!* Senator Rick Santorum (R-Pa.) is once again using his pro-life credentials to reelect pro-abortion senator Arlen Specter [R-Penn.] Senator Specter is challenged in the primary by pro-life congressman Pat Toomey.

The pro-life community has the opportunity to replace pro-abortion Specter with pro-life Pat Toomey; however, Senator Santorum supports pro-abortion Arlen Specter on the basis of political pragmatism and party loyalty.

Senator Santorum apparently regards his political career of more importance than his alleged pro-life convictions. I would appreciate your comments.

Our comments? We think you can pretty much guess. But we will add that party loyalty has nothing to do with this case because both Specter, who is *rabidly* pro-abortion, and Toomey are Republican. Political pragmatism? Definitely. "We do not need pro-abortion politicians to wound the Pro-Life Movement, we do a fine job ourselves," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott. "How many pro-abortion politicians do you see actively supporting pro-life candidates? How can we be so naïve? And we wonder why pro-life legislation cannot be passed even with a Republican majority."

Two LDI supporters wrote to give their respective opinions regarding our decision to add corporate supporters of NARAL Pro-Choice America (NARAL) and the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League (CARAL) to *The Boycott List*. One person supported the change. But the other, Rev. Louis Sirianni, did not like it at all:

I recently received the May 2003 *Boycott List*...together with your cover letter...I was extremely distressed to learn that LDI had changed the nature of CFP [Corporate Funding Project] by adding NARAL and CARAL to the boycott. It was my understanding, based on the literature I have received from you in the past, that the boycott had a single focus that was clear and concise: put and [sic] end to Planned Parenthood's [PP] ability to provide abortions by encouraging companies to end financial support of PP. PP directly provides abortions and it was clear that a corporation that supports any aspect of PP could be construed as financing the abortions themselves.

Now this clarity is gone. Unless I am mistaken, NARAL and CARAL, although they promote and support abortions, are not direct providers of abortions. This is a change from the previous focus of CFP. Furthermore, LDI has taken upon itself the decision to make this change without polling, as far as I am aware, the loyal membership of the boycott. Added to this is the decision that the loyal membership does not know which of the three organizations, PP, CARAL, NARAL, a particular corporation supports. This does not allow us to make mature choices about participation in CFP.

It may be that I am missing some important information about this transition. I would be happy to hear from you in this regard before I make a decision about my future participation in CFP. Please understand, I do not support either NARAL or CARAL, but I do believe we are changing what was a clear and realizable goal for something more vague and less realizable. And if it is [sic] important to include NARAL and CARAL, why not NOW [National Organization for Women] and Catholics for [a Free] Choice and other similar organizations?...

LDI first announced its intention to add NARAL and CARAL supporters to *The Boycott List* nearly a year before doing so. In fact, the planned change was prominently mentioned at the top of the previously published *Boycott List*, in several letters sent over the past eight months or so, and so forth. While a poll of LDI supporters was not conducted, *no* concerns were raised until *after* the change was implemented. So, yes, LDI had "taken upon itself the decision to make this change." Poll-taking is not a normal part of running an organization. We know of *no* group that operates in such a manner. (If we had taken a poll and the vote was 50.1 percent to 49.9 percent, would we have been bound by it?) Decision-making is why LDI has a Board of Directors and other leadership.

LDI leaders decided against delineating which specific pro-abortion group was being funded by the company for key strategic reasons. For example, we do not want a company to cease funding NARAL and then start supporting Planned Parenthood, and so on. Telling a company that it is supporting a pro-abortion group such as Planned Parenthood, NARAL and/or CARAL, it was decided, would be both helpful to us and educational for corporate leaders. It never occurred to us that people would seek the delineation so they can choose to boycott corporations supporting Planned Parenthood and not those funding NARAL or CARAL. Doing so would undermine our efforts.

We do not include corporate supporters of NOW or "Catholics" for a Free Choice because we want to keep the boycott practical. When it is practical it can be effective. It would be unwise to simultaneously track and urge a boycott of corporations that fund every pro-abortion group. It was our judgment that pro-life activists were ready for and could handle two additional groups to be added to our research.

LDI's leadership may choose to return to tracking support of Planned Parenthood only. We may choose to stay on the present course. Or we may choose to add even more pro-abortion groups sometime in the future.

To quote from the newly revised booklet “The Economic Boycott” (“Why Do Some Boycotts Fail?” section):

Another key problem that can greatly hinder the success of a boycott is second-guessing by participants. Boycott leaders must be trusted to decide when the economic action will cease and what demands the offending corporation must meet before this can occur. If every individual decides what constitutes sufficient grounds to end the action, the corporation may ignore boycott leaders. Unity is essential. If boycott leaders are ignored, corporations are effectively disregarding the economic action itself. This is only possible if the corporation is able to undermine boycott leaders and divide the loyalty of those who should naturally support the effort.

It is each individual’s conscience that determines the level of his or her participation in the boycott. And we at LDI do not mind receiving and will continue to print the opinions of those who disagree with our decisions. However, any person who cannot accept and trust the judgment and experience of LDI’s leadership should probably forgo participation in the boycott altogether. Such trust and acceptance are critical to the success of the boycott and without it LDI is wasting time and *your* money.

Andrew Maul says that LDI’s leaders will face eternal judgment for seeking donations for *The Boycott List*:

LDI to my knowledge doesn’t distribute the latest information on these companies in the best way possible, via their website, to the public (stating that the list could change daily, to check back often). Instead, they require people to pay them money for this life-saving information. Unless this has also changed, I also will not support LDI for putting a price on human lives...The [LDI] board prefers to make money over saving lives...There is *no reason* to not [sic] publicize the list on your website, in addition to accepting donations and payments for literature...I will pray for your conversion. We could judge a tree by it’s [sic] fruit, but your organization prefers to put more into manure fertilizer than bearing fruit...but may I add that God’s judgement [sic] for salvation will be *most severe* for those experienced, *especially* the shepherds (ministers & priests), who should know better...[LDI] is a “pay for information” organization (life critical information that is)...

As evidenced by the preceding e-mails, we “cannot please all of the people all of the time.” We have even been challenged on our choice of rhetoric:

[Y]ou ought to use more emotional language. Keep the reasoning around for integrity because the liberals are getting sloppy with all its support from the media and various umbrella organizations and are so out of touch they can’t see grassroots opposition (what hurt conser-

vative hold on society before the 60s because we were stuffy and oppressive then), but still, people don’t seem to care about truth and reason anymore. Flattery/patronizing may help in this egotistical age as well. Call it “ageism” and “discrimination against those who look different”. Compare it to racial purification against the Jews in the 30s/40s by the Nazis; blacks in slavery days being justified by making them not quite human, dehumanization of “enemies” in a war leading to unnecessary brutality. I don’t think most want to believe the so-called tolerant compassionate liberals have taken up Satan’s baton of man’s inhumanity to man and are no better than their far-right conservative rivals who ruled society before the 60s.

— Phil E. Sieve

Of course, LDI always gets its share of mail from people who simply oppose *everything* we stand for. And they feel compelled to let us know:

Planned Parenthood is *not pro-abortion*; they are *pro-choice*. Pro-planning, pro-education, pro-family health-care, pro-contraceptive measures, as *is* the Catholic Church. Look up the word “choice.” And since when is a “commitment to population control” a *bad* thing? Do you even *read* what you write? Aren’t you all glad *your* teenagers have the possibility of getting contraception? Or can you really believe they just aren’t, any of them, having sex and spreading sexually transmitted diseases?

— Susan Morten

In the midst of all of the discouraging messages sent to LDI lately, Ruthanne Shepherd sent this e-mail:

Mr. Scott: Just wanted to let you know we’re rejoicing with you over the Berkshire Hathaway victory. Praise the Lord and may He be glorified!! I am...thankful you are there, doing this job. Thank you *so* much. I know you are a very humble person and you are not looking for recognition. I do believe, however, that you were born for such a time as this to facilitate these battles against the enemy (lower case “e” because he doesn’t deserve a capital) and his pawns, the Planned Parenthood people. Thank you...for stepping up to the plate and obeying when God began giving you this vision.

Challenging Mrs. Shepherd in the tough battle for the “Most Thoughtful Person on the Planet” title is Dave Kothman:

To Doug Scott: Just a short note that I am praying for you...I had to laugh when I read in the latest edition of *The Caleb Report* some of the e-mails you’ve been getting, criticizing you and your mission. Without exception, every criticism was the product of the writer’s ignorance—ignorance about who you are, what you are doing, and why you are doing it.

To God’s People at LDI: Nobody on this planet is doing more to fight the evil wrought by Planned Parenthood than you are. Nobody does it better, with more integrity, with more grace and humor, or with more fo-

cused efficiency. Nobody puts a dollar or a prayer to work as effectively as you do. From those of us who “get it” comes this message: keep up the phenomenal work! And when you’re feeling just a bit beleaguered by the harpies and their whining, keep remembering that God “gets it” too. Thank you for all you do.

And Clair Beaver wrote to express her support:

Thank you for making a difference in the Pro-Life movement...I have been very disappointed by the names of corporations on the *List*. Many we do business with currently. It will be a process to cancel our credit cards and send the letters explaining why, but worth the statement that we hope it will make. Many of these companies’ products we just love, but are willing to do without until we are confident that their practices have changed...

Phil Magnan of San Diego-based Life Source called to ask a question. He also left these words:

I get your newsletter and I’m quite excited to hear about what’s happening with Berkshire Hathaway. I was just amazed that they finally rolled over and it’s a beautiful thing...Great work...I appreciate what you...are doing. And I wish people had more understanding about the nature of the boycott—that it basically attacks the god of the pro-aborts; and that’s money.

We appreciate receiving your comments.

#### QUOTABLE QUOTE

“*Roe v. Wade* enabled women to participate in the social, financial and political life of this country.”

— PPPA President Gloria Feldt, as quoted by Reuters News Service, June 17, 2003.

#### EXTENDING THE “RIGHT TO PRIVACY”

There has been a great deal of discussion about the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Lawrence v. Texas*, in which all sodomy laws were ruled unconstitutional—based on a “right to privacy.” LDI has received a few inquiries as to what we think will come next. Well, homosexual activists are not satisfied. They are emboldened and are more active than ever.

Take a look around. There are now many television programs trumpeting the homosexual lifestyle. *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy* (Bravo), a program where homosexual men do home and personal makeovers for heterosexual men, has moved to NBC. *Boy Meets Boy* (Bravo) is the homosexual version of *Cupid*. *The AMC Project: Gay Hollywood* (AMC) follows five homosexual men who are trying to break into the entertainment business, including how established homosexuals in the industry, such as comic writer Bruce Valanch, are helping them to succeed. *Queer As Folk* (Showtime) is probably the most realistic of such programs in that it includes the

seedy side of homosexual life. The show could not be more graphic and still be on cable television.

Animators are using homosexual characters. *Saturday Night Live* (NBC) has “The Ambiguously Gay Duo.” *South Park* (Comedy) features “Big Gay Al.” And *Queer Duck* (Showtime) often follows *Queer As Folk*.

Several other programs prominently feature homosexual characters or persons. *Will & Grace* (NBC) makes it all out to be a big joke. In *Six Feet Under* (HBO), the lead character is homosexual. Nathan Lane is an openly homosexual congressman in *Charlie Lawrence* (CBS). And homosexuals have been featured on many “reality” programs including *Big Brother* (CBS), *The Real World* (MTV), *Last Comic Standing* (NBC), and *Survivor* (CBS). In fact, this season of *The Amazing Race* (CBS) featured two homosexual men who were routinely identified as “married.” (The pair ended up winning the game and the \$1 million prize but they have since separated.) Daytime dramas often include homosexual characters. *NYPD Blue* (NBC) has a homosexual character. And let us not forget the cancelled programs *Melrose Place* (FOX), *Dawson’s Creek* (WB), and *Ellen* (ABC), among others.

There are many similar programs in the works: *It’s All Relative* (ABC), *A Minute With Stan Hooper* (FOX), *Mr. & Mrs. Nash* (ABC), *Wonderfalls* (FOX), and *The L Word* (Showtime), the latter being equal time for lesbians version of *Queer As Folk*. And one television producer is working on yet another program that will be an *American Idol*-like search for the first openly homosexual country music singer. It will tentatively be called *American Pride*. Many motion pictures, often aimed at a teen-age audience, also have strong homosexual themes/characters.

Once again it appears to be chic to be homosexual. After all, homosexuals dress well, are funny, keep a neat house, and are very helpful to heterosexuals who possess none of these traits. Ellen DeGeneres (now the host of a talk-show), Ian McKellen (the *Lord of the Rings* and *X-Men* movies, among others), Christopher Lowell of *It’s Christopher Lowell!* (Discovery), Rosie O’Donnell, Elton John, and Harvey Fierstein proudly trumpet the homosexual lifestyle. And this list is just the beginning. If this were not enough, liberal heterosexual actors are gladly accepting roles as homo-sexual characters to add their “seal of approval.”

The change in society does not relate to the entertainment industry alone. The American Episcopal Church is allowing an actively homosexual man to serve as a bishop. Several other denominations have faced similar situations and very rarely is a black-and-white, right versus wrong, line drawn. Surveys show that Evangelicals are far more upset by this issue than are Catholics—

even among conservatives. And the media and entertainment industries portray pastors as homosexual child molesters/rapists and/or fornicators.

Segregation still exists and is being applauded by liberals. The Harvey Milk School, named for a murdered homosexual San Francisco city councilman, has opened in New York City. It exclusively serves homosexual, transgendered, bisexual and teenagers who are unsure about their sexual orientation.

Jean Chrétien, Canada's prime minister, has embraced homosexual marriage. (He embraced abortion long ago. The only thing Chrétien has not embraced is his supposed Catholicism.) Vermont officially recognizes homosexual unions. Schools (aided and abetted by Planned Parenthood) teach that homosexual sex is simply a matter of preference that can be likened to preferring raspberry flavor over vanilla.

What is the "moral" of the story? The homosexual lifestyle is just another choice. Anyone who calls it a "sin" is a bigot—ah, a "homophobe" (the word applied to those who oppose *anything* homosexuals want). And besides, those who say the *Bible* is anti-homosexual behavior are misinterpreting it for their own selfish, hate-justifying reasons.

"Barring a constitutional amendment, it is my prediction that some judge somewhere will dictate that homosexual marriage—with all of the rights relating thereto—is guaranteed by the Constitution," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott. "Refusing to hire a homosexual (even for religious groups) will be unlawful. If President Bush thinks a federal law will solve this problem, he is dreadfully wrong. After all, which branch of government interprets and even throws out laws passed by Congress? Only a constitutional amendment will do the job."

But do homosexual groups really want to get marriage rights? Definitely. Many corporations, including the "family-friendly" Wal-Mart, give benefits to homosexual partners of their employees. Other corporations, such as Enterprise Rent-A-Car and American Airlines, sponsor homosexual-based events and groups. And consider the words of Dale Carpenter, J.D., in *MetroWeekly*:

Gay couples are just as capable of love, commitment, mutual caretaking, and raising children [as heterosexuals]...

Marriage is important for the social affirmation it offers, not just for the legal benefits. Not even a landmark Supreme Court decision can offer that deep affirmation. No "civil union" or "domestic partnership" can offer it either.

Homosexual law professor Nancy Polikoff writes that, "A legal system that gives benefits to married couples but withholds those benefits from other types of rela-

tionships that help people flourish and fulfill critical social functions harms many people, both straight and gay." But rather than giving benefits/rights to others, Polikoff argues for "abolishing the legal status of marriage for everyone." She sounds like Margaret Sanger.

Remember, this is an issue that revolves around who people have sex with. It is not about race, religion or creed. Nevertheless, the Christian response to any social issue should be the same. Physically attacking any person—including homosexuals—could not be more wrong. "I believe that what Fred Phelps does is atrocious," Scott said. "I believe that what was done to Matthew Shepherd was an ungodly tragedy. Violence and hate make a mockery out of our claim that we 'hate the sin' but 'love the sinner.' And those who do not love the sinner make a mockery of Jesus Christ. Our response to this issue must be one bathed in love, prayer and compassion, just as much as it is immersed in the truth. If we cannot do so, let's stop telling people we 'hate the sin but love the sinner,' because it's not the truth."

*The Caleb Report*, an official periodical of Life Decisions International (LDI), is published six times per year. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every LDI Partner or members of its Board of Directors/Advisors or staff. Visit us at: [fightpp.org](http://fightpp.org). 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. Write: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161.

©2003 Life Decisions International