



# *The Caleb Report*

March-April 2003

Life Decisions International

vol. xi • no. 2

*IN THIS ISSUE:* Pro-Life Senator In Trouble--Again / Doctrine Actually Matters / The Prayer Project / Update: Corporate Funding Project / Corporate Embrace / In The (E-)Mail / Not Too Smart / Advice: Go See A "Shrink" / Student Calls For Defunding / UK Government Cautions Doctors / Cincinnati Resident Urges Action / Abortionist Speaks Out / Fund-Raising Stunt De Jour / In The Loop / Doctor Warns Parents, Teens / Tastes Like Chicken

## PRO-LIFE SENATOR IN TROUBLE—AGAIN

In his race to become a United States Senator from New Jersey last year, Doug Forrester made it clear that he is not pro-life. This fact was well known among Republicans throughout the Garden State. Yet one of the first to endorse Forrester was Senator Rick Santorum, R-Penn., who said the candidate had agreed to support the proposed ban on partial-birth abortion, unless the life of the mother is in danger.

Santorum's action angered several pro-life leaders. "It was enough, in the desperate attempt to restore the Senate to Republican control, for the pro-life Senator to embrace the pro-choice New Jersey Republican nominee and try to sell him as 'pro-life' to pro-life voters," wrote Colleen Parro, executive director of the Republican National Coalition for Life.

Retired United States Senator Frank Lautenberg, a pro-abortion liberal, replaced incumbent Bob Torricelli as the Democratic Party's nominee when the incumbent faced charges of ethical misconduct. Forrester's poll numbers quickly began to drop, prompting the National Right to Life Committee Inc. (NRLC) to publish a comparison piece asking pro-life voters to "Vote Against Frank Lautenberg—Vote for Doug Forrester." NRLC said Forrester "supports banning partial-birth abortion unless the life of the mother is in danger." It also said the candidate "opposes using your tax dollars to pay for abortion" and "favors requiring parental notice before an abortion is performed on a minor."

There was an expectation that, if elected, Forrester would support President George W. Bush's nominees to the federal judiciary. But Parro said such a belief was "derived from nothing beyond his [Forrester's] simply being a Republican without a record."

When polls began to indicate a loss of support for Forrester among women, the pro-abortion Republicans who run New Jersey party politics took matters into their own hands. The Associated Press reported that, "Forrester says Frank Lautenberg has distorted his position on abortion, trying to paint him as a conservative who opposes a woman's right to choose." The news agency quoted Forrester as saying: "I believe a woman's right to choose is something that needs to be respected and that's why I say I'm pro-choice."

Nearly two weeks before the election, the Republican Pro-Choice Coalition issued a press release announcing its endorsement of Forrester. "We are very pleased to provide our Coalition and PAC [political action committee] endorsement for Doug Forrester in this tightly contested Senate race," said the Coalition's Jennifer Stockman. "After personally meeting with the candidate and gaining full clarification of his positions on reproductive health issues, it is clear that Forrester is strongly pro-choice and will be a true asset in the Senate to all of us."

The release continued: “Forrester has assured us in writing that he opposes reversing *Roe v. Wade* and would vote against any Supreme Court nominee who indicated a desire to do so. That is the commitment we all needed to pledge our wholehearted support...”

The Coalition said there had been some “confusion” throughout the campaign regarding Forrester’s stand on Medicaid funding for abortion: “He has reiterated...his support of Medicaid funding for medically necessary abortions.” The Coalition’s statement said that if elected Forrester would work to expand the current Hyde Amendment to include the health [exception] provision.”

“In addition to Forrester’s support of *Roe v. Wade*,” the press release concluded, he “made it clear that he hopes to help set a new tone in the GOP. He recently stated that he will work with the New Jersey Republican Congressional delegation to include pro-choice language in the [Republican] Platform...”

“For pro-life Republicans, those are fighting words!” said Parro. She noted that the press statement made it clear that both Santorum and NRLC were dead wrong and that pro-life politicians and groups need to stop sabotaging the Pro-Life Movement. Parro said that the supposed reasons for justifying support of Forrester were ludicrous at worst and naïve at best. After all, both NRLC and the Republican Pro-Choice Coalition had endorsed the same candidate.

“From the perspective of those who have worked tirelessly...to elect people to public office who respect the sanctity of every innocent human life, there isn’t a dime’s worth of difference between Frank Lautenberg and Doug Forrester,” Parro said. “Placing party over principle and lowering the pro-life standard for reasons of political expediency has never moved the pro-life ball down the public policy court. The Forrester debacle is a clear illustration of that fact.”

“This is not a case of people who claim to be pro-life leaders shooting themselves and the Pro-Life Movement in the foot,” said Douglas R. Scott, president of Life Decisions International. “This is

more a case of people who claim to be pro-life leaders shooting themselves and the Pro-Life Movement directly in the head and the heart.”

Both Santorum and NRLC have come under fire before due to their support of decidedly pro-abortion candidates. Santorum had also been criticized for supporting the Clinton Administration’s pro-abortion judicial nominees. When Santorum was first elected to Congress he was asked what he hoped to accomplish during his first term. His answer: “Get re-elected.”

**ACTION:** We bring this issue to your attention at this time because avoiding another debacle is *very* important. Let Senator Rick Santorum (120 Russell Senate Office Bldg., Washington, DC 20510; phone 202-224-6324) and NRLC (512 – 10<sup>th</sup> St. NW, Washington, DC 20004; phone: 202-626-8800) know what you think.

**MORE INFORMATION:** Visit [rnclife.org](http://www.rnclife.org). In addition, read the August 1999 issue of *Special Reports*, located online at: [http://www.fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=special\\_reports](http://www.fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=special_reports).

## DOCTRINE ACTUALLY MATTERS

William K. Weigand, bishop of the Diocese of Sacramento (California), has urged politicians who call themselves Catholic to “abstain from receiving Communion” until they have “a change of heart.” The Catholic News Service reports that Weigand’s statement has, in the Bishop’s words, had “more reverberations” than he was “intending or foreseeing.”

Local and national media have reported on the Bishop’s speech and criticism of Governor Gray Davis, D-Calif., in a homily during a pro-life Mass on the thirtieth anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. In the weeks following the homily, the bishop said he received hundreds of letters and e-mails praising him for urging the governor, who insists that he is a good Catholic, to renounce his rabid—and we mean *rabid*—support of abortion.

Weigand told *The Catholic Herald* that the position Davis advocates is not only contrary to that of the Church, it has also been “very public” and “even boastful.” Weigand said his main intent was to instruct local Catholics with clarity on a serious moral teaching of their faith. “The Governor is clearly mocking his own church and relying on anti-Catholic bigotry of others to further his political

career,” said LDI President Douglas R. Scott. “This action shows a lack of faith. Davis apparently does not believe he will ever be held accountable by a higher authority. The Governor may further his political career, but he may also be in the process of destroying his very long term ‘career.’”

Bishop Weigand still hopes to have a personal meeting with Davis to discuss church teaching on abortion and other life issues, but repeated attempts to do so over the past four years have been rebuffed. “Early on, I wrote to the Governor privately in my capacity as pastor...and offered to meet with him at his home or my home, off the record, to discuss pastoral issues and explain the teachings of the church. These requests were not even acknowledged,” the Bishop said.

“I’ve always assumed the Governor is sincere and in good faith,” the Bishop said. “In the past he’s had clear political purposes in identifying himself as a Catholic and as pro-choice. But abstracting from that, I’ve just assumed that he’s not very well instructed in the faith.”

Weigand hopes the homily will start dialogue among other pro-abortion Catholics. “The concern I have is for our own people, especially those who are not well-instructed, who could so easily be led astray by the Governor’s stance in favor of abortion and the impression that lots of Catholics hold the same views,” he said. “That leaves the impression that it’s fine to call yourself a Catholic and also hold views that are contradictory to the Catholic faith. Well, I said it’s not fine.”

The Bishop said one reason he spoke out was to address questions raised about the decision by Monsignor Edward Kavanagh, director of St. Patrick Home in Sacramento, to bar Davis from distributing Christmas gifts to children at the home because of the Governor’s stance on abortion. Weigand said he still hopes that Davis will agree to a meeting. “I don’t rule him out at all. I have no personal antipathy. It’s an admirable thing to go into public service. But at the same time the Governor has been very public on the abortion issue and anybody in a public position who goes out of their way to wave their Catholic credentials ought to know there are consequences.”

When the newspaper contacted the Governor’s office, a spokesman read a statement from Davis: “I’ve been a practicing Catholic for a very long time and I was raised to believe in the separation between church and state.” Regarding a possible meeting the spokesman said: “I highly doubt that a meeting will take place after all that’s happened. The Governor is not going to get in a fighting match with the church because he believes it’s unseemly and any comments from him will only prolong this debate.”

Scott praised the Bishop’s actions. In a speech in Houston, Texas, Scott said that he respects the Catholic Church and that if it were not for its leadership the Pro-Life Movement would have been virtually nonexistent in the early days. “They were standing for the unborn child when no one else would; when no one had even given serious thought to what was happening,” Scott said. “Under no circumstances should politicians or other dissidents be allowed to lead God’s children into Satan’s realm.” Scott’s comments received very enthusiastic applause.

## 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: **March**—*Jill June*, chief executive officer of Planned Parenthood of Greater Iowa; **April**—*Nancy Pelosi*, leader of the Democrats in the U.S. House of Representatives; **May**—actor *Ed Harris*; **June**—Governor *Gray Davis*, D-Calif.; and **July**—abortionist *Morris Wortman*.

## UPDATE: CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

**Ukrop’s Super Markets Inc.:** As is LDI’s usual practice, before a company is added to *The Boycott List* corporate officials are contacted, information about Planned Parenthood is provided, and they are asked to agree to make the abortion-committing group ineligible for future support. Ukrop’s Super Markets received three such letters, all of which went unanswered.

After Ukrop's was added to *The Boycott List*, as reported in the January-February 2003 edition of *The Caleb Report*, LDI received a call from a person who expressed her shock and asked if there had been some kind of error. After all, she explained, Ukrop's is a "Christian company." It is closed on Sundays. It does not sell alcohol. It does not sell tabloids. All of this is true, but Ukrop's Super Markets has also funded Planned Parenthood. And rather than pledging to not do so in the future, Robert S. Ukrop, the company's president and chief executive officer, actually defends Planned Parenthood. Ukrop contacted Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI, to discuss the boycott.

Ukrop said that he is opposed to "some of the extremism" in the Pro-Life Movement. He suggested that LDI's boycott was an example of such "extremism." Ukrop made it clear that he does not care for "threats" (the boycott) and "getting dumped on" (publicly challenged). Ukrop said that, "Jesus would not approve" of the boycott and that he does not think "the organization [Planned Parenthood] is all bad."

Ukrop said that it would be "inappropriate to investigate organizations before offering a...gift certificate to be used in a raffle or as a door prize." He said he cannot be expected to watch over his managers to be sure that Planned Parenthood is not funded in the future and that managers have great leeway in this area. But asked if his managers would fund the Ku Klux Klan if asked to do so, Ukrop said he thinks managers would turn down the request. Scott said that knowing the nature of the groups Ukrop's funds is "more than appropriate." Scott said it is the "duty" of corporate officials. He also told Ukrop that, "Failure to do so places your company in a precarious situation."

When it became clear that Scott was not going to excuse Ukrop's for giving to Planned Parenthood just because the company is closed on Sundays, Ukrop asked Scott to fax to him a copy of the letters he had sent to the company that went unanswered. Scott did so, along with LDI's analysis of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's *Annual Report*.

During a second phone call Ukrop said that one of his customers, who has apparently supported LDI as

well, berated LDI for challenging the company. "Christians shouldn't put down other Christians," she reportedly told Ukrop. He said that LDI is "on the extreme one side" of the Pro-Life Movement. Ukrop went on to say that "Planned Parenthood does some good" and that while he may not agree with everything the group does, he does "agree with their right" to do it. When Scott asked Ukrop what "good" Planned Parenthood does, the corporate leader said that it "counsels people on family planning."

"I was surprised to hear Mr. Ukrop repeat the defense of Planned Parenthood," Scott said, "particularly since I had faxed him our analysis of PPFA's *Annual Report*. One cannot read that analysis, which quotes heavily from Planned Parenthood's own—often-graphic—material, and think the group is worthy of support by anyone, particularly Christians."

"Your position is more extreme than I think Jesus' would be," Ukrop said. He went on to say that Scott is "judging" Planned Parenthood and those who donate to it and "trying to push people around" by advocating a boycott. Ukrop also said that "reasonable people can disagree" over Planned Parenthood.

"After it became clear that Mr. Ukrop was only interested in saying I am a bad Christian, I decided to close down the conversation," Scott said. "I told him that the discussion was really fruitless and that if he changed his mind or had something new to offer to let us know. I told him to have a good day. Mr. Ukrop interrupted me and said I should not hang up. 'You're not getting off that easy!' he told me."

"Holiness is not graded on a curve," Scott wrote to Ukrop regarding the good the company does and the suggestion that LDI ignore the bad. "The claim that issues are gray rather than 'black and white' is folly. No one ever heard Jesus say things are 'sort of right' or 'kind of wrong—in a way.' While Ukrop's should be applauded for the good it does, such actions do not excuse the bad it does."

**Berkshire Hathaway:** Cindy Coughlon is the dynamic former Pampered Chef associate who is

spearheading LDI's effort to convince Berkshire Hathaway to stop funding Planned Parenthood. Coughlin reports that she is continually receiving "testimonies" from her colleagues. Consider this message—sent by a man to his wife, a Pampered Chef consultant, who was in the process of deciding what she should do:

You have to consider a few things. You could be a great consultant. If you do well, the corporation does well. You don't want to lend your...God-given talents to those ends, regardless of the here and now...Our family will get by. Sure, that money could help us out financially, but will it help you out morally? I could get us out of debt by stealing or selling drugs, but that would be a loss for me personally. We will not die without that money. We might have to move to a smaller house...,but we will be alive and living our lives the best way we can. God doesn't care what our credit rating is...You can still make yourself known and push for changes...but you cannot continue to fund them and wish you weren't.

Now that is impressive! Here is one from an Advance Director who closed her Pampered Chef business:

I have contacted all of my consultants and hostesses...to let them know that I will not be their Pampered Chef Lady anymore...Even though all are not believers and confused on the issue of abortion and Planned Parenthood, each was very supportive of my conviction not to be affiliated with the company and, especially, Warren Buffett. With every show I canceled...I offered to...have another consultant assigned to them. Not *one* has taken me up on it...I've spoken with almost all of my consultants...and even though they may not hold the same conviction, they know that I couldn't stay and protect my witness for Christ! Walking away from a business that I've [poured] 4 years of my heart and life into was sad, but [I know] that when I get to heaven and God looks at me, I won't be ashamed of what I've done...I honestly believe that God will supply all of your needs, including (in my case) a car payment [and]...Christian school tuition.

What an incredible blessing! What an amazing witness!

"For the record, I wholeheartedly endorse the boycott of abortion supporting businesses,"

Coughlon recently wrote to those she is leading in the effort. "Throughout this effort [the people at LDI] have been incredibly helpful and supportive in spreading the word about the petition, tangibly demonstrating their commitment to fight the corporate support of abortion..." Coughlon is very kind, but the fact is that she has been doing about 99.9 percent of the work with regard to The Pampered Chef, all as a volunteer. She has been doing such an outstanding job that LDI can hardly keep up!

"More importantly," Coughlon continued, "in reading through the materials that accompany the [Boycott] List, along with LDI's *Caleb Report*, I am satisfied that this is an organization run with the highest level of integrity. For instance, not only does LDI exhaustively research their targeted corporations before placing them on the list, but they also vigorously defend those companies which have been unfairly targeted through misinformation and misrepresentation..."

Pampered Chef management is so nervous about the boycott that a senior vice president sent a message to all Advanced Directors and Senior Directors:

We are aware that some Consultants have asked questions about the donation policies of our parent company, Berkshire Hathaway. We know that you, as the leaders of our field, may need to respond to these questions. Below are some approaches that you might find helpful.

The most important keys are to listen carefully, respond calmly, and help them to sort through their issues.

1. Acknowledge their concerns.

"I understand that this is a highly personal issue. Ultimately, each person needs to make an individual decision about what they will do."

2. Share information to increase understanding.  
"Would you like to hear some information that may help you to move forward?"

"First, let's look just at the Berkshire Hathaway company. Last year, it supported over 3500 charities. Among those 3500 charities were contributions to 437 different churches and

synagogues and 790 schools. These charities are selected individually by Berkshire Hathaway shareholders themselves. Each shareholder is asked to submit the names of up to three charities. When they do this, Berkshire makes a donation to those specific charities. This is unusual, because most corporations—including The Pampered Chef—have a management team who decides what charitable organizations to support. Berkshire Hathaway allows individual shareholders to decide where their money is donated.”

“Mr. Buffett has a separate private foundation (the Buffett Foundation) which contributes to various organizations. It is this foundation which has received the most publicity. The Pampered Chef is a Berkshire Hathaway company, but is not part of the Buffett Foundation.”

“As much as we would like to separate ourselves from issues we do not support, it is a hard thing to accomplish as our world is so interconnected. Here is one example that may be helpful for us to see how hard it is to separate ourselves completely. Many people feel that gambling is a destructive behavior. And most agree that tobacco is generally harmful and kills people. You and I might decide we don’t want to support anyone who profits from those two things. Unfortunately, that would mean we’d never be able to buy gasoline again—because virtually every gas station sells lottery tickets and cigarettes.”

“The reality is that in any work setting, your efforts contribute to the success and earnings of others whether they be a coworker or a boss, and yet you don’t have control over the donations they make with those earnings.”

“In the same way, we have approximately 4500 Directors at The Pampered Chef. Each of these Directors earn override income from the sales of the Kitchen Consultants whom they have brought into the business, yet all Directors can use those earnings to support individual causes and charities that are of personal importance to them.”

“It would be very difficult to find a job where everyone was fully supportive of the same organizations and causes, or to even be aware of them. For example, if you have a spouse who’s employed, or if you work at another

job—you may not have full knowledge of all the contributions made by your superiors, by the company, or by the larger corporation it may be part of.”

### 3. Help them consider their options.

“Here are a couple of things to consider:”

“Does your business allow you to contribute to the issues that are important to you? Could you continue to use your business to support those key causes?”

“Do you like being part of The Pampered Chef’s own charitable efforts? The Pampered Chef will continue to support America’s Second Harvest, The American Cancer Society and The Family Resiliency Program at the University of Illinois. The Pampered Chef will continue on its path of serving families in the wonderful ways it always has. Each company in the Berkshire Hathaway family operates with its own particular culture and mission. As The Pampered Chef, we join together and support only those charities that we have designated above. That will continue to be our strength.”

“It is our hope that each person will focus on the positive aspects of their individual business and of The Pampered Chef as a company, and that they will continue as a Kitchen Consultant.”

“If what you want to do is encourage Mr. Buffett to re-think his contributions, please consider carefully how you communicate. Not only is courtesy and respect the right way to approach people, it’s truly the only avenue that can be effective.”

In closing—as Kitchen Consultants with The Pampered Chef, it is important when communicating that you are professional and respect the privacy and differing opinions of others.

Whenever you have questions or concerns, I encourage you to call your Regional Sales Manager at the Home Office to get the most accurate information, rather than getting involved in e-mail loops.

— Jean Jonas  
Sr. V/P Sales  
The Pampered Chef, Ltd.

This reads like a propaganda piece designed to teach Directors how to appease or steer concerned women away from the real issue. It is very clever and probably necessary from a political and business point of view, but it is nothing more than manipulation and rhetorical game playing.

### CORPORATE EMBRACE

Combining the Corporate Equality Index of the militant Human Rights Campaign with *Fortune's* "Top 100 Companies to Work For," the *Corporate Pride Directory* lists the top corporations for homosexuals to "work for and patronize." PlanetOut has identified the top 21 big companies based on whether they provide domestic partner benefits, have a nondiscrimination policy and a homosexual employee group.

The leading "homosexual-friendly" corporations are (those known to support Planned Parenthood are in bold type): Adobe Systems, Vision Service Plan, Qualcomm, **Microsoft**, Pfizer, Intel, S.C. Johnson & Son, Merck, Agilent Technologies, Goldman Sachs Group, American Express, **International Business Machines (IBM)**, Fannie Mae, Procter & Gamble, Starbucks, **Sun Microsystems**, Deloitte & Touche, Nordstrom, **New York Times**, Texas Instruments, and Washington Mutual.

### IN THE (E-)MAIL

The July-August 2002 edition of *The Caleb Report* included an article about Clergy for Choice, a Santa Barbara, California-based group that was founded with the support of Planned Parenthood. The article included the following text: "Most members of the group are primarily from Congregational, Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Unitarian churches." LDI received a letter from a supporter regarding the article:

We are Presbyterian (PCA) and as far as I know, the liberal, pro-abortion clergy in the Presbyterian Church are in the PCUSA. I respectfully ask that if the denominational name "Presbyterian" is going to be used, insofar as it can be determined, [that LDI] distinguish between PCUSA and PCA.

— Ron Y., St. Louis, Missouri

We are thankful for the letter and happy to do so.

Someone sure has the pro-abortion rhetoric down pat. This fact was made clear to LDI via e-mail:

CAN'T TRUST ME WITH A CHOICE, HOW CAN YOU TRUST ME WITH A CHILD!

Get over it the fact is it is a woman's choice to have an abortion or not.

— Kelly Shields

We have no idea what it is that makes Shields believe we *would* trust her with a child when she just made it clear that there is nothing wrong with killing one?

Some people associated with The Pampered Chef continue to shoot the messenger. Consider this e-mail:

The...email link [to Cathy Coughlon] no longer works. Perhaps it is due to the influx of email you must be receiving from rational-thinking, conservatives, like myself. Contained below is the message intended for this link, regarding your organization's poor boycott decision.

This is so sad. Life Decisions International has chosen The Pampered Chef as its target due to it being a household name. Such clout is sure to draw attention must be the thinking here. Although Berkshire Hathaway recently acquired Pampered Chef, the two are not related except by means of the stock exchange. What Life Decisions International has done is choose to boycott a company with the very highest moral code. Although—among our 70,000 U.S. consultants and 80,000 approximate employees internationally—there are sure to be many varied views on this heated subject, our founder, Doris Christopher—still in place at the head of this company, is a conservative Christian woman. Ms. Christopher has put in place an incredibly strong and deep-running set of values that her employees and consultants spread worldwide through the most basic of dying traditions—meals around the table. If this cause is rallied, I imagine a difficult task at best, what will happen in the end is that Mr. Buffett will still be a very rich man. Because Mr. Buffett (not the 80,000 Pampered Chef employees) has Planned Parenthood as *his* pet organization, *he* (not the 80,000 Pampered Chef employees) will still find a way to give the same amount of

money—through personal or business funds—to Planned Parenthood. However, men and women throughout the world making good livings spreading a great, conservative message will lose their businesses. I say, shame on Life Decisions International for not thinking about this rationally. What this organization has done above all—is alienate thousands or tens of thousands who are likely to share their cause.

— Regina Laberge  
Independent Pampered Chef Director

For the record, The Pampered Chef is not a boycott target “due to it being a household name.” It is a boycott target because its parent corporation, **Berkshire Hathaway**, funds Planned Parenthood. LDI is “thinking about this rationally,” but it seems that some are seeking excuses for their actions. No matter how one may try, attempts to separate The Pampered Chef from its parent company (if you do business with the former, you fund the latter) have even less validity than a local Planned Parenthood trying to distance itself from the Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

### NOT TOO SMART

Once a month, Planned Parenthood of the Hudson Peconic (PPHP) sends a “medical and informational” van, called “Smartwheels,” to provide HIV and pregnancy testing at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. “The reaction to Smartwheels is always amazing!” wrote Lauren Madonia of Student for Choice (SC) at the campus. “Every time the big purple Winnebago drives onto campus, students crowd around to check it out.” PPHP sends material and staff to perform HIV tests throughout the day and SC sets up a table outside to distribute propaganda about “current sexual health issues.”

Speaking of a recent visit to the campus by Smartwheels, Madonia said “students were already waiting to come aboard and get tested” even before the van arrived. “As we began to set up our Students for Choice table, students wandered over to pick up information and free goodies—we always have condoms, dental dams, and lubricants for students. We also give out information about our group’s mission and upcoming events, and about the

services that Planned Parenthood offers. We’re currently also handing out buttons, stickers, and information to raise awareness about emergency contraception and a woman’s right to choose.”

“In addition to educating students about staying healthy and preventing unintended pregnancy, the Smartwheels visits give us a chance to teach students about the threats to reproductive rights,” the student said. “Many college students are not aware of reproductive rights issues...and it’s important that they understand how these issue affect them.” Students who are tested inside the van are encouraged to become active in the Planned Parenthood Action Network which “keeps them informed about the issues and gives them a chance to make their voices heard in Congress!” Madonia claims that many students read their pamphlets, sign petitions and join SC.

“Smartwheels provides a fun environment for peer-to-peer education about sexual health and it’s a convenient way for students to get tested for HIV,” Madonia said. “It’s also a great way to promote our Students for Choice group...”

### ADVICE: GO SEE A “SHRINK”

Those who assisted LDI in trying to convince Care Net to stop doing business with American Express (when it was a boycott target) will be interested to know that its vice president, Kurt Entsminger, recently contacted LDI President Douglas R. Scott with some advice. Scott was told that he needs psychological “help” for exposing Care Net’s decision to do business with the then-boycotted corporation. “Please seek the help you need,” Entsminger wrote. “You will be in our prayers.”

The Entsminger e-mail came on the heels of one from Care Net’s president who said he was “gratified” that American Express is no longer supporting Planned Parenthood. “I believe some of Care Net’s donors will be relieved to know of it,” wrote Mike Reid, who apparently wanted to tell Care Net supporters that his failure to end the group’s association with American Express is no longer an issue.

“It is unfortunate that Mr. Reid will not be able to tell his supporters that Care Net played a role in

bringing about the American Express victory,” Scott said. “The issue is Care Net’s refusal to do the right thing. The issue has not been eliminated just because American Express has been removed from *The Boycott List*. This is particularly true since Care Net leaders still believe that having a business relationship with a Planned Parenthood-funding corporation is an honorable and moral thing to do.” As for Entsminger’s suggestion, Scott said, “There are probably quite a few reasons why I should see a psychiatrist and I’m sure there are people who can think of several more, but having reported Care Net’s actions is not one of them.” Scott said the comment was an unnecessary “cheap shot.”

### STUDENT CALLS FOR DEFUNDING

Hans Zeiger is a senior at Puyallup High School in Puyallup, Washington. Writing for *NEXT*, the student made his view clear—Planned Parenthood should not be getting public funds.

“I recently made an appearance on opening day at a new Planned Parenthood clinic in Puyallup...I went as a picketer, along with a dozen other Puyallup residents,” Zeiger wrote. “We picketed not merely because we are pro-life; we stood outside of the clinic in the cold and rain with our signs because we are opposed to government funding of Planned Parenthood.” And Zeiger was eager to prove his case:

If family planning itself is a core government function, taxpayers and lawmakers should at least reconsider the privileged position of Planned Parenthood. From its political agenda to its propaganda campaign to its plush corporate headquarters, Planned Parenthood has made liberal use of its lavish profits offset by government funding.

Planned Parenthood is the largest piece of the massive government family-planning bureaucracy in America. Government funding for Planned Parenthood first began in 1967 as a part of Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society. Today, according to Planned Parenthood financial reports and IRS returns, taxpayer money accounts for about 30 percent of Planned Parenthood’s revenue.

Zeiger noted that over the past 14 years alone Planned Parenthood has received more than \$2.2

billion. “During this time, the ‘nonprofit’ Planned Parenthood has recorded consistently impressive annual profits,” Zeiger wrote. “Last year alone, more than \$670 million in taxpayer money was spent on family planning, of which, more than \$200 million was channeled from your wallet to Planned Parenthood operations around the country. This does not include massive amounts of foreign aid for international family planning.”

Zeiger is especially upset with his own state—the only one in the union to legalize abortion by a vote of the people before *Roe v. Wade*. “Our state treats family planning like a core government function. The vision statement of the Washington State Family Planning and Reproductive Health Office at DSHS [Department of Social and Health Services] is to recognize the ‘essential, cost-effective role of family planning’ in public health.” Zeiger points out that DSHS has earmarked \$50 million for family planning in its 2003-2005 budget.

Washington’s DSHS is criticized for its “family planning” program, which it says “is aimed at the unintended pregnancies that dramatically add to welfare rolls and medical assistance costs.” This does not sit well with Zeiger. “In other words, financing the possible elimination of pre-born children is good policy because it saves money in the long run.”

“Women are eligible for free family planning simply by being unemployed,” Zeiger wrote. “This not only provides a handout to poor women, it encourages the statistical increase in pregnancies, and abortions, among young and single women.” He further notes that, “Current state policies do not preclude the enrollment of the unemployed teenage daughter of a Microsoft millionaire into free family planning.”

What should the state legislature tell Planned Parenthood leaders when they beg for more and more money? “Funding for Planned Parenthood has been a poor use of family-planning dollars,” Zeiger suggests. “In a state budget crisis, tough questions must be asked. Is Planned Parenthood wise and balanced in its referrals and recommendations to patients? Why does so much public money go to Planned Parenthood while it is making a significant

annual profit? Why don't alternative groups such as Crisis Pregnancy Centers receive equal funding from the common purse?"

Zeiger offers a theory as to why Planned Parenthood gets so much government money:

The answer to any question about Planned Parenthood's overwhelming business success is that it enforces its own taxpayer-funded dominance by maintaining a major budget for political activities. It lobbies for pro-abortion legislation and budget favoritism and spends money to defeat pro-life candidates for public office.

In the world of family planning, competition to Planned Parenthood is unheard of. When it comes to choice in contracted public family-planning services, there is essentially one option.

"Taxpayers have no business in contracting with or lining the pockets of a self-sustaining organization," Zeiger wrote. He concludes by urging the state legislature to make the necessary changes to stop the flow of taxpayer funding into Planned Parenthood coffers. Good work, Hans!

#### U.K. GOVERNMENT CAUTIONS DOCTORS

Research has forced the pro-abortion government of Tony Blair to alert young women to the danger of potentially deadly ectopic pregnancy from the morning-after pill. Sir Liam Donaldson, the government's chief medical officer, has told doctors to be vigilant because the pill is related to a high rate of ectopic pregnancy. He also ordered boycott target **Schering AG** to change the wording of patient information leaflets to make it clearer that there is a risk of ectopic pregnancy.

"This drug should immediately be removed from the market so that the available data can be fully assessed," said John Smeaton, national director of the Society for the Protection of Unborn Children (SPUC). "It is being given out by the thousands of doses every day to unsuspecting women. It is immoral to continue to present it as an 'emergency contraceptive' when it is known to interfere *after* fertilization."

Smeaton said that SPUC's insistence that the safeguards of Great Britain's Abortion Act be applied to

the drug were met with "outright opposition" by the Blair Government. Schering AG also opposed SPUC's position. "Despite the fact that there have been no proper trials on the safety of this drug among under-16s it is now the policy of the Government or school nurses to give this drug to school-girls from age 11 without informing or seeking permission from their parents," Smeaton said.

"It is particularly reckless for the Government also to have made the drug available without prescription as they did in 2001. This means that women may take it repeatedly in a short time span, possibly increasing the risks, including the potentially fatal risk of ectopic pregnancy," Smeaton said.

#### CINCINNATI RESIDENT URGES ACTION

A pro-abortion resident of Cincinnati, Ohio, was infuriated to learn that President George W. Bush had that he would select Dr. W. David Hager to head up the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Reproductive Health Drugs Advisory Committee. She sent out a message urging her pro-abortion allies to take action:

The FDA's Reproductive Health Drugs Advisory Committee makes crucial decisions on matters relating to drugs used in the practice of obstetrics, gynecology, and related specialties, including hormone therapy, contraception, treatment for infertility, and medical alternatives to surgical procedures for sterilization and pregnancy termination. Dr. Hager's views of reproductive health care are far outside the mainstream of setback for reproductive technology. Dr. Hager is a practicing OB/GYN who describes himself as "pro-life" and refuses to prescribe contraceptives to unmarried women. Hager is the author of *As Jesus Cared for Women: Restoring Women Then and Now*.

The book blends biblical accounts of Christ healing women with case studies from Hager's practice. In the book Dr. Hager wrote with his wife, entitled "Stress and the Woman's Body," he suggests that women who suffer from premenstrual syndrome should seek help from reading the bible and praying. As an editor and contributing author of *The Reproduction Revolution: A Christian Appraisal of Sexuality, Reproductive Technologies*

and the Family, Dr. Hager appears to have endorsed the medically inaccurate assertion that the common birth control pill is an abortifacient.

Hager's mission is religiously motivated. He has an ardent interest in revoking approval for mifepristone (formerly known as RU-486) as a safe and early form of medical abortion.

Hager recently assisted the Christian Medical Association in a "citizen's petition" which calls upon the FDA to revoke its approval of mifepristone in the name of women's health. Hager's desire to overturn mifepristone's approval on religious grounds rather than scientific merit would halt the development of mifepristone as a treatment for numerous medical conditions disproportionately affecting women, including breast cancer, uterine cancer, uterine fibroid tumors, psychotic depression, bipolar depression and Cushing's syndrome. Women rely on the FDA to ensure their access to safe and effective drugs for reproductive health care including products that prevent pregnancy.

For some women, such as those with certain types of diabetes and those undergoing treatment for cancer pregnancy can be a life-threatening condition. We are concerned that Dr. Hager's strong religious beliefs may color his assessment of technologies that are necessary to protect women's lives or to preserve and promote women's health.

Hager's track record of using religious beliefs to guide his medical decision-making makes him a dangerous and inappropriate candidate to serve as chair of this committee. Critical drug public policy and research must not be held hostage by antiabortion politics. Members of this important panel should be appointed on the basis of science and medicine, rather than politics and religion. American women deserve no less.

#### WHAT CAN YOU DO?

1. SEND THIS TO EVERY PERSON WHO IS CONCERNED ABOUT WOMEN'S RIGHTS.
2. OPPOSE THE PLACEMENT OF THIS MAN BY CONTACTING THE WHITE HOUSE AND TELL THEM HE IS TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE ON ANY LEVEL.

Pro-abortion activists were urged to contact President Bush and say, "I oppose the appointment

of Dr. Hager to the FDA Reproductive Health Drugs Advisory Committee. Mixing religion and medicine is unacceptable. Using the FDA to promote a political agenda is inappropriate and seriously threatens women's health."

#### ABORTIONIST SPEAKS OUT

Despite his belief in the "right" to abortion, Rochester, New York, abortionist Morris Wortman has qualms about his work, reports *The Buffalo News*, which is owned by boycott target **Berkshire Hathaway**. "I estimate that I've done about 30,000 abortions in my career, and it would be too simplistic for me to say, 'No, it never bothers me.'"

Wortman said he has been disturbed in recent years by the casual attitudes in a growing number of his customers, most of whom are emotionally distressed over their decision to have an abortion. But each year he sees an increasing number of women who have had multiple abortions. Each year, he sees more and more women who "seem to be using abortion as their only means of birth control," the newspaper reports. Wortman estimates that about 50 percent of his customers have had more than one abortion. Some have had two or three in a single year. One of his recent customers had eleven abortions with several different abortionists.

"The right to choice is becoming an abused right. The number of woman having repeat abortions is staggering," said Wortman, who commits first and second-trimester abortions. "It bothers me when I see a patient who has no remorse at all about having an abortion. I can't imagine someone going through an abortion without re-examining themselves, without looking at the ethical issues involved."

Wortman said there is a "direct relationship" between the gestational age of the unborn baby and how much it "bothers" him. "It bothers me a lot more doing an abortion of a fetus of 19 weeks than a fetus that at five or six weeks." Wortman continued: "Doctors have many responsibilities. I have made a decision that, up to a certain gestational age, that the mother's wishes supersede those of the fetus or embryo."

Wortman told of another recent customer who was merely eleven years old. He said she had been

sexually active for many months before she became pregnant.

“I would not call him an evil man, but I think what he does is evil,” Carol N. Crossed, a pro-life activist who heads Brighton Residents Against Violence, told *The Buffalo News*. “I think he knows what he’s doing is wrong, but he does it anyway. How could he take an oath as a doctor and then make his living by destroying human lives? There are other doctors who have stopped doing abortions because their consciences were bothering them. Why doesn’t he?”

“I know that what I do is difficult and that it must be done,” Wortman said of his deadly practice. “I wish that life was black and white and simply divided into right and wrong. What is wrong is to allow women to be forced to have children. It is evil to stand idly, knowing I could do more, and wonder why a woman showed up at the emergency room with a perforated uterus because she performed her own abortion. It’s evil to allow more children to be flushed down a toilet or abandoned to die, or beaten to death as infants. It is nobler to heal the sick than to ‘save their souls’ and offer the false hope that there will be a home for every unwanted child.”

## FUND-RAISING STUNT DE JOUR

Planned Parenthood Federation of America is always coming up with new fund-raising gimmicks. Its Action Network describes a recent stunt:

President Bush and his extremist allies have launched a war on condoms. Unless you help, millions of men and women will be at risk as a result of the president’s anti-condom agenda. Condoms save lives—and without them, preventing sexually transmitted infections, including HIV, will not be successful.

In his recent State of the Union address, President Bush promised to provide funds for HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment programs in Africa and the Caribbean. However, the president’s extremist allies are now demanding that not a dime be spent on condoms as a means of preventing AIDS. Their solution? Abstinence only. Our solution? Education and access to condoms that will allow individuals to make their own best decision about how to protect themselves and others against HIV/AIDS. Each person’s decision may include one or all of

these prevention strategies: refraining from or postponing sexual activity, reducing the number of sexual partners, and using condoms.

Today, 42 million people worldwide (almost a million in the U.S.) suffer from HIV/AIDS. It is estimated that 1.1 billion condoms are needed in sub-Saharan Africa for HIV prevention efforts.

Please help us remind President Bush that condoms work. For sexually active People, condoms are the best protection against sexually transmitted infection and HIV/AIDS, and they reduce the risk of unintended pregnancy. Distributing condoms and disseminating information about their efficacy are essential to any HIV/AIDS prevention program. If the president is serious about fighting AIDS in Africa, he must expand access to condoms.

With your consent, we will send one condom to an HIV prevention program in Africa in President Bush’s name. All of the condoms gathered through this action alert will be bundled and sent abroad. In addition, we will send a message to the White House about the condoms sent to Africa in President Bush’s name and will urge the administration to support condom distribution as part of its AIDS relief plan...

If you would like to send more than one condom in President Bush’s name, you can make a donation to send additional condoms to Africa during National Condom Week (February 14-21).

Your letter will be addressed and sent to: President George W. Bush

—THIS LETTER WILL BE SENT IN YOUR NAME—

Dear [decision maker name automatically inserted here],

I must respectfully express my concern about your Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief in Africa and the Caribbean. In your recent State of the Union address, you failed to mention plans for distributing condoms as a part of your relief effort. If you are serious about fighting AIDS, please stop downplaying the value of condoms in preventing sexually transmitted infections, including HIV/AIDS. I support additional funding in developing countries, but I urge you not to shortchange these men and women by promoting a relief plan that does not include condom distribution and information about their effectiveness.

To show support for comprehensive HIV/AIDS prevention programs, which must include condoms, I am joining other concerned Americans by sending a condom to an HIV prevention program in Africa in your name. I urge you to increase U.S. support for condoms as part of your Emergency AIDS Plan. The men and women in developing nations deserve nothing less.

—END OF LETTER TO BE SENT—

Clever, aren't they? Clever and deadly.

### IN THE LOOP

The Planned Parenthood Action Network had urged its members to thank those United States Senators who voted against the ban on partial-birth abortions:

From: "Planned Parenthood Action Network"  
Date: 14 Mar 2003  
Subject: Thank Senators for Opposing the Abortion Ban

Yesterday, the Senate passed the "Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003." This ban undermines a woman's ability to make private medical decisions in consultation with her physician, disregards the need to preserve a woman's health, and is unconstitutional. During the debate, a number of important amendments were considered, including the Murray-Reid amendment and the Harkin amendment. During all three of these important votes, your Senator showed staunch support for women's reproductive rights by supporting family planning initiatives, expressing support for *Roe v. Wade* and for opposing the abortion ban act.

Please thank your Senator(s) for standing up for reproductive rights and *Roe v. Wade*.

Send a letter to the following decision maker(s):  
Below is the sample letter:

Subject: Thank You for Opposing the Abortion Ban

Dear [decision maker name automatically inserted here],

Thank you for supporting women's reproductive rights, including the Murray-Reid prevention package and the Harkin

amendment, and for voting *no* on the so-called "partial birth" abortion ban.

You clearly understand that abortion bans without an exception for a woman's health is unconstitutional and undermines her ability to make private medical decisions in consultation with her physician.

By opposing the ban, showing support for *Roe v. Wade* and voting in favor of key prevention initiatives, you demonstrated your commitment to protecting the health of women. Thank you for representing the millions of pro-choice Americans who believe in a woman's right to make her own childbearing decisions.

Take Action!

What's At Stake:

The Murray-Reid amendment would have helped women by providing for equity in prescription coverage, funds for emergency contraception education programs, emergency contraception in emergency rooms and expanded access to prenatal care for low-income women. This amendment was defeated on procedural grounds, even though it won the majority of votes in the Senate.

The Senate voted in favor of Senator Harkin's amendment, which expresses the sense of the Senate that *Roe v. Wade* was appropriate and secures "an important constitutional right" and should not be overturned.

Even though the majority of the Senate voted in favor of the abortion ban, the Murray-Reid and Harkin amendments were still tremendous votes for the pro-choice community.

Thank your Senator(s) for supporting reproductive freedom, including the Murray-Reid prevention package and the Harkin amendment, and for voting *no* on the so-called "partial birth abortion" ban.

In another e-mail the Planned Parenthood Action Network suggested language for communication to be sent to United States Senators who voted "wrong":

Subject: Abortion Bans are Unconstitutional

Dear [decision maker name automatically inserted here],

I am very concerned about your disregard for women's reproductive rights. Your votes on the Murray-Reid prevention package, the Harkin amendment and the so-called "partial birth" abortion ban demonstrate that you have little respect for women's reproductive rights.

S. 3, which does not contain an exception for a woman's health, is unconstitutional and undermines a woman's ability to make private medical decisions in consultation with her physician. Moreover, it is clear that the so-called "partial birth" abortion ban is not designed to ban only one procedure. It is written so that it could outlaw some of the safest and most common pre-viability abortion procedures without any exception for a woman's health.

I urge you to reconsider your position on these important issues. I vow to remain vigilant on reproductive rights and will hold you accountable for protecting the health and lives of women.

**ACTION:** Tell *your* U.S. Senators what you think. Write to: [Senator's Name], U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510.

### DOCTOR WARNS PARENTS, TEENS

Every day a silent epidemic strikes 8,000 American youngsters, said Meg Meeker, M.D., and it is killing and physically and psychologically crippling hordes of America's children. Meeker, author of *Epidemic*, told a group of conservative activists that she was speaking "on behalf of the millions of American teenagers who cannot speak for themselves, who cannot articulate how to preserve the sanctity of their lives as they are being crushed amidst our culture which is so toxic to their sensibilities and their sensitivities to their psyches, to their bodies, to their sexuality."

"In 2003 we are living in the midst of a public health epidemic of sexually transmitted diseases amongst 12- to 18-year-old children, and an epidemic of depression related to much of the promiscuous sexual activity amongst our youth," Meeker said. The epidemic has been "caused by our silence as [we] sit by and allow big businesses to use sexual advertising to our children to sell their stuff," she charged.

"Selling sex to our children makes a lot of money for a lot of businesses. There's one reason why we

live in the most promiscuous nation on the face of the earth. There's one reason why we allow sex to be sold to our children: money," Meeker said. The doctor continued:

We live in the midst of an epidemic of diseases, bacteria and viruses which are making their way up to the beautiful and tender reproductive tracts of our children and strangling them towards infertility and cancer and threatening their very lives. What I have seen in my beautiful quiet and suburban northern Michigan practice is occurring nationwide, and when I turned to the medical literature two years ago to see if what I was experiencing was unique I found that the Centers for Disease Control talks about the hidden epidemic of 15 million Americans getting a new sexually transmitted disease every year and two thirds of them being in people under 25, my patients, your children, the kids on your kids' basketball teams and soccer teams and ballet recitals.

According to *The New England Journal of Medicine*, one in five Americans twelve years and older test positive for genital herpes. After just one episode of intercourse, 46 percent of teenage girls contract the human papilloma virus (HPV) and 14 percent of them will go on to develop signs of cervical cancer. The doctor said that more women's lives are lost to cervical cancer every year than to AIDS. Meeker warned the audience by saying this "is not a time for mothers and fathers and doctors and teachers and politicians to be silent about the sanctity of the life of our teenagers."

"We have taught 14-, 13-, 12-year-old kids to put condoms on bananas. We have done this for 15 or 20 years," Meeker said of the so-called "solution" to the aforementioned problems. Yet in 1960 there were just two sexually transmitted diseases (syphilis and gonorrhea). After 20 years of teaching young people how to use condoms, we now face at least 30 sexually transmitted diseases among 12- to 18-year-olds.

Meeker boldly declared that condoms have failed:

A little over a year ago the National Institutes for Health reviewed all the best condom literature available in the world. They found that condoms, if used 100 percent of the time correctly, may reduce the risk of HIV by 87 percent in men and women,

and it may reduce the risk of gonorrhea in men, but for all of the other sexually transmitted diseases which infect beautiful heterosexual children across the country there is insufficient evidence that condoms work at all.

Yet we are still teaching condoms and more condoms in our schools. As a physician I consider it malpractice to hand one of my patients a condom and tell them that they will be safe when the NIH doesn't say so.

We have the answer. It is abstinence education. Many opponents of abstinence say it doesn't work—it does work—all the time. The kids are willing to learn it. Are we willing to teach it?

Meeker said that sex among girls is leading to an epidemic of cancer. “The 14-, 15-year-old girl's cervix cannot handle bacteria and viruses.” She said the bacteria and viruses “flourish and turn into cancer much more quickly than in a 25-year-old.”

“We are living in an epidemic of depression, where one out of three American teenagers have thought of killing themselves, much of this related to sexual activity,” Meeker said. “Are we willing to tell teenagers that sexual health trumps sexual freedom? We'd better be.”

### TASTES LIKE CHICKEN

The January-February 2003 edition of *The Caleb Report* included a report on Bradley Markham's attempt to find a Planned Parenthood leader to debate LDI's president at Coe College. Finding no takers, he turned to everyone short of the cafeteria staff for someone to defend the pro-abortion position; but no one would do so.

The most recent “chicken” is Peter J. Durkin, chief executive officer of Planned Parenthood of Houston and Southeast Texas Inc. Durkin turned down an invitation to appear with LDI's Douglas R. Scott at a “Town Hall meeting” at the University of Houston.

“As you might imagine, I would find it difficult to participate with an organization that consistently misrepresents the Planned Parenthood mission and services to the general public,” Durkin wrote in a letter to the Foundation for Life, which was to

cosponsor the event with the student pro-life group, Pro-Life Cougars.

Once again Scott spoke to the audience without opposition: “Let me see if I understand Mr. Durkin's position. He would not appear with me because LDI ‘misrepresents’ Planned Parenthood's ‘mission and services.’ So Mr. Durkin's response is to refuse to appear where he could have specifically challenged me on these supposed misrepresentations and where he could set the record straight for all to see. That's an interesting tactic.”

*The Caleb Report*, an official periodical of Life Decisions International, is published six times per year. A minimum donation of \$39.00 (US) or \$95.00 (CAN) per year is requested. To schedule a speaker or notify us of an address change, please contact us at: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161. We may be reached by e-mail at [ldi@fightpp.org](mailto:ldi@fightpp.org) or phone at 202-347-2066. Visit us on the World Wide Web at [www.fightpp.org](http://www.fightpp.org). Thanks for your support! Opinions expressed and comments made herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every member of LDI's Board of Directors, Board of Advisors, or staff. This publication may be copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation.

©2003 Life Decisions International.