



The Caleb Report

May-June 2003

Life Decisions International

vol. xi • no. 3

IN THIS ISSUE: Going Too Far—As Usual: Pro-Abortion Leader Shows Just How Extreme They Are / New Found Ethic: Planned Parenthood Assails “Court Stacking” / Wanted: Teens / “Catholic-Lite” / Heading Off A Disaster / In The (E-)Mail / Update: Corporate Funding Project / The Prayer Project / Newspaper Bias Challenged / Quotable Quote / Variation On A Bad Theme / No Big Surprise / Local Group Upset By Article / Coming Out / No Sense Of Decency

GOING TOO FAR—AS USUAL Pro-Abortion Leader Shows Just How Extreme They Are

According to Mavra Stark, the leader of the Morris County New Jersey chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW), no one should be mourning the death of Laci Peterson’s unborn baby, who was killed along with his mother. Their bodies washed ashore in the San Francisco Bay area several months after the eight months pregnant mother disappeared. According to Stark, we are only talking about a “fetus,” not a real murder victim, so why would anyone mourn “it”?

The *New Jersey Daily Record* reports that Stark is worried that Scott Peterson, who has been arrested for the crimes, will be prosecuted for a *double* murder, for which the prosecution may seek the death penalty. Stark fears that if the unborn baby is considered a murder victim, “any time a late-term fetus is aborted, they could call it murder,” which could jeopardize legal abortion.

“As outraged as we all are about the murders,” said columnist Susan Estrich in *USA Today*, “in almost half of the states no law governs the killing of a fetus. If two bodies washed ashore in one of these states, the murderer might be prosecuted only for a single death. If a woman in the late stages of pregnancy were assaulted and only her child was killed, the attacker might not be prosecuted for murder at all.”

In 1970, a divided California Supreme Court held that a man who attacked his pregnant former wife

while yelling, “I hear you’re pregnant...I’m going to stomp it out of you!” could not be prosecuted for murder after the baby was delivered stillborn. The court determined that even though the woman was eight months pregnant and her former husband clearly intended to cause death, the fetus she carried could not be considered a “human being” within the legal definition of murder. The public outcry after that decision led to a state law that covers the killing of an unborn baby after eight weeks gestation—by anyone other than mother.

What makes Scott Peterson’s actions “particularly heinous is the idea that he would kill his own unborn baby,” Estrich wrote. But Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI, said it is ludicrous to say that the killing of an unborn baby by his or her father is any more repugnant than the killing of an unborn baby by his or her mother or by an abortionist. “Either way you have a dead baby at the hands of the very person who is naturally supposed to do everything to protect his or her own child,” he said.

The Peterson case has drawn increased attention to the Unborn Victims of Violence Act, which would ensure that perpetrators of crimes against pregnant women are also punished for any harm to unborn children. The bill would recognize a fetus as an independent being if killed or injured during the commission of a federal crime. But pro-abortion zealots say the legislation would open the door to classifying an embryo or fetus as a legal person in

other contexts and could interfere with “a woman’s right to abortion.”

White House spokesman Ari Fleischer has said the President hopes Congress will pass the bill. “When an unborn child is killed during the commission of a crime of violence, the law should recognize what most people immediately recognize, and that is that such a crime has two victims,” he said.

Senator Mike DeWine, R-Ohio, a former prosecutor and co-sponsor of the bill, said the Peterson case “really puts the spotlight” on the issue: “Particularly with this horrible tragic case in the news, it reinforces the reality that an unborn child can be the victim of a crime. I think this brings home to people that there is a victim, and it makes it personal when we see this on TV night after night.”

The pro-abortion lobby is particularly angry that the Unborn Victims of Violence Act refers to a “child in utero,” an “unborn child,” a “human being” and “a member of the species *Homo sapiens*, at any stage of development, who is carried in the womb.” They say such rhetoric could lead to end of abortion.

Pro-abortion Congressman Jerrold Nadler, D-N.Y., said abortion foes “are trying to establish the fetus as a separate person under the law. It has nothing to do with domestic violence or the severity of the crime. What they want to do under the guise of domestic violence is lay the groundwork for abolishing abortion rights. That is violence against women.” Nadler said pro-lifers are seeking to say a fetus is a person within the meaning of the Fourteenth Amendment, which bans any state from depriving “any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law.” According to Nadler the bill is a deliberate attempt “to establish fetal personhood because if you can establish a fetus is a person, then the law would mandate that the rights of the person must be protected and abortion is murder.” He said that if Republicans were really concerned about domestic violence they should stiffen the penalties for assaulting a pregnant woman, rather than define the fetus as a separate victim.

Senator Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., another former prosecutor, drafted the legislation when he was a member of the House of Representatives: “I think most Americans would agree that whoever killed this lady and her unborn child should be prosecuted for the deaths of both of them,” he said. “They shouldn’t play this game that the unborn child doesn’t exist.” Graham said he doubts Senate opponents would dare to block passage of the bill: “Anybody who wants to filibuster this would get the wrath of the American people on his head.” He also said that even some of the most strident supporters of abortion would have no trouble prosecuting the perpetrator twice.”

Congresswoman Melissa A. Hart, R-Penn., who spearheaded a fetal homicide law through Pennsylvania’s legislature, said she plans to introduce a measure soon in the U.S. House. She said the legislation has nothing to do with a woman choosing an abortion. But in a horrible display of logic, Hart said this issue is about a woman who “has her choice wrested away from her.” In other words, the decision regarding the killing of an unborn baby should rest with the mother alone.

“It is amazing how the pro-abortion mindset brings out the worst in pro-abortion leaders,” Scott said. “They will do anything to protect unrestricted legal abortion, even if it means trying to convince people that the sky is orange and the grass is purple.”

NEW FOUND ETHIC: PLANNED PARENTHOOD ASSAILS “COURT STACKING”

“This coming week, the Senate will tackle a triumvirate of judicial nominees who oppose women’s reproductive freedom,” said Gloria Feldt, president of Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA). “All three nominees must be rejected.”

The last several weeks have not been pleasant for the pro-abortion leader. The nominees of President George W. Bush to federal judgeships, who were not even given the courtesy of a hearing when the U.S. Senate was controlled by the pro-abortion Democratic Party, are now routinely being confirmed by the upper chamber of Congress.

Feldt specifically attacked the President's nomination of James Leon Holmes, who she said "has worked throughout his career to eradicate women's reproductive freedom." Feldt said Holmes had "served as president of Arkansas Right to Life and as secretary of the Unborn Child Amendment Committee."

Another Bush nominee, Judge Carolyn Kuhl, is accused of using "her position in the Reagan-era Justice Department to advocate for the reversal of *Roe v. Wade*. While in private practice, Kuhl argued in favor of a 'gag rule' that would have prohibited health care providers who receive Title X funds from counseling women about abortion," Feldt charged.

Of course, PPFA continued to oppose the confirmation of Texas Supreme Court Justice Priscilla Owen who Feldt said "has demonstrated her willingness to dismantle women's civil rights by legislating from the bench." Last year the Senate Judiciary Committee rejected Owen, but Bush renominated her after Republicans regained control of the Senate.

"The U.S. Senate must give civil rights more than lip service by rejecting all of these nominations," Feldt said. "President Bush is poisoning the judicial system, weaving a pernicious web of attacks on women's reproductive rights. We call on the Senate to require every judicial nominee to affirm fundamental civil rights, including a woman's right to make her own childbearing choices. And we call on the president to stop stacking the courts against women's civil rights."

"Maybe my memory is failing," said Douglas R. Scott, president of Life Decisions International (LDI), "but I do not recall even one time when Feldt bemoaned the fact that Bill Clinton spent eight years stacking the courts when he was president." Scott said that unlike the Democrats who use every weapon within their arsenal in an attempt to defeat the President's court nominees, Republican Senate leaders were much less willing to flagrantly challenge Clinton's candidates.

The most shocking comment Gloria Feldt made must be her concern about jurists who believe in "legislating from the bench." Scott's response was obvious: "How does Gloria think *Roe v. Wade* came about in the first place? Without legislating from the bench, there would never have been a *Roe v. Wade*."

ACTION: Make sure your U.S. Senators know how you feel about the President's court nominees.

WANTED: TEENS

When the founder of Planned Parenthood wanted to use her programs to attack minority populations, she cunningly hired people who were minorities themselves to spread the message. Similarly, Planned Parenthood now hires teenagers to spread its message to their peers.

Planned Parenthood of San Diego and Riverside Counties wants to hire some young people. From its website:

ACTORS WANTED! AUDITION NOW!

No acting experience necessary. Bring only your enthusiasm and willingness to serve your peers through the art form of drama.

Click on a link and you get the details:

ACTORS! ACTRESSES! PEER EDUCATORS! TECHNICAL DIRECTORS! ALL TEENS!

Auditions for the 23rd Season of Planned Parenthood's Award-Winning IMAGES: Theatre for Young Hearts & Minds. No acting experience necessary but to participate, you must: love performing, be 16-19 years old by September 2003 and live in San Diego County, have reliable transportation or be willing to take the bus or carpool, be willing to commit major time and energy to an 11-month program (June 2003 - May 2004), be eager to work as part of a dedicated team, have a strong desire to learn and help others and be creative, fun loving, and responsible, be in high school, junior college, or the equivalent.

How to prepare: be prepared to sing a one-minute song, tell us about yourself in one minute, prepare a monologue or do a dramatic reading (no longer than 2 min.), bring a resume and headshot if available (not required).

IMAGES is a performance/peer health education program created by and for teens and young adults. Each year, after extensive training, the cast develops an original/professional production based on adolescent issues. The show provides positive role modeling, promotes healthy self-esteem and responsible decision-making. Issues addressed include relationship violence, peer pressure, communication, substance abuse, sexually transmissible diseases, diversity, etc. IMAGES live stage show tours California from November through May, presenting 50-60 performances for 10,000+ adolescents. This is a paid position.

Margaret Sanger would be proud, but parents should be afraid.

“CATHOLIC-LITE”

The Spectator reports that a handful of students sat behind an information table in the Student Center of Seattle University (a Jesuit institution) to mark National Abortion Provider Appreciation Day. But the Associated Students leadership and staff ordered that the table be removed. In response, the Young Democrats of Washington issued a press release with the headline reading “Seattle University Bans Pro-Choice Club, Prohibits Discussion of Reproductive Freedom.”

During winter quarter, students Blake Shaw-Phillips and Erica Terence decided to form a Students for Choice club. According to Terence, the primary objective of the group is to “educate” students and to provide them with the “information and resources” they need to form their own opinions on abortion. “We’re not trying to advise anybody to have an abortion or kill babies,” she said. “Certainly that’s not our goal. We’re actually trying to reduce abortion as much as the pro-lifers are. We want to be very much educational, get both sides of the issue airing on campus, and get people to talk about it in a real way. We want everybody to have a right to express what they believe.”

Shaw-Phillips and Terence advertised throughout campus, recruited two advisors, and located a room to use for meetings. “We did everything right to become a club,” Terence said. But the administration prohibited recognition of the group

because a pro-abortion club is not in harmony with Catholic values.

Seattle University’s administration is not at all opposed to the free exchange of ideas on campus regarding different issues. In fact, members of the pro-abortion group have met with campus officials to discuss possible solutions. “I suggested that we establish a group of students, faculty, and staff who have studied this issue to look at how we can bring the issue to bear on the campus,” said Tim Leary, vice president of Student Development.

According to Leary, the school is in no way trying to suggest that people cannot think differently on the subject of abortion. However, the fact that the university is a private, Catholic institution makes it very difficult for it to support certain opinions. “A diversity of opinion is essential to who we are as a campus,” stated Leary. “It’s how we choose to organize and officially recognize those opinions—that’s the major issue.”

Seattle University differs from many of the other Catholic institutions in that it is committed to keeping an open dialogue going on the abortion issue. “I think Seattle University has gone beyond where many Catholic schools have to allow for that to happen,” says Leary.

The unrecognized club continues to meet weekly. “We’re not trying to start a revolution,” claims Terence. “We’re trying to start a dialogue.” The administration’s next step, says Leary, is to continue the dialogue and figure out a way in which these students can voice their opinions.

While Seattle University is acting in the tradition of the faith, Marist College has come under fire from a local Catholic Church leader and a pro-life group regarding its selection of Attorney General Eliot Spitzer as commencement speaker. Spitzer, who is rabidly—and we mean *rabidly*—pro-abortion, has led the fight against pregnancy help centers in the state.

“We are opposed to inviting a man with such a pro-abortion record,” said Monsignor William Belford, pastor of Blessed Kateri Church in LaGrangeville and the vicar of Dutchess County, representing

about 25 parishes. Belford said Marist, which is not affiliated with the Roman Catholic Church but was founded by Catholic brothers, has the right to choose its own commencement speaker, but that concerned residents also have a right to protest.

“We say the board of trustees made a mistake,” Belford told the *Poughkeepsie Journal*. “The tradition of a place certainly matters.” He said local churches plan to cover the issue Sunday in bulletins handed out at Masses.

Marist spokesman Tim Massie defended inviting Spitzer to address graduates and receive an honorary degree. “Marist College is an independent institution and awards its honorary degrees based on an individual’s professional and personal accomplishments,” Massie said. “Marist has no litmus test and considers an individual’s overall achievements in awarding honorary degrees or inviting speakers to campus. Throughout the years, Marist has had commencement speakers representing a variety of professions and diverse views.” (Would the college have given an award to David Duke if he has been successful in business or politics?)

While Marist is not a Catholic institution, it does emphasize its Catholic heritage. Its name appears in many Catholic publications, giving the impression that its leaders care about the traditional teachings of the church.

A similar controversy erupted at Marist three years ago when former Senator Bob Kerrey, D-Neb., also pro-abortion, spoke at the school’s graduation.

ACTION: Let the President of Seattle University know what you think. Write to: Stephen V. Sundborg, S.J., President, Seattle University, 900 Broadway, Seattle, WA 98122-4340; Phone: 206-296-6000.

Let the President of Marist College know what you think. Write to: Dr. Dennis J. Murray, President, Marist College, 3399 North Rd., Poughkeepsie, NY 12601; Phone: (845) 575-3000.

HEADING OFF A DISASTER

The Republican National Coalition for Life (RNCL) and New York pro-life activists are scrambling to be sure that William Murphy, a pro-abortion Democrat

from Staten Island, is not nominated to a federal judgeship. In a letter to Colleen Parro, RNCL’s leader, Gene Cosgriff warned that Murphy, an outgoing district attorney, has announced that he would like to be considered for a federal judgeship, after serving as a borough district attorney for the last 21 years.

Murphy has been interviewed by White House Deputy Counsel David Leitch. Murphy said he expects to hear “soon” whether President George W. Bush will nominate him to a vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the eastern district. Murphy said Leitch asked “no litmus-test questions,” such as his opinion about abortion, but quizzed him on whether he could adhere to federal sentencing guidelines.

Murphy said he was asked to describe his judicial philosophy. “I believe in judicial restraint,” Murphy said he told Leitch. “It’s not the place of a district court judge to be an activist, or to be looking to change the law he’s looking to apply.” Murphy said that one reason he is looking to get into the judiciary “is to get out of the politics.” Murphy was also asked if he would have any difficulty being known as a “Bush appointee” to the bench. Murphy said “he’d be honored.”

Radically pro-abortion Senator Charles Schumer has asked the President to make the nomination. “What nerve this senator has after his attempts to block President Bush’s nomination of Justice [Miguel] Estrada and [Priscilla] Owen,” Cosgriff wrote.

“Not only is a pro-choice Democrat getting consideration from the Bush administration while the left wing pro-abortion senators are holding a filibuster against previous and possibly future Bush nominees, but fellow Staten Island Republican [and] pro-life congressman Vito Fossella told Murphy he would support his judicial nomination,” Cosgriff wrote. “I believe that Bill Clinton forwarded enough pro-abortion federal judges during his administration and that the Bush administration should in turn have their nominations proceed without the left wing influence of feminist and abortion lobbies being obstructionists, especially now when the Democrats are showing their partisan

politics, Republicans should not support Democratic applicants for federal nomination to the bench.”

ACTION: Let the President know what you think. Write to: President George W. Bush, The White House, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, DC 20500; Phone: 202-456-1111.

IN THE (E-)MAIL

LDI has received an unusually large number of letters and e-mails over the past couple of months. In one e-mail, LDI is criticized for being “hypocritical”:

Just wondering...

You that are making such a stink about Pampered Chef and Warren Buffet’s Berkshire Hathaway...

Are you making an equally big stink and refusing to pay your taxes on April 15 because the majority of the check you write will be funding military action that also senselessly [sic] takes innocent lives.

Didn’t think so....

Where do you stand on the NRA [National Rifle Association]?? Feeling OK about supporting an organization [sic] that strives to put deadly weapons in everyone’s hands...???

Think again about the hipocracy [sic] of it.

Killing Babies...Killing women, children, husbands, fathers, brothers, wives....Where is the difference??

— J. Brady

One person wrote to disagree with our entire agenda:

You call your organization Life Decisions but you fight organizations that help women with decisions that affect their lives. Get a clue!

Your organization is obviously very narrow-minded.

— sent unsigned

LDI continues to receive criticism because we ask for a donation for *The Boycott List*. In the following letter we are again accused of being hypocritical, but for a completely different reason:

Pay for a boycott list? You want to profit from anti-abortion? You guys are despicable hypocrites and give Christians and the Pro-Life movement a bad name. If you really cared about stopping the American Holocaust, you would be begging people to freely distribute that list. There are plenty of legitimate ways to raise cash for your organization. Add yourselves to the list and to hell with you. In fact add yourselves to the TOP of the list. I’ll find out the information the hard way, by researching it myself.

— Lew E. Webb

P.S. If you guys aren’t Christians, then I apologize to the Christians.

After learning that LDI was investigating local business support of Planned Parenthood, one pro-abortion entrepreneur virtually begged to be added to *The Boycott List*:

Please add Moonlight Mac of Portland, Oregon to your national boycott. My company consults with computer users and companies about the advantages of Macintosh equipment, and I service existing machines as needed.

Every year I donate time and services to the NARAL auction. I don’t normally donate to Planned Parenthood, but I will if that is what it takes to get your attention.

Please list me with the group of companies you boycott. I would be proud to be on the hate list of groups like yours.

— Michael Pearce, Moonlight Mac

PS: I am a registered Republican and voted for Bush. But not again.

We could not grant the writer’s wish because an e-mail is insufficient confirmation that a business qualifies to be added to *The Boycott List*.

Several people wrote to thank LDI for the work we do. In most cases the letters referred to our commitment to integrity and telling the truth no matter what the cost:

Many pro-lifers here in Lostine, OR [Oregon] support you in boycotting Pampered Chef among others...thank you for your information and keep up the good fight.

— Beckey Buck

Thank you for your ethical, thrifty, and dependable service to our nation's pro-life community.

— Gloria Ziegler

A few people were upset that we dropped The Walt Disney Company from *The Boycott List*. They wrote to express their disappointment:

I want to urge you in the strongest possible way not to end a boycott of Disney. That it is not overtly supporting Planned Parenthood does not mean it really isn't behind the scenes. Those of us in Florida know better.

However the larger issue here is that Disney is aggressively pro-homosexual which is in itself an anti life view point. Disney directly supports abortion through a variety of back door schemes including their support for homosexuals being tied to their (gays) support of the anti life agenda. Furthermore, Disney continues to pursue an aggressive anti-traditional family agenda with their movies that promote full mouth kissing of boys and girls as young as 12 and glorification of anti-parent behavior.

Please re-think ending this boycott.

— Pastor Rick Stoneking

I was heartsick when I received this letter [announcing that The Walt Disney Company had “qualified to be removed from *The Boycott List*”], as I have known for years that Disney is one of the most anti-Christian companies out there. Disney owns Miramax (among other things)—from which we received such masterpieces as “Priest” and, if I am not mistaken, “The Last Temptation of Christ.”

If they have made one move to stop funding one organization, that in no way changes their entire stance. I realize that your focus is limited, but I wish you had just said nothing, rather than encouraging innocent and unsuspecting subscribers (parents of young children in particular) to support an organization [sic] that sponsors gay days at its theme parks and commits countless other violations against God's law. Even some of its movies for small children present frequently questionable philosophies (Pocohontas [sic]), crude language (as noted by George Will, eminent columnist), and immodest attire on the characters.

I strongly support LDI and commend you for your wonderful work, but as I said above—on this one, I am just HEARTSICK.

— Anne M. Collopy

It is important to keep in mind that *The Boycott List* identifies corporate supporters of Planned Parenthood, NARAL Pro-Choice America, and the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League. If The Walt Disney Company had never supported Planned Parenthood it would not have been on LDI's *Boycott List* in the first place. If a company stops supporting these groups it qualifies to be dropped from *List*. (Keeping this information from our supporters is truly out of the question.)

We know that many pro-family groups are advocating a continued boycott of Disney for other reasons. Contrary to the statement made above, LDI has done *nothing* to dissuade people from participating in such a boycott. We rely on pro-family groups that track other corporate behavior to say that which needs to be said. When we talk about Disney's good decision to stop funding Planned Parenthood, we choose our words *very* carefully. In fact, unlike every other corporation that has stopped funding Planned Parenthood, we have never said “Disney is no longer a boycott target.” Instead we have said, “Disney is no longer a target of the *Corporate Funding Project* boycott.” Persons choosing to boycott Disney are doing so for reasons other than its support of pro-abortion groups. If LDI were to loudly criticize Disney and urge a continued boycott, the company would have no reason to stop funding Planned Parenthood.

We received one e-mail from a person defending pro-life Senator Rick Santorum, R-Penn., after LDI criticized him and the National Right to Life Committee Inc. (NRLC) for supporting pro-abortion Republican candidates. We also received a letter from a person who was happy that we did so:

Mr. Scott:

I just received your latest *Caleb Report*, and I must say that I disagree strongly with your position on the New Jersey senate election, and Senator Santorum's action in support of Doug Forrester. Like Senator Santorum, I am a Catholic, and like him, I am aware of the Catholic

Church's statements on elected officials. In *Evangelium Vitae*, the Pope clearly states that where electing an official will save some lives, whereas electing his opponent will not, one has a moral obligation to support the person who will do something. And according to your article, which is all I have to go by, Forrester would have voted to end Partial Birth Abortion. He would have voted for the Hyde Amendment, even if weakening amendments had failed, although he would have supported such amendments. He probably would have voted to support state laws by making it a federal crime to transport a minor across state lines to avoid the family notification abortion laws in her home state. In comparison, Lautenberg has a perfect pro-abortion record. So, according to the teachings of the Catholic Church, Forrester deserved the support of pro-lifers insofar as he was the only candidate realistically capable of defeating Lautenberg. Santorum as a Catholic pro-lifer followed Church teaching to the letter. His position may have had something to do with politics, but his faith probably gave it its strongest impetus.

I know you're not a Catholic, and didn't want anyone to respond some time ago when you expressed your frustration with the Church's failure to excommunicate pro-abortion politicians. There are two points of *Canon Law* to keep in mind. One is that anyone who procures an abortion is automatically excommunicated. The other is that "accomplices who are not named in a law or in a precept incur an automatic penalty attached to an offense if it would not have been committed without their efforts and the penalty is of such a nature that it can punish them." So one could argue that all such politicians are automatically excommunicated, because without them at least some of the offenses would not have been committed.

Canon Law also encourages bishops to use exhortation to persuade people to avoid scandalizing others. Certainly that's what [California Governor] Gray Davis's bishop is attempting to do. If you check the Congressional Record for the period during which Senator Daschle made his first vote against partial birth abortion, you will find a rant he made against his bishop. I think it was right after the voting was over, but I could be mistaken about that. So the bishops do act, even though it's usually behind the scenes. Certainly I hope they become more effective, but I do know that they do act.

Mr. Scott:

I wish to compliment you for your item on Senator Santorum in your March-April 2003 issue of *The Caleb Report*.

I have on many occasions written to Senator Santorum, NRLC, and local pro-life groups re: alleged pro-life politicians who use their pro-life credentials to support pro-abortion candidates such as Christine Todd Whitman [former New Jersey governor and now head of the Environmental Protection Agency], Tom Ridge [former Pennsylvania governor and now head of the Department of Homeland Security], Arlen Specter [U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania], and Doug Forrester [unsuccessful Republican nominee in New Jersey for the U.S. Senate in 2002 who was endorsed by Santorum and NRLC].

I have written numerous letters to the editor identifying Senator Santorum as one of the worst offenders. But my information always falls on deaf ears.

In regard to NRLC and local pro-life groups, they advise me that Senator Santorum is only facing the realities of party politics when he endorses pro-abortion Republicans.

Senator Santorum is beyond criticism as far as NRLC and local "pro-life" groups are concerned. [I'm] Disgusted!!!

— Ed Mahoney

And finally, one LDI supporter said last edition of *The Caleb Report* left her wondering which side LDI was on:

I recently received the March-April 2003 *Caleb Report*, vol. xi, no. 2. It is quite confusing to me. It seems as if most of the report tells about the Pro-Choice people and their positions on issues. In fact, as I read the Berkshire Hathaway section, there were times that I was not sure whether LDI was supporting Berkshire or opposing them [sic]. For me too much of the report focused on PP [Planned Parenthood] and what they did or didn't do. I would like to see more reporting on Pro-Life success issues. Maybe feature some companies that are outstanding in their Pro-Life involvement

[sic]—or individuals who are. Or more ideas on how people have or can prevent the growth of PP.

— Theresa McCall

UPDATE: CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

A revised edition of *The Boycott List* was released in May 2003. It includes far too many changes to note herein. The new edition is the first to include corporate supporters of NARAL Pro-Choice America and the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League, along with those who fund Planned Parenthood. To date at least 91 corporations have ceased supporting the pro-abortion groups.

Berkshire Hathaway Inc.: The head of The Pampered Chef has written to those who work for the company regarding the boycott against Berkshire Hathaway:

In the history of our nation, there has probably never been a greater need for the mealtime message of The Pampered Chef. Tonight, gathered around tables across this land, are families and friends who, because of your work, are turning off the news even for a little while, sharing a meal and reassuring one another. At this time, let us not forget those who are serving our nation both here and in far away lands. At The Pampered Chef, we're family. Perhaps that's why I feel I can talk to you as though you were sitting across the table from me.

In recent weeks, there have been expressions of concern from a relatively small, yet important, number of Kitchen Consultants who strongly disagree with Berkshire Hathaway's and Warren Buffet's charitable giving. They question whether our new parent company has influenced our own Pampered Chef giving. In some cases, they have even questioned my own personal faith as a Christian. You may have heard some of these questions, have some of your own, or this may be brand new news to you. I would like to share with you what is in my heart on these matters. Please feel free to share this letter with others to help answer any questions that may come your way.

In a nutshell, the question is this: do profits from The Pampered Chef support pro-choice organizations such as Planned Parenthood? The question arises because of Mr. Buffet's well-

known personal giving choices and because of Berkshire Hathaway's uniquely democratic system of allowing each of its shareholders to vote their share of profits to the charitable organization of their choice. We know that The Pampered Chef has been added to the boycott lists of some pro-life organizations, joining the names of all other Berkshire Hathaway companies. So, it is possible that Pampered Chef profits could benefit either pro-life or pro-choice organizations. Let me tell you how that might happen.

The Berkshire Hathaway giving strategy works in the following way; Each Berkshire Hathaway shareholder may name up to three nonprofit organizations where they would like funds related to their ownership of Berkshire Hathaway shares to go. The organization(s) they choose must be a legal, nonprofit organization. Last year, Berkshire Hathaway's shareholders supported more than 3,500 charities, including 437 different churches and synagogues. Among these thousands of charities, donations were made to both pro-life and pro-choice organizations. Shareholders are not questioned by Berkshire Hathaway about their choice or their own personal belief system. They are invited to vote their conscience as to where they want their share to go.

As a Berkshire shareholder, I, too, vote my conscience and give my dollars to the churches, universities and causes of my choice. Neither Warren Buffet nor Berkshire Hathaway influence my choice or ask me how I have designated my funds.

Now, let's talk about The Pampered Chef profit. Here is how the profit from our company sales are prioritized. First and foremost, as they always have been, they're invested into building and growing this company. Second, they are donated to the three charitable giving programs developed by The Pampered Chef. Third, they go to Berkshire Hathaway, which distributes dividends to its shareholders. Fourth, they are given to charities by shareholder designation in the way I mentioned above. So it is possible that profit from The Pampered Chef could be used to support many and varied charities, people, organizations, institutions and causes.

Our corporate giving policies have not and will not change.

You are the largest corporate cash donors to America's Second Harvest feeding America's hungry through our Roundup from the Heart campaign. That will not change. You serve women by helping them to understand the value of early detection in the fight against breast cancer, through our Help Whip Cancer campaign in partnership with The American Cancer Society. And, you serve families through The Pampered Chef Family Resiliency program at the University of Illinois. None of this has or will change!

As to what Mr. Buffet does with his profits from Berkshire Hathaway? Truly, it is not my place to ask or to judge. Obviously, my personal views on some issues differ from Warren Buffet's. Despite this difference in opinion, he and I share a common belief...that each person is entitled to his or her own opinions. Warren Buffet respects my right to my opinions, and I respect his right to his. Further, I respect him as a businessperson and as an individual of stature and high business ethics.

As a Christian, a mother, a businesswoman, and an American, I believe in welcoming everyone to the table. That will never change. I believe that The Pampered Chef is a large and diverse family committed to the goals of doing good by being good to the best of our ability. I truly believe our conscientious work will continue, as will our success. At The Pampered Chef table—as in this strong nation itself—we welcome both Kitchen Consultants and co-workers from every land, every color, and every creed. When a new Consultant looks to our opportunity we would never consider asking them for the name of their church or synagogue or where their charitable dollars go. This is what America is all about!

I am resolved in the decision made to align The Pampered Chef with Berkshire Hathaway. We are very proud to be part of the Berkshire Hathaway family. It is the right place for this company to be able to grow and flourish so that we can forward our mission of serving America's families and provide a secure future for all who choose to be involved with our company.

Thank you for all you do that make this company strong and great.

— Doris K. Christopher

One Pampered Chef consultant responded:

In response to your article that was written about the purchase of The Pampered Chef by Berkshire Hathaway, I quickly terminated my newly signed consultant contract with them and cancelled my seven kitchen shows. Every one of my friends was thankful to me for informing them of this.

What bothers me about the new turn in The Pampered Chef's financial direction is that Doris Christopher was recently featured in a Guideposts article espousing her Christian faith. I recently received a letter from her addressed to all the kitchen consultants in which she tries to justify her continued support of the company she started.

Doris Christopher writes: "As to what Mr. Buffet does with his profits from Berkshire Hathaway? Truly, it is not my place to ask or judge. Obviously, my personal views on some issues differ from Warren Buffet's. Despite this difference in opinion, he and I share a common belief...that each person is entitled to his or her own opinions. Warren Buffet respects my right to my opinions, and I respect his right to his. Further, I respect him as a businessperson and as an individual of stature and high business ethics."

She further writes: "I also believe that The Pampered Chef is a large and diverse family committed to the goals of doing good by being good to the best of our ability...we welcome both Kitchen Consultants and coworkers from every land, every color, and every creed."

Isn't this the same as some politicians saying that personally they are pro-life and politically they are pro-choice? I would challenge Ms. Christopher to be heroic, not just sellout her beliefs as she has with her company.

Here is a copy of my letter to The Pampered Chef:

Originally sent by mail: February 13, 2003, resent by e-mail: March 31, 2003:

To whom it may concern:

I have just learned that The Pampered Chef had been recently purchased by a company that supports Planned Parenthood and other anti-life issues. In good conscience, I cannot sell products for a company knowing that a portion of what I sell could in any way contribute to the destruction of pre-born life.

Upon learning this information, I have cancelled seven shows and informed the hosts of the reasons

behind my decision. All have been in support of me and were grateful that I let them know. Please pass this letter on to your stockholders. Their support of abortion, sterilization, and contraception is going to be devastatingly destructive to this family-based company.

I am requesting to be released from my contract. I cannot do the six shows required by it. I have already used many of the products, so I don't know whether or not you need them back. In addition, I had purchased a super-starters kit enhancement for \$35.00. I would like a refund on that since I have not used any of the materials in it. Do I need to send it back myself or is there anyone who could pick it up?

I had sent this notice by mail in February and have received no response to date. Your swift reply would be greatly appreciated.

— Elizabeth A. Nguyen

As usual, Pampered Chef officials seek to skirt the real questions: First, does Berkshire Hathaway *corporate* money go to Planned Parenthood? If Warren Buffett gave every dollar of his personal salary to Planned Parenthood, that would not land the corporation on *The Boycott List*. Second, does the success of The Pampered Chef fuel Berkshire Hathaway's profits? The answer to both questions is "yes," and no amount of refocusing, evading and distancing will change these facts.

MORE INFORMATION: LDI has devoted a lot of its website to this matter. Go to: www.fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=PC
--

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: **May**—actor *Ed Harris*; **June**—Governor *Gray Davis*, D-Calif.; **July**—abortionist *Morris Wortman*; **August**—*Doris K. Christopher*, founder and chairman of The Pampered Chef; and **September**—Congressman *Jerrold Nadler*, D-N.Y.

NEWSPAPER BIAS CHALLENGED

Christopher Slattery, founder and director of Expectant Mother Care, the largest pregnancy care center in the metropolitan New York area, and

Theresa Schweigert, administrative director of the Albany, New York-based Citizens Concerned for Human Life, took **The New York Times Company** to task over abortion reporting at the Annual Corporate Shareholders Meeting.

“In the wake of 30 years under *Roe v Wade*, The New York Times Company has shown a woeful lack of reporting about the impact of the deaths of over 40 million pre-born children in America,” Schweigert said. She said that what is lacking are the articles dealing with long-term psychological complications, such as post-abortion stress syndrome or physiological complications such as the increase rate of sterility and breast cancer, even maternal deaths. “Why aren't investigative reporters at *The New York Times* exposing unlicensed abortion facilities and the immense harm done to women by incompetent and often criminal practitioners?”

Slattery echoed that sentiment when he asked the Company's Board of Directors why the editorial staff at *The New York Times* has ignored the shift of America's youth back to pro-life values. When 40 teens calling themselves Survivors of the Abortion Holocaust were arrested by New York City Police as they engaged in an act of civil disobedience by kneeling in the snow near Times Square, *The New York Times* reported nothing.

According to Slattery and Schweigert, The New York Times Company core values of objectivity and integrity are compromised by its bias when it publishes a story on abortion. A word search conducted by Schweigert showed that during a random 90-day period this year, *The New York Times* used the term “pro-choice” 19 times more frequently than “pro-abortion.” On the other hand, “The slur ‘anti-abortion’ was used four times more frequently than ‘pro-life’, which is how those in the Respect for Life Movement refer to themselves,” Schweigert said. “No pro-life teen would say, ‘Surprise, Mom, I'm anti-abortion!’”

Schweigert distributed a graphic derived from the 2001 U.S. Abstract illustrating how the destruction of 42 million of America's progeny has resulted in a population shift that according to Alan Greenspan, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, will greatly

impact our Social Security and Medicare Systems. For *The New York Times*, fewer people means fewer newspaper copies sold and less advertising revenue generated. “Even at its crassest level,” concluded Schweigert, “abortion is bad business for The New York Times Company stockholders.”

The New York Times Company is a boycott target due to its longtime financial support of Planned Parenthood.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

“To the person who thinks people with HIV should disclose their status [to sexual partners]: You need to be responsible for your own actions. If you’re HIV-negative, you shouldn’t be swapping body fluids with anybody. I look forward to you joining those of us in the HIV-positive status.”

— anonymously printed comment by a male homosexual warning HIV-negative men to abstain from sexual contact; written in response to a previous letter-writer who had suggested that men with HIV should merely tell their sexual partners that they have the virus but not refrain from sexual contact

VARIATION ON A BAD THEME

Remember the “Choice on Earth” holiday cards that PPFa sold around Christmastime? Despite the criticism, Planned Parenthood now offers “Choice on Earth” stickers, magnets and buttons. “Planned Parenthood’s hierarchy relishes every chance to ridicule all that is sacred,” said Douglas R. Scott, LDI’s president.

Speaking of sacred, Planned Parenthood made available “Mother’s Day E-Cards.” They came in four styles:

- “Every Child a Wanted Child, 1938” features a drawing of a mother holding and kissing a child from the era;
- “Celebrating Family Planning, 1948” features a photograph of attendees at PPFa’s annual conference in 1948;
- “Bangladesh: Mother and Child” pictures an African mother holding a baby. The caption reads: “In Bangladesh, a young woman and her

daughter participate in a reproductive health educational session, made possible by PPFa-International”; and

- “March on Washington” pictures attendees at a pro-abortion rally. The only protest sign that can be read says, “Mother Of Two By *Choice*.”

NO BIG SURPRISE

Some pro-life leaders have expressed shock and disgust that the Young Women’s Christian Association (YWCA) has selected Patricia Ireland, the former president of NOW, as its new chief executive. The Traditional Values Coalition (TVC) is leading the opposition to Ireland’s selection. It has asked Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson to review and possibly cancel the \$114 million in government grants provided the YWCA under President Bush’s faith-based initiative.

As the head of NOW, Ireland spent ten years guiding what is perhaps the most liberal organization in Washington. Ireland defended women’s “right” to “safe and legal” abortion and planned a filibuster strategy to “save *Roe*,” going farther to the left than Senator Daschle on the issue. TTVC also points out that NOW opposed virtually all of Bush’s conservative judge nominees, attempted to pass an Equal Rights Amendment for women to enshrine abortion in the Constitution, and so forth.

Ireland said that the YWCA is “nourished by its roots in Christianity and, at the same time, over the years, it’s been enriched by beliefs and values from all kinds of places, even, in fact, strengthened by our diversity.” TTVC warns that Ireland will attempt to bring NOW’s values to the YWCA. There is also great concern that she will use the group’s after-school programs to indoctrinate children in her brand of “tolerant” gender politics.

“This appointment should surprise no one,” said Douglas R. Scott, president of LDI. “The YWCA has long been a friend of the radical feminist movement. It has publicly supported programs such as Title X, the federal program that gives birth

control to teenagers, and abortion on demand. It already has the values espoused by Ireland.”

“Demanding that the YWCA drop Ireland as its leader is like insisting that Satan drop Beelzebub,” Scott said. “It’s just not going to happen. This just makes YWCA’s philosophy that much more obvious. But the truth is that nothing much will change.”

LOCAL GROUP UPSET BY ARTICLE

The leader of a local pro-life organization is upset about a *New York Times* piece that was published near the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*. The article was coauthored by Cristina Page of NARAL Pro-Choice America’s New York affiliate, and Amanda Peterman of Right to Life of Michigan. The article was titled, “Prolifers and Pro-choicers Should Focus on Common Ground”:

Wednesday was the 30th anniversary of *Roe vs. Wade*, the Supreme Court decision that legalized abortion in the United States. We are two women who were born in the early 1970s and, like other Americans our age, were raised with the divisions the decision has wrought.

We are activists on opposite sides of the abortion issue. While we are both committed to carrying on the work of our predecessors, we also recognize the need to re-examine their tactics. The slogans are old, the battle is tired.

Those older than us have said Americans born after *Roe vs. Wade* cannot truly comprehend what is at stake. Maybe so. But we think we have a fresh understanding of how to achieve real progress.

Instead of just focusing on our differences, we need to acknowledge the surprising number of important issues on which we agree. We all believe we should work to reduce unintended pregnancy and abortion. Our efforts are succeeding. Over the last seven years the rate of abortions performed in the United States has dropped by 11 percent, according to a 2002 study by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a research group.

Whether that has come through better education on contraception or through programs that

discourage premarital sex, prolife and prochoice advocates should celebrate such an achievement together and acknowledge each other’s role in it. There are times when both movements have missed common-ground opportunities.

This past year, advocates should have come together to fight the Florida Adoption Act. The act requires a woman who wants to place a child for adoption to publish newspaper advertisements to try to find the father. In the ads, the woman must disclose her name, as well as her sexual history, including a description of every potential father and the dates they had sex. In short, the law is an attack on women and discourages adoption. Collaboration by the two sides of the abortion movement could have benefited all women in Florida.

There will be other chances to work together and still be true to our missions. For example, many unintended pregnancies could be prevented by ensuring that women have health insurance coverage for the most effective contraception methods.

Making the workplace more accommodating to the demands of parenthood is also a common goal. Why is affordable, high-quality child care out of reach for the majority of American families? If the prochoice and prolife movements work together for legislation to expand the social safety net for low-income mothers, and to lobby for more family-friendly policies for working parents, their power would be formidable. These are goals that we share. But, sadly, such issues often get lost in the larger debate.

The only way we will have the chance to explore these mutual areas is if we feel comfortable doing so. Both sides must unite publicly against the use of violent measures in the movement and must isolate extremists who employ them. The language we use to argue our positions must change, too. We can no longer tolerate inflammatory terms that serve only to divide us further. Doctors who offer safe abortion services are not murderers or butchers. People who engage in peaceful protests against abortion are not fanatics. We accept that we will never find a solution to the most fundamental disagreements we hold on abortion. And we should never compromise our strongly held beliefs. Outside of them, though, we can find a path to escape this endless cycle of division. We hope the next

generation of activists will join us in seeking areas of common ground and merge the power of both movements to serve Americans in a meaningful way.

According to Judy Climer, president of Flint Area Right to Life, the article is “very disturbing in that I find no common ground with this organization who is committed to killing the unborn.” Patricia Pitkus Bainbridge, a member of the Board of Directors for Human Life International as well as associate director of the Respect Life Office at the Diocese of Rockford (Illinois), was stunned that any pro-life leader could have coauthored such a piece: “What does a pro-lifer have in common with anyone who works to keep a woman’s ‘right’ to choose to kill her unborn baby legal?” she asked. “Would these people come together if one of the groups ardently fought in favor of racism or terrorism? Would they work together if one of the groups fought for the ‘right’ to kill two-year-olds? I cannot believe that anyone would actually say that pro-lifers should legitimize pro-abortion groups by working with them. Isolating extremists is important and someone who is willing to kill unborn children is definitely an extremist.” Bainbridge said that she would gladly socialize with any pro-abortion person but she would definitely try to convert them: “I would never agree to work with a pro-abortion group but I am happy to go to lunch with any pro-abortion individual.”

COMING OUT

The Caleb Report occasionally identifies corporate supporters of groups and events operated by homosexuals. The following companies are sponsoring “Capital Pride” in the District of Columbia (those in bold type are also boycott targets due to their support of Planned Parenthood): Rock the Vote (MTV), Bud Light, U.S. Airways, T-Mobile, Washington Freedom (soccer team), Hard Rock Café, ID Lubricants, Showtime, Westin Hotels & Resorts, and **Fresh Fields/Whole Foods Market**.

The following companies funded an event (“Cherry 7”) to raise money for several groups, including those involved in political activism: British Midland Airlines, Universal Gear, Empire Video, Capital City Brewing Company, and Rolling Rock beer.

Corporations supporting the National Gay & Lesbian Task Force Leadership Awards program were: American Airlines, **Prudential Financial**, Radisson Hotels, Wells Fargo and Wyndham Bel Age.

NO SENSE OF DECENCY

Important Note: *This article includes text that is unsuitable for minors and highly offensive to most adults. Please exercise appropriate discretion.*

A seller of sex-related products publicly and loudly declared May to be “National Masturbation Month.” Good Vibrations, a San Francisco, women-owned and operated “sex toy, book and video store,” is “committed to making the world a place where sex and pleasure are recognized as a birthright.” The self-description continued: “Selling sex toys, books and videos has always played an important role in our mission, which is to provide accurate information about sex in a nonjudgmental atmosphere.”

The company has a so-called “education” department, which it says “functions as a catalyst for acquiring, incorporating and disseminating up-to-date and accurate sex information to both our staff and the public.” The department is composed of four programs:

- 1) Outreach & Community Education—the “Outreach Team” brings their “knowledge and skills in the form of fun, interactive and educational workshops to festivals, schools, health clinics, or wherever there’s a need to learn about a wide range of human sexuality topics”;
- 2) After Hours Events—adults-only “educational” classes and workshops featuring “some of the most innovative sex education around.”;
- 3) Pleasure Parties—one-night events “similar to having a sex expert give you and your friends a first-class sex toy tour, complete with the most current sex information”; and
- 4) SESA Training—a Sex Educator/Sales Associate must take a 21-hour program taught by “staff

sexologists and sex experts” to they can “help customers.”

So you have never heard of “National Masturbation Month”? This year marks the seventh that Good Vibrations “celebrated” the event, which it said “Will Give a Rise to All Participants.” The company used other suggestive language to promote its program: “Feel the love—your own, that is—and don’t miss the nationwide festivities honoring the gratifying yet under-appreciated activity of solo pleasure.”

“Masturbation is an elemental component of healthy, happy sexuality...,” says author and sex educator Carol Queen, Ph.D. “The popularity of National Masturbation Month reflects the Good Vibrations motto: ‘If you want something done right, do it yourself!’ Our overwhelming customer response only reinforces the fact that everyone’s doing it—we’re just the only ones talking about it.”

Other events have included the “‘Come For a Cause’ Masturbate-A-Thon”:

At Good Vibrations, we know that sexual pleasure is a birthright and that masturbation is a powerful source of sexual gratification. Since practically everyone masturbates, but few of us talk about it, we created National Masturbation Month, a month-long celebration recognizing the many ways we can pleasure ourselves. This year our theme is “I’d rather be masturbating.”

....

Since the first Good Vibrations Masturbate-A-Thon, approximately 1200 people have participated. The largest amount of money raised by a single participant was \$500. However, over the years, many small groups have gathered, including the Center for Sex and Culture, in the name of the Masturbate-A-Thon and collectively raised thousands of dollars. Participants from across the globe have also taken part in the Masturbate-A-Thon. In fact, Good Vibrations has received donations and sponsorship sheets from as far as Great Britain.

....

This is Good Vibrations fifth annual marathon of self-lovin’. Participants are encouraged to recruit their friends and co-workers to sponsor them for every minute they spend masturbating during National Masturbation Weekend...Co-sponsored by Toys in Babeland (New York and Seattle),

Grand Opening! (Boston) and Come As You Are (Toronto). All proceeds raised will go towards the fight against HIV/AIDS (masturbation is the one foolproof safe sex method!).

This year Good Vibrations partnered with a sperm bank to “raise awareness about the bank’s services and recruit donors.” The Sperm Bank of California (TSBC) is specifically intended for lesbians and women “who have historically faced discrimination in the sperm banking industry.”

Alice Ruby, executive direct of TSBC, said the company is “excited about participating in Good Vibrations’ Masturbation Month. We hope this event will encourage men between the ages of 18 and 40 to masturbate for another excellent cause—helping women’s dreams of building a family become a reality, by becoming donors.”

Sperm Bank information was included on all Masturbation Month marketing materials and Masturbate-A-Thon sponsor sign-up sheets. “Throughout the month, Good Vibrations will feature a diverse line-up of activities to educate and excite people about the healthy practice of self-gratification,” the promotional material reads. “The partnership between Good Vibrations and TSBC serves as a reminder that not only is masturbation a pleasurable and healthful activity in its own right, but it’s also a way in which procreation and sexual pleasure can be enjoyed separately, thus ensuring reproductive choice for everyone.”

In addition to the Masturbate-A-Thon, “highlights” of National Masturbation Month have included:

Live Events: appearances by masturbation authors and experts, exclusive book signings and lectures, an “Online Masturbation Round Table” at salon.com, sex toy pioneers, a meeting in which all leaders in the sexual health community discuss their experiences and collective 45 years of supporting masturbation all over the world in an online discussion on salon.com.

Party: mingling with other “self-loving folk” at San Francisco’s Red Devil Lounge and a special price on drinks. Not surprisingly, every alcoholic beverage associated with the Masturbate-A-Thon has a vulgar slang sexual name.

Planned Parenthood would surely love this “educational” program.

The Caleb Report, an official periodical of Life Decisions International, is published six times per year. 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 or phone at 202-347-2066. Visit us on the World Wide Web at 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