



# The Caleb Report

November-December 2003

Life Decisions International

vol. xi • no. 6

*IN THIS ISSUE:* Schindler Schiavo Case Reopens Discussion On Serious Questions / As Callous As One Can Get / The Prayer Project / In Your Own Words / Latest Canadian Statistics / Bioethical Conference Was Folly / Procedure Ban Doomed? / Non-Cooperation With Evil / Teen Magazine Polls On Sex / Quotable Quote / Self-Serving "Report" / The Cost Of Children

## SCHINDLER SCHIAVO CASE REOPENS DISCUSSION ON SERIOUS QUESTIONS

"Doctors who think they are God need to butt out of the Terri Schindler Schiavo case," LDI's Douglas R. Scott said in a press release issued in early November. Doctors who argue that the Florida legislature and Governor Jeb Bush had no business getting involved in a "medical decision" that should be left to doctors and family members "need to be reminded that they are not all-knowing and all-powerful," he said.

Scott scolded the doctors who believe they are above the law. "The duly elected representatives of the people of the great State of Florida have a vital interest in what is being done to Terri Schindler Schiavo. Doctors who believe they should not be regulated by these duly elected representatives of the people are perfect examples of why it is absolutely necessary that moral questions not be left to them." Scott said doctors are supposedly experts in medicine, but they are not gods of ethics. He pointed to a willingness of some in the medical profession to kill their patients, both born and unborn, as evidence of his point.

Clearly, all Americans have a vital interest when it comes to such issues. The protection of its citizens is the primary purpose of government. "Judges who feel differently need to be reminded of their role in the American legal system," Scott said.

Governor Bush released a statement noting that this case and his intervention are "about safeguarding the fundamental right to live for every Floridian, particularly those with disabilities. Both the U.S. and Florida constitutions secure this right, and elected officials in our state are required to protect it."

Schindler Schiavo's husband, Michael Schiavo, and his attorney are arguing that Governor Bush violated Florida's Constitution when he ordered her feeding tube reinserted. Media reports continue to describe

Schindler Schiavo as "a woman who has been in a vegetative state since 1990," but this flies in the face of expert medical testimony. In fact, Schindler Schiavo's parents have courageously fought to keep their daughter fed and they maintain that she responds to them.

It took a special act of the state legislature to give the Governor the power to intervene after a Pinellas County probate judge ruled that Terri Schindler Schiavo is in a "persistent vegetative state with no hope for recovery" and ordered her feeding tube removed. "The judge seems to think that citizens who have been dehumanized by being referred to as 'vegetables' lose their constitutional rights if some doctor believes they have no chance of recovery," Scott said. But the *guessed* chance of recovery is not the issue. "It is time that all people who value life stand up for those who are being targeted for death." Of course, the brain is the one part of the body that continues to baffle scientists in many ways.

"What is the real crime of these people who have been given a death sentence?" Scott asked. "They have the audacity to remain alive when someone wants them dead. All these people need is a little shove off the cliff and buried in the ground with the rest of the useless vegetables. Totally appalling."

Schiavo's attorney, George Felos, said "Terri's Law" violates *her* right to privacy and Florida's Constitution, in part because the law applies only to Terri Schindler Schiavo. He also said that "by compelling the reinsertion of the feeding tube," Governor Bush had "utterly disregarded her wishes and her rights." This is odd since there was no evidence that Schindler Schiavo ever made her wishes known. She certainly never said that she wished to be starved and/or dehydrated to death.

“Michael Schiavo simply wants to run away with his new girlfriend even though he is still married,” Scott said. “He wants to spend the money that should have been used for his wife’s care on himself and his female companion. Otherwise, why would Schiavo refuse to give control of medical care to Schindler-Schiavo’s parents?”

The Associated Press (AP) reported that so-called “legal scholars” predict that Governor Bush’s intervention will eventually be ruled unconstitutional. Schiavo and his attorney hope the decision comes sooner rather than later. “In my view the bill [“Terri’s Law”] is plainly unconstitutional,” said Joseph Little, professor of law at the University of Florida. He also told AP that Bush’s move was an attempt to do an end run around the courts. Little says this as though the courts have never done an end run around the legislative branch—but no one is there to declare the actions of the judiciary to be unconstitutional.

Felos told NBC that Schiavo is “deeply troubled, angry and saddened that his wife’s wishes have become a political pingpong.” He said it is a “horrible tragedy for Terri [Schindler] Schiavo, literally being abducted from her deathbed and her death process.” CNN quoted Felos as saying that Schindler Schiavo “is being force fed against her will.”

“This particular administration [of Jeb Bush] has not yet understood why we have separation of powers,” former Florida Supreme Court Justice Gerald Kogan told AP. “They seem to believe that the governor and the legislature can do whatever they want and the courts should not interfere and that’s not right.”

Bush and the lawmakers who supported the bill said they had a legitimate reason to intervene in the case to save Schindler Schiavo’s life. “Let us err on the part of not condemning this woman to a painful death...,” said state Senator Anna Cowin, R-Florida.

Meanwhile, Cecilia Martin, editor of *The Catholic Advocate*, has criticized Florida’s bishops for not speaking out in the case. (Schindler Schiavo is Catholic.) Martin said she finds the inaction “inexplicable.”

“The silence on the part of the Florida bishops is deafening. Catholics across the state are justifiably outraged at this act of cowardice,” Martin told the Catholic News Service. “The Florida bishops have made no less than ten appeals to the governor for criminals on death row, asking that their sentences be changed to life in prison. For Terri [Schindler] Schiavo, there has not been one single public word.”

The office of Bishop Robert Lynch at the Diocese of St. Petersburg, Schindler Schiavo’s diocese, originally issued a statement on October 15, 2002:

Some of the members of Terri’s family believe that her condition is irreversible and inevitably deteriorating towards death, while others do not. As there is significant disagreement among the family of Terri [Schindler] Schiavo, the Catholic Church would prefer to see all parties take the safer path. The Church, however, will refrain from passing judgment on the actions of anyone in this tragic moment.

But members of the Catholic media say the Church has already “passed judgment” on all such cases. “According to Catholic doctrine human life has inherent value and dignity regardless of its condition,” several members of the Catholic media said in a letter sent to Florida’s bishops this past July. “Medical records show that Terri [Schindler] Schiavo is not in a persistent vegetative state nor is her death imminent. Therefore, the removal of her feeding tube has the sole purpose of causing her death.”

The glossary of the Catechism defines “euthanasia” as, “An action or an omission which, of itself or by intention, causes the death of handicapped, sick, or dying persons—sometimes with an attempt to justify the act as a means of eliminating suffering.” It clearly states that euthanasia violates the fifth commandment.

“Whatever its motives and means, direct euthanasia consists of putting an end to the lives of handicapped, sick, or dying persons. It is morally unacceptable,” the Catechism reads. Thus an act or omission as described above “constitutes a murder gravely contrary to the dignity of the human person and to the respect due to the living God, his Creator. The error of judgment into which one can fall in good faith does not change the nature of this murderous act, which must always be forbidden and excluded,” it adds.

In an April 1989 statement on “The Life, Death and the Treatment of Dying Patients,” bishops said that “nourishment or hydration may be withheld or withdrawn where that treatment itself is causing harm to the patient or is useless because the patient’s death is imminent, as long as the patient is made comfortable.” First of all, nutrition and hydration are not medical treatment!” Scott said. “The bishops have given in on a critical point—and they are wrong both medically and morally.”

The statement noted that the phrases “death is imminent” and “terminally ill” are intended to imply that a physician can predict that the patient will die “within a few days or weeks, regardless of what life pro-

longing methods are utilized.” The statement referenced what the bishops called “a general rule” on such matters. They wrote that “artificial sustenance should not be withheld or withdrawn...”

Martin believes the statement is even stronger evidence of the bishops’ hypocrisy, speaking out against the execution of criminals while remaining silent about what she calls the potential murder of Terri Schindler Schiavo. “Starvation is not legal for executions, or for animals; it is deemed too cruel,” Martin wrote. “When will the Florida bishops speak?”

But Scott said that like a perceived chance of recovery, suffering is not the issue. “Placing emphasis where it does not belong—a chance of recovery, suffering, or anything else—places us on the playing field of pro-death rhetoric. The issue is that someone must act to kill another human being.”

In an open letter to the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Barbara Kralis, director of the Jesus Through Mary Foundation, wrote that, “Many Catholic laity have been ‘dumbed down’ by lack of magisterial teachings from the pulpits on the Gospel of Life and thereby are confused today on what should be done with Terri [Schindler] Schiavo’s life. Just as not one U.S. bishop has ever publicly warned he would deny Holy Communion to a manifest sinner if he approached the altar (as other world bishops have courageously done), be he a pro-abortion politician, a manifest gay activist, or a renown Mafia figure, not one U.S. bishop has intervened on Terri’s behalf to stop her very public, very horrific attempted murder.”

While religious leaders remain silent, pro-death “experts” fill the void. Arthur Caplan, Ph.D., director of the Center for Bioethics at the University of Pennsylvania, somehow believes that he is an “expert” on medical ethics. But ethics, by its very nature, is based on morality and morality has been turned into a very subjective matter. It seems that to Caplan virtually everything a doctor wants to do to a patient is justifiably “ethical.”

As usual, Caplan offered his predictable two cents on the matter. “There have been plenty of bone-headed decisions over the years by government officials and doctors playing doctor in controversial medical cases. But few lawmakers have acted as rashly, ineptly and dangerously with respect to the public as did the Florida state Legislature and Gov. Jeb Bush...”

Not surprisingly, the ever-vocal and self-described “expert” had more to say:

Why is the state’s decision so awful? The Legislature tried to craft a law that would apply only to Terri’s situation, but has instead created a policy that will have far-reaching consequences for all the state’s citizens.

Sadly, most people do not have living wills or other documents that state in writing who should make decisions for them or what they would want if they should fall into a permanent coma or be unable to communicate. Under the new law, every person in Florida who does not have a living will is now in a situation where a spouse’s decision to remove artificial feeding can be challenged.

First of all, living wills are a waste of money. “My uneducated wishes should not be considered when I am comatose,” Scott said. “It is much more important that I make a legal record of who I want to make medical decisions for me in the event I cannot do so—an educated pro-life person I implicitly trust to do the right thing—and that person may or may not be my spouse.” Caplan continued:

But there is nothing medically special about feeding tubes—and the legal challenges will not stop there. Parents or siblings will now have more legal authority to override the decision of a spouse to stop kidney dialysis, ventilators or any form of medical technology that can maintain physiological function in someone who is dying or unable to think.

What is wrong with a legal challenge if its purpose is to determine truth and prevent wrongdoing? Who do pro-death people fear it so much? Because they want to do the killing without interference—without the possibility that someone will tell them what they want to do is wrong. There is more from Caplan:

The good news is that the U.S. Supreme Court looked at these issues a decade ago in the case of Missouri’s Nancy Cruzan and affirmed the right to stop medically supplied food and nutrition to patients in permanent comas. There is every reason to think that the newly enacted Florida law is unconstitutional and will be overturned.

Florida legislators knew they were on thin ice in trying to intervene in the death of Terri [Schindler] Schiavo. Florida Sen. Jim King, the president of the Florida Senate, said after the vote: “I keep on thinking ‘What if Terri didn’t really want this done at all?’”

Okay, but what if Terri *did* want her feeding tube to be reinstated? *What if?* Should we err on the side of death? Caplan continues:

Senator, it is hard to imagine that Terri, you or anyone else would want to spend 13 years in a comatose state in a nursing home bed. But, because the Governor and the Legislature were not willing to honor their own legal system, there is a grave risk that she may well spend another 13 years—or longer—in this condition.

Pardon us, but is not the state legislature part of the “legal system?” Back to Caplan’s rant:

And what is worse, because of this law every single resident of the state now faces the same risk unless they fill out a living will. So Floridians, sharpen your pencils lest the Legislature decides that you, too, cannot have the plug pulled.

Would that “same risk” be the right of people who want to second-guess a doctor’s decision—or the decision of anyone—to ask a court or legislature to intervene to defend life? This is not an issue of “pulling the plug.” It is an issue of ending that which everything needs to sustain life—nutrition and hydration.

There are many things that a person would not want to endure and living in a coma for even a month would surely be on that list. But the key point is that they are *living*. And because they refuse to do the polite thing and die, someone takes action (or refuse to take an action) to kill them.

The truth is that Governor Jeb Bush and the legislators who supported his efforts are real lifesaving heroes. They are to be thanked and honored for doing the right thing regardless of any political ramifications. “Governor Bush has put a stake in the heart of the vampires who want blood and this is one ‘treatment’ that will not be withdrawn,” Scott said.

It should be noted that even Senator Joseph R. Lieberman, D-Conn., a pro-abortion candidate for President of the United States, has spoken out in support of Governor Bush’s actions. At this writing, the legal maneuvering for permission to kill continues. “In a best case scenario, Schindler Schiavo would become fully conscious and smack her husband and his lawyer upside the head,” Scott said.

### **AS CALLOUS AS ONE CAN GET**

In early November 2003, the *Washington Post* reported that the death of 18-year-old Holly Patterson was directly related to drugs she received at Planned Parenthood Golden Gate (San Francisco, California). Patterson took mifepristone onsite and was given a second drug, misoprostol, to take at home the next day. Within four days Patterson was at a hospital emergency room complaining of severe pain and bleeding. She returned three days later, vomiting and in great pain. Patterson died that afternoon.

The newspaper coverage was based on a report released by the local coroner who had concluded that Patterson died from “septic shock, due to endomyometritis (inflammation) due to...drug-induced abor-

tion.” At the request of the hospital where Patterson died, the California Department of Health Services and the U.S. Food & Drug Administration’s Center for Drug Evaluation and Research are investigating both the drug and the resulting death. At this writing neither agency has released their findings.

According to the *Washington Post* abortion apologists are arguing that Patterson’s death only proves that the drugs regimen is “remarkably safe” because more than 200,000 women “have successfully used the drug in North America since it came on the market three years ago.” Pro-abortion activists say that Patterson’s death “would be the first directly attributable to a medical abortion administered to a woman without other health problems.”

LDI President Douglas R. Scott described the response from the abortion-committing group “heartless.” He charged that “the Planned Parenthood hierarchy is more interested in continuing its lucrative death-by-drug practice than in protecting the lives of women and their children.”

“The FDA recognizes that once they approve a drug, the science advances and doctors use it based on scientific evidence,” said Vanessa Cullen, Planned Parenthood Federation of America’s (PPFA) vice president for medical affairs. “The opposition here is political and not medical, because the medical community is comfortable with the way the drug is being administered.”

“Once again Planned Parenthood is trying to blame others for its role in the death of an unsuspecting teenage girl,” Scott said. “Vanessa Cullen, Gloria Feldt [PPFA president], and the other elitists who think they know better than anyone else have their hands dirty—very dirty. The fact is that this potion kills. It has led to the demise of a number of women and a colossal number of children throughout the world. Yet for Planned Parenthood’s hierarchy it’s all about the odds. This is not Las Vegas or Atlantic City. We are dealing with real lives here. It’s hard to believe that even the worst Planned Parenthood official can be that callous.”

“No matter how many times Planned Parenthood tries to blame someone else for their collusion with other death-makers, we will continue to remind its leaders that they are equally as guilty as the drug manufacturer and the FDA for approving the dangerous drug.” Scott said that Planned Parenthood’s hierarchy is “no better than corporate officials who refuse to correct harmful flaws in products because the math shows it is cheaper to pay out in lost lawsuits than to fix the

problem or pull it from the market—no matter how many people are killed.”

Although drug-induced abortion is not widely used, protocol in the United States has helped make it a growing alternative to surgical abortion. Danco Laboratories, distributor of mifepristone, said sales of the drug increased by 43 percent in fiscal 2003 over the year before. Spokesman Heather O’Neill told the *Washington Post* that the growth rate is similar to what happened when the drug was introduced in Europe, where it accounts for 15 to 30 percent of abortions.

“Let’s face it,” Scott said. “This is about money and about defending every possible way there is to kill an unborn baby. Just as Planned Parenthood zealots screamed in defense of partial-birth abortion, they also want to keep this concoction—no matter how many people suffer and die.”

### THE PRAYER PROJECT

Please join us in daily prayer for the men and women who are active in the Pro-Abortion Movement and those who have not been strong in their claimed pro-life convictions: *November*—presidential candidate **Howard Dean**, D-Vermont; *December*—**Michael Schiavo**, the Florida man who is seeking court permission to kill his disabled wife; *January*—members of the anti-life band **Hell on Earth**; and *February*—Democrat candidate for President **Al Sharpton**, N.Y.

### IN YOUR OWN WORDS

Thank you for accepting our invitation to tell us what you think. The following is a sampling of the correspondences received over the past few months:

Just wanted to take a moment to say God bless all of you. I was very encouraged to see the number of companies no longer funding Planned Parenthood grow again recently.

I wrote a letter to William Harrison at [J. P. Morgan] Chase...and they responded with a justification letter, as your literature said they might. They claimed to not fund abortion with their donations, only education and so forth. Sort of like feeding your enemies army without buying them weapons.

I was very disappointed as I have been a Chase shareholder for several years. In fact, that is how I discovered LDI. In last year’s annual report, a shareholder resolution was introduced to end the bank’s corporate giving that mentioned their Planned Parenthood involvement and LDI’s boycott. (By the way, the resolution garnered a respectable 3% of all shares voted, which may not seem like much until you factor out insider shares and institutional ownership which almost always vote with management.) I was stunned as I had always thought

(rather naively) of both J. P. Morgan and Chase as bastions of conservativeness. Banks in general seem to have that image and yet it seems that financial services firms are all over *The Boycott List*.

I wrote to Jerry Jones (owner of the [Dallas] Cowboys [Football Club]) recently as well but so far I have not heard back. I suppose I may not but who knows?

Anyway, I wanted to let you know that I have been encouraged in seeing the number no longer funding increase and simply knowing you guys are out there doing what’s right.

— Daniel Jennings

LDI has never received a response to our letters and phone calls to the Dallas Cowboys.

I just read your most recent update. With great victories come great costs. Thank you for taking the heat; for standing firm; for not succumbing to pressure and compromise, and for your great personal sacrifice. I’m praying that others will respond as I did today with financial support.

But we are not of those who shrink back and are destroyed, but of those who believe and are saved: Hebrews 10:39.

Rock on!

— David A. Vercellino

Doris Gordon, who leads Libertarians for Life, wrote to comment on the issue of *Special Reports* that analyzed the recall election in California:

You said, “It is wholly indefensible that members of Congress such as...Dana Rohrabacher...did not speak out against Schwarzenegger in the early going...All of these men have run for office touting a pro-life position.”

Actually, I am surprised and glad that Rohrabacher has been voting pro-life. I knew him as a libertarian activist before he got into politics, and I had assumed that he would be vote abortion choice in Congress. It’s my understanding, however, that abortion isn’t an issue that he cares to be active in. The fact that he and Schwarzenegger are personal friends can help explain (but not necessarily excuse) his enthusiastic support for him.

A LDI Partner also comments:

Thank you so much for the article in *Special Reports* on Schwarzenegger and Republicans. You hit the nail right on the head when you said that pro-life Californians need to tell pro-abortion Republicans to send Schwarzenegger back to the Kennedy clan.

It doesn’t surprise me that the Republican Party is going down hill. It’s been slowly headed that way for some time.

Thank you for speaking out on this. I pray that more Christians and pro-lifers will do the same. Thank you also for the articles on Warren Buffet and Pampered

Chef. I anxiously await the next *Special Reports* for [Part] #3.

May God continue to bless you there and provide all of your needs.

— Lori Johnson

### LATEST CANADIAN GROUP STATISTICS

Planned Parenthood Federation of Canada (PPFC)'s annual report for 2002-2003 shows an increase in revenue. PPFC's income for fiscal year 1998-1999 was \$1,738,431. Its 1999-2000 income was down to \$1,884,665. PPFC's 2000-2001 income was a \$2,283,545. The pro-abortion group's most recently released annual report shows that its income hit a historic \$2,441,043. Not surprisingly, one key source of revenue for PPFC is the Canadian taxpayer. To our Canadian friends: We feel your pain but all is not lost.

"Thankfully, Canada has some of the best pro-life organizations in the world," said LDI's Douglas R. Scott, who pointed to the Campaign Life Coalition as an example. "They also have some of the most skilled and committed pro-lifers. I have no doubt they will eventually prevail."

### BIOETHICAL CONFERENCE WAS FOLLY

This past summer, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) and the University of Pennsylvania Center for Bioethics [UPCB] held a conference that purportedly included the world's "leading minds" in the areas of "bioethics, faith and health." The goal was to "identify and explore the bioethical aspects of emerging reproductive health issues and their implications for public policy, law, religion, science and society."

The conference, called "Beyond Abortion: Critical Bioethical Issues in Reproductive Health for the 21st Century," was the first gathering of its kind for PPFA, the world's leading pro-abortion advocacy enterprise. "Planned Parenthood is uniquely positioned to frame the increasingly complex issues surrounding emerging reproductive health technologies," PPFA President Gloria Feldt said. "It's core to our mission as advocates and health care providers to help people to make informed, responsible choices about their health and their families. Our goal is to help establish reasoned policies that balance the interests of individuals and the public square."

The conference was led by Feldt and none other than Arthur Caplan, Ph.D. (there is that name again), UPCB's director. The event focused on identifying the critical bioethical issues of reproductive health, how bioethics might mediate the division between

science and religion, how bioethics can inform public policy on reproductive health issues, and how to develop a greater understanding of these issues and their implications for the public.

According to Caplan, this gathering provided an opportunity for a diverse group of self-described "prominent thinkers" to "anticipate the challenges and opportunities that may arise from developments in reproductive technology and related practices. It is hard to imagine a more timely or more important meeting."

Readers of *Special Reports* will recall that PPFA is working toward becoming an "authoritative voice on the bioethical standards of reproductive health and sexuality." This is a primary objective of its long-range organizational plan, the Planned Parenthood Vision for 2025. Among the questions explored at the meeting were:

Are we on a path that will lead to fundamental changes in what it means to be human?

What are the implications for the meaning of "family" and for family structure?

What new developments in genomics and related technologies will create new challenges for society and bioethics in the coming decades?

How can bioethical principles, such as justice, autonomy and beneficence, assist in developing or improving reproductive health-related public policy?

What are the means and methods needed to engage the public on issues related to reproductive health technologies?

Other notable participants included two from the University of Pennsylvania: Paul Roote Wolpe, Ph.D., assistant professor of sociology in psychiatry; Glenn McGee, Ph.D., professor of bioethics and editor-in-chief of the *American Journal of Bioethics*. Also attending were: Alta Charo, professor of law and bioethics at the University of Wisconsin; Troy Duster, professor of sociology at New York University; Dr. Greg Stock, director of the program on medicine, technology and society at the University of California Los Angeles School of Public Health; Juan Enriquez, chairman and chief executive officer of Bitechnomy; Barbara Katz Rothman, professor of sociology at the City University of New York; and Tom Davis, leader of PPFA's Clergy Advisory Council. It is easy to see what these people have in common—a disrespect for human life.

What does bioethics have to do with Planned Parenthood? Not much, but it is yet another way for the abortion-committing business to put its hands into additional areas and it can serve as cover for the

group's most sinister activities. "After all," its leaders will say, "what we do is supported by the world's leading experts in bioethics."

### PROCEDURE BAN DOOMED?

President George W. Bush has signed into law the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act. Planned Parenthood immediately sought and received at least two court orders prohibiting the law from taking effect.

"The so-called Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 could put doctors in jail for providing the best and safest health care to women," said PPFA President Gloria Feldt. (Actually the name of the legislation is the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003. It is not the "so-called" Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003.) "This dangerous ban prevents women, in consultation with their families and doctors, from making decisions about their own health," she continued.

Of course, readers of *Bad Choices: A Look Inside Planned Parenthood* know what the pro-abortion leaders really think of discussions with doctors. One Planned Parenthood publication, "So You Don't Want To Be A Sex Object," describes the real relationship the group suggests for a woman and her doctor. "You should expect the doctor to take *your* choices into consideration in the matter of contraception, abortion, childbirth, surgery of any matter affecting you." If a doctor were to suggest that a woman not have an abortion, Planned Parenthood offers a suggested retort. "Doctor, unless you're proposing marriage my personal life shouldn't concern you," or, "Doctor, I'll have a baby when I choose to do so." So much for what Planned Parenthood's hierarchy thinks about consulting doctors. But saying that abortion should be a decision made between a "woman and her doctor" is a good rhetoric seller.

Feldt called the legislation, which was supported by many pro-abortion members of Congress, "the culmination of a deceptive campaign to endanger women's health and lives and mislead the public for political gain." She emphasized that the bill does not make an exception that would allow the gruesome procedure if necessary to protect a woman's health. Of course, the procedure is *never* necessary to save anybody. And according to the Supreme Court's decision in *Doe v. Bolton*, "health" is defined so broadly that it encompasses virtually all excuses.

"Planned Parenthood, the U.S. Supreme Court and the medical community agree that women, in consultation with their families and doctors—not politicians—should decide the best and safest medical treatment," Feldt said. Not only is the killing procedure called a

"medical treatment," just as nutrition and hydration are in other cases, Feldt relies on a general reverence for doctors and a disdain for politicians in her rhetoric.

LDI's leaders have predicted that the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act will eventually be ruled unconstitutional. This will effectively mean that children may be killed using any method whatsoever so long as the child is not fully out of the mother's womb. While the bill would surely not save even one baby anyway since the paid killers would simply employ another method of "treatment" for the woman's pregnancy, it did serve as an educational tool. Unfortunately, however, pro-abortion forces even diminished the educational advantage by leading people to believe that *all* late-term abortions were outlawed by the bill.

### NON-COOPERATION WITH EVIL

Catholic News Service (CNS) and several other media outlets are reporting that Texas builders have blocked construction of a \$6.2 million abortion facility in Austin. Browning Construction, one of the state's largest such firms, pulled out of the contract after a key contractor balked at the project because it was going to house a Planned Parenthood abortion facility.

"We have requested that the construction contract be terminated because we are unable to secure and retain adequate subcontractors and suppliers to complete the project in a timely manner due to events beyond our control," read a statement by Browning Construction.

Chris Danze, president of the Austin-based concrete contractor Maldonado & Danze Inc., launched his campaign in August 2003, when he learned for whom the building was going to be constructed. "When I saw that, I said to myself, 'Okay they're going to build a new building, which means they're going to need subcontractors, suppliers, many of which I know because I'm in the building business,'" Danze told CNS.

Danze sent a letter to several of his construction associates from whom he buys or to whom he sells. "I respectfully told them that if they participated in and cooperated with Planned Parenthood in building that abortion clinic that I would no longer do business with them," Danze explained. "The response was very positive. They said, 'We're with you. Not only that, but we're going to help you and call around to some of our other construction folks, concrete plants particularly, and ask them not to participate.'"

Events soon snowballed and gave birth to the Austin Area Pro-Life Concrete Contractors and Suppliers Association, an informal affiliation of every concrete supplier within a 60-mile radius of Austin. "About a

week after that we wrote 750 letters to all the businesses in San Antonio that could be identified as construction-related that might provide services and we asked them not to participate in the construction,” Danze said.

Planned Parenthood initially dismissed Danze’s effort. “It will not delay the start of this project,” Glenda Parks told an Austin television station. However, Danze said, participants then began contacting builders who had signed to do work on the construction project. “We’d call the boss and say, ‘Did you know this is an abortion clinic? Do you know what they’re going to be doing in there?’ Some of them said, ‘Yes, I don’t care.’ Others said, ‘No, I didn’t, thanks for calling. We’re out of here,’” Danze said. “That’s where it’s gone for the last four or five weeks. We’ve had support from national and state pro-life groups, local businesses.”

Danze said his efforts saw even more fruit when churches became involved. Church planning and building committees wanted names of builders who were involved in the construction of the Planned Parenthood abortion facility and those who had refused to get involved when they learned the nature of the project.

“Those planning committees got involved and said, ‘Who’s working over there? I know that guy. He wants to help me build my church. Well, he’s not going to build my church if he’s building that abortion clinic,’” Danze recalled. “They started making calls and suppliers started bailing out. The plumber bailed. You know he started the plumbing job, had all his pipes installed in the foundation, but he told Browning, the general contractor, he quit. He can’t afford it. He can’t afford to lose church work.”

The media reported that some contractors received 1,200 phone calls. But the decision of Browning Construction sparked an outcry from abortion apologists, including some local politicians. “This is not a simple demonstration of free speech rights,” Danielle Tierney, spokesman for Planned Parenthood of the Texas Capital Region, told AP. “This is denying people affordable health care and reproductive rights.” She called the action a “campaign of harassment and intimidation” and said the building project will be completed.

Elizabeth Graham of Texas Right to Life called Danze a “true American hero.” She said the Planned Parenthood statement simply was not true. “Planned Parenthood will tell you that in Austin only five percent of their business is abortion and the rest of

their business will be for providing women’s health care, contraception, and the like. Planned Parenthood is America’s number one abortion provider. Most of their business is on the sale of abortion, their tax forms indicate that,” Graham told CNS. “There are enough clean (non-abortion) women’s health care providers in the Austin area that Planned Parenthood does not need to build a new \$6.2 million facility.”

Some have questioned the legality of Danze’s tactics. “These people have gone way beyond the boundary and violated the very tenets that make our community strong,” Gus Garcia, former Austin mayor said at a press conference, joining others in charging the proliferators with “illegal activities.”

“There’s nothing illegal about it at all,” Danze replied. “They can’t cite one thing we did that was illegal. We made phone calls and we were polite. If they have evidence, then they need to call the district attorney.”

Mark Proeger, college pastor at Austin’s Hope Chapel, said the media and “pro-abortion crowd” want to make them look like “small extremists.” But Danze, Proeger and Graham vowed to continue the fight until Planned Parenthood abandons the project altogether, something the pro-abortion outfit emphasized would not happen.

How would Planned Parenthood get its abortion facility built? In mid-November the *Austin Chronicle* reported that the group will do the work itself. “We are going to become our own general contractor,” Parks told a crowd of about 500 at the group’s annual public affairs luncheon. The event, attended by many elected officials, took in more than \$180,000, topping the group’s previous fund-raisers. The total included nearly \$33,000 that was collected midway through the luncheon, when attendees dutifully took out their checkbooks in response to an appeal for more money.

“We have a few legal details to work out,” Parks told the gathering. “But we will see the building going up.” Planned Parenthood will have the assistance of other general contractors who contacted the organization in the wake of publicity about Danze’s success, the *Chronicle* reported.

Danze vows to continue what he has started, but whatever happens he was successful in delaying construction and giving Planned Parenthood officials a big headache. “It was a real shock because we had been working with Browning since November,” Parks said.

Planned Parenthood is out for revenge, claiming that Danze and his supporters employed unethical if not

illegal tactics. The subcontractors who vacated the project did not join Danze because they agreed with him, insists Planned Parenthood's architect, Tom Hatch. "They joined...because their livelihood was being threatened." Hatch told the newspaper that he received a call from Danze. "He respectfully requested that I not work on the 'abortion chamber.' I told him I've been working with Planned Parenthood for 25 years, and I would respectfully ask him to stop harassing me and others on the project." Now politely asking a person to stop doing something is "harassment."

### TEEN MAGAZINE POLLS ON SEX

"OK, we admit it: Like most of you, we have sex on the brain..." So begins the *Teen People* sex survey. Conducted via the Internet, the nationwide survey consisted of 1,337 respondents between the ages of 13 and 19. Here are some of the highlights:

- 62 percent said they had learned little or nothing in school sexuality education classes;
- 52 percent said they were not currently in a relationship;
- 11 percent said it is "very important" to be in a relationship, 31 percent said it is "somewhat important," seven percent said it was "somewhat unimportant," and 13 percent said that being in a relationship is "completely unimportant";
- teenagers who come from wealth tend to have more sexual partners and engage in sexual activities they do not enjoy;
- 58 percent of boys have not had sexual intercourse;
- most of the boys who say they have had sexual intercourse say they did so at the age of 15;
- 46 percent of boys who said they have been sexually active had one partner, 31 percent have had two or three partners, and a few have had many more partners;
- 46 percent of girls said they were not having sexual intercourse;
- 16 percent of those girls who claimed they have had sexual intercourse first did so at 14 years of age, 23 percent said their first sexual intercourse took place when they were 15 years old, 21 percent at age 16, and 18 percent at age 17;
- 40 percent of teenagers who said they are sexually active have had sex with one partner, 29 percent have had two or three partners, 17 percent say they have had sex with four or five people, five percent had six or seven partners, five percent have had between eight and ten partners, and four percent claim to have had as many as 25 different partners;

- 67 percent of homosexual teenagers and 88 percent of bisexuals have had more than one sexual partner, which is far higher than their heterosexual peers;
- 31 percent said they always use birth control, but more than 60 percent chose abstinence; and most girls who have had sexual intercourse did so because they thought they were in love and many did so to be like their peers;
- ten percent of the teenagers said they had engaged in sexual behavior they did not enjoy (a whopping 84 percent being girls);
- 26 percent of girls said they had engaged in some type of sexual activity in a group setting;
- 15 percent said drugs or alcohol had affected their sexual decision-making; and
- most teenagers who chose not to engage in a sexual did so for religious or moral reasons.

It is important to keep in mind that the survey is totally unscientific. One can also expect that the rates of sexual activity are highly inflated, particularly since many teenagers, especially boys, exaggerate or lie outright about such matters. It should also be noted that the survey included teenagers who are married or engaged and most moral young people would never subscribe to a rag like *Teen People* or visit its website. And, of course, it is *assumed* that no one below 13 years of age or older than 19 participated in the online poll.

Another magazine aimed at teenagers, *CosmoGIRL*, includes a section called, "Hear Me Roar." The November 2003 edition featured a pro-abortion and an anti-religion rant. The pro-abortion writer, identified as 16-year-old Heather of Columbia, South Carolina, wrote:

My friend recently had an *abortion*, unwillingly, because her dad made her. Making *choices* for a girl about her body is simply *wrong* in every way. I'm not against abortion; I just don't think a man should tell a *woman* what to do with her *body*. Men have no idea what we feel.

The anti-religion writer, identified as 16-year-old "Joy" of Austin, Texas, wrote:

Don't you just *hate* it when people try to *convert* you to their religion? Or when they talk about how no religion other than theirs is the *right* one? I have enough respect for my friends not to *preach* to them, but some of my friends don't respect my *beliefs* enough not to try to convert me. That really bothers me.

It seems that a person who believes his or her religion may not be "right" is basically giving a reason why no one else should embrace it. It also shows a lack of faith and makes religion out to be a club rather than

anything truly important. Furthermore, if you honestly believe that your religion is the truth and the one way to heaven but you fail to share that with those you claim to care about, what kind of love is that? People who share their faith are showing true love and care for others. Those who are hearing the message should appreciate this fact, even if they never accept the religion. Despite references to “shoving re-ligion down someone’s throat,” we have yet to see it literally happen. Just how exactly does one do that?

The same issue of *CosmoGIRL* prominently featured an interview with Eliot Spitzer, the radical pro-abortion attorney general of New York. The piece was titled, “The Good Guy.” The article’s author wrote that it was Spitzer’s “honesty and integrity” that got him elected. Honesty? Integrity? Now those are the last word in the English language that could legitimately be associated with Spitzer, who has relentlessly, shamefully and dishonestly tried to shut down pregnancy help centers. Nevertheless, the goal of the magazine editors was to paint Spitzer as a man who should someday be President of the United States. And unfortunately young people will form an opinion based on a huge distortion of reality.

The magazine has a column written by New York City resident Terry Iacuzzo that is called, “Ask The Psychic.” And, of course, there is the usual horoscope section.

**ACTION:** Does your daughter or granddaughter read magazines such as *Teen People* and *CosmoGIRL*? Are such magazines available at your local schools? Find out.

### QUOTABLE QUOTE

“This is the real face of Bush’s compassionate conservatism—a war on women and their children across the globe in flagrant violation of women’s legal rights.”

— PPFA’s Gloria Feldt on President George W. Bush’s extension of the “global gag rule,” *tompaine.com*, September 8, 2003.

### SELF-SERVING “REPORT”

According to a new “report,” the Bush Administration’s “global gag rule” endangers the lives and health of women, children and families in some of the world’s poorest countries. “Access Denied: U.S. Restrictions on International Family Planning” takes an indepth look into the effects of the policy and was released less than a month after the President extended the rule to State Department family planning funds. In essence, the rule prohibits groups that receive money from the American taxpayer from including abortion as a method of “family planning.”

When President Bush implemented the rule, hours after his inauguration in 2001, he said that, “American taxpayers don’t want their money going to pay for abortions in developing countries.” But PPFA President Gloria Feldt argues that if he would read the report, “he would know that our money doesn’t go to pay for abortions in developing countries. In fact the global gag rule will cause more women to seek abortions because fewer women will have access to family planning services that prevent abortions.”

“Because of Bush’s policy, the Lesotho Planned Parenthood Association no longer receives condoms from the United States—even though it has perhaps the highest HIV-infection rate in Africa,” Feldt lamented. “Women in Nairobi, Kenya, may have to go without basic healthcare because the only nearby health clinic was forced to close. And in Romania, women continue to die from unsafe though legal abortions because family planning providers cannot talk about abortion with their clients.” Of course, simply eliminating abortion from the equation is too much to ask of the group, despite the fact that doing so would once again allow the money to flow. Feldt continued:

Perhaps what the president meant to say was, “Americans are willing to risk the lives of millions of women and children to ensure they are never able to have a safe abortion.” Or that “Americans don’t believe that we should be paying for poor women in poor countries to have birth control or better health care.” But that also would not have been true. In fact, most American voters oppose the global gag rule. And nearly 70 percent of American voters believe that the United States should be supporting the very programs discussed here this morning—on a par with support for the war against terrorism.

Feldt said the Bush Administration “has had some success in masking its extremist agenda with feel-good talk about supporting women’s health and human rights.”

Planned Parenthood of the Columbia/Willamette, based in Portland, Oregon, released an overall message about President Bush’s policies:

Even the *New York Times* is proclaiming that Bush administration anti-abortion policies will lead to women dying. In a stunning editorial on January 12 – “The War Against Women”—the *Times* confirmed what we all know—that right now women’s constitutional liberties are being threatened, essential reproductive health care is being denied or delayed and some women will die needlessly.

“On the surface, the Bush Administration’s war against women’s rights is a series of largely unnoted changes. It is intended to look that way. In reality it is a steady

march into the past, to a time before *Roe v. Wade* when abortion was illegal and pregnancy was more a matter of fate than of choice.”

*Even the New York Times* opposes the Bush Administration’s policies? *Even the New York Times*? Not only does the *New York Times* editorialize for unrestricted abortion, the New York Times Company donates money to Planned Parenthood.

Oh, who conducted the study that produced the report titled, “Access Denied: U.S. Restrictions on International Family Planning”? Population Action International, in partnership with PPFPA. Other groups assisting in the “study” included Pathfinder International and EngenderHealth. All of these groups are outrageously pro-abortion and most would financially benefit if the Bush Administration’s rule, which has already been found to be constitutional and reasonable by the U.S. Supreme Court, were to be rescinded.

### THE COST OF CHILDREN

LDI recently received the following e-mail. We thought you would enjoy it as much as we did, particularly at this special time of year. The author is unknown.

The government recently calculated the cost of raising a child from birth to age 18 and came up with a total of \$160,140.00 for a middle-income family.

Talk about sticker shock! That doesn’t even touch college tuition.

But \$160,140 isn’t so bad if you break it down. It translates into \$8,896.66 a year, \$741.38 a month, or \$171.08 a week. That’s a mere \$24.24 a day! Just over a dollar an hour. Still, one may think the best financial advice is “don’t have children if you want to be ‘rich.’”

Actually, it is just the opposite. What do you get for your \$160,140?

Naming rights. First, middle, and last!

Glimpses of God every day.

Giggles under the covers.

More love than you ever thought your heart can hold.

Butterfly kisses and Velcro hugs.

Endless wonder over rocks, ants, clouds and warm cookies.

A hand to hold, which is usually covered with jelly or chocolate.

Someone to laugh yourself silly with, no matter what the boss said or how your stocks performed that day.

For a mere \$160,140 you never really have to grow up.

You get to fingerprint, carve pumpkins, play hide-and-seek, catch lightning bugs, and never stop believing in Santa Claus.

A partner for blowing bubbles, flying kites, building sand castles and skipping down the sidewalk in the pouring rain.

You have an excuse to keep reading *The Adventures of Piglet and Pooh*, watching Saturday morning cartoons, going to children’s movies and wishing on stars.

You get to frame rainbows, hearts and flowers under refrigerator magnets and collect spray painted noodle wreaths for Christmas, hand prints set in clay for Mother’s Day and cards with backward letters for Father’s Day.

For \$160,140 there is no greater bang for your buck.

You get to be a hero just for retrieving a Frisbee off the garage roof, taking the training wheels off a bike, removing a splinter, filling a wading pool, coaxing a wad of gum out of bangs and coaching a baseball team that never wins but always gets treated to ice cream anyway.

You get a front row seat in history to witness the first step, first word, first date, first prom, and first time behind the wheel, even if the last few are rather scary.

You get to be immortal. You get another branch added to your family tree and, if you’re lucky, a long list of limbs in your obituary called grandchildren and great grandchildren.

You get irrefutable proof that God wants the world to go on. Of all the people in the world He has chosen *you* to care for someone created in His own image.

You get an education in psychology, nursing, criminal justice, communications and human sexuality that no college can match.

You have the power to heal a boo-boo, scare away mon-sters under the bed, patch a broken heart, police a slumber party, ground them forever and love them without limits so that one day they will, like you, love without counting the cost.

No price can be placed on an “I love you, Mom,” “I love you, Dad,” “I love you, Grandma,” and “I love you, Grandpa.” Enjoy your children and grandchildren every day of the year, no matter what their age.

All of us at LDI pray that you have the most joyous and blessed holidays ever!

*The Caleb Report*, an official periodical of Life Decisions International (LDI), is published six times per year. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every LDI Partner, members of its Board of Directors/Advisors or staff. Visit us at: [www.fightpp.org](http://www.fightpp.org). This publication may be copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation. Write: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161. Phone: (540) 631-0380.

© 2003 Life Decisions International.