



The Caleb Report

July-August 2004

Life Decisions International

vol. xii · no. 4

IN THIS ISSUE: Liberals Of A Feather: Pro-Life Leaders Weigh In On Kerry's Running Mate / HLI Repelling Insurgents / Another Self-Serving Survey / In Your Own Words / Update: Corporate Funding Project / Convention Speakers Cause Stir / The Prayer Project / Pro-Abortion "Catholics" / Quotable Quote / "Free" Birth Control Distributed / Better Check That Mailing List

LIBERALS OF A FEATHER...

Pro-Life Leaders Weigh In On Kerry's Running Mate

LDI President Douglas R. Scott has criticized the presumptive Democratic Party nominee for President, Senator John F. Kerry, Mass., as well as Senator John Edwards, N.C., who will be Kerry's running mate. Other pro-life leaders have followed suit. A millionaire trial lawyer, Edwards is currently serving his first term in the United States Senate. In fact, the Senate is the *only* position of public service he has ever held.

"I have chosen a man who understands and defends the values of America," Kerry said in announcing his selection, but Scott disagrees. "These two men are virtually identical. Instead of having two northern leftists we have one northern leftist and one southern leftist. But an unwavering liberal is an unwavering liberal, no matter where he calls home. These men have nothing in common with the values of the vast majority of Americas," Scott said.

Scott said that Edwards could have easily been elected to public office in any liberal northeastern state. "John Edwards may have a southern accent; he may have folksy charm; he may even make his home in the south," Scott said. "But make no mistake—his politics are all northeastern liberal."

Scott, who has been critical of Kerry for claiming to be "Catholic," said both Kerry and Edwards are in favor of *every* kind of abortion. "They support absolutely no protective legislation. They are opposed to educating women about abortion and the nature of the unborn child. Their policies, both domestic and foreign, will rely on abortion as a 'solution' to social problems. They will answer to Planned Parenthood and NARAL." Kerry and Edwards are "just like Bill

and Hillary Clinton when it comes to a respect for unborn human life," Scott said. "They have none."

Edwards has not cast even one pro-life vote in the Senate. "The right to choose is an essential ingredient to realize the full equality of America," he said. Despite having southern roots and a populist image, Edwards is rated as the fourth most liberal member of the Senate. And who comes in first? Kerry.

In 1999 and 2003, Edwards joined a majority of his colleagues in expressing the Senate's support for the *Roe v. Wade* decision. He also voted against the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. Edwards has voted for taxpayer-funded abortions and against the Unborn Victims of Violence Act.

During his campaign for President, Edwards visited Planned Parenthood of New England. In 2003, he celebrated the anniversary of *Roe v. Wade* with NARAL Pro-Choice America.

Edwards has come under fire from pro-life leaders numerous times for voting against President George W. Bush's anti-*Roe v. Wade* judicial nominees. He supported efforts by abortion advocates in the Senate to filibuster several nominees for key appeals court positions.

In 2003, Edwards proclaimed that he would oppose the nomination of any judge who does not share his pro-abortion beliefs. "I don't believe in litmus tests," he said, "but I believe very strongly that the right to choose and the right to privacy are fundamental constitutional rights and I can't imagine supporting a Supreme Court nominee who doesn't share my view of the Constitution. I would use every effective means

to stop a nominee I oppose.” Why does this sound exactly like a litmus test?

“John Kerry has selected a vice presidential candidate whose Senate record mirrors his own,” Family Research Council (FRC) President Tony Perkins said. Kerry and Edwards have a zero percent rating from FRC and a 100 percent rating from NARAL. Perkins also said that both men have “a history of opposing judicial nominees simply because of their deeply held religious beliefs.”

“The Democrats continue to be the party of abortion. No one turns from pro-life to pro-abortion; unless, of course, you are a Democrat who wants to be president,” Scott said. “In that case, it is well known that one must worship at the altar of abortion if one is to have any chance of winning the nomination.” A former elected Democratic Party official, Scott said he will not return to the party so long as it “embraces death.”

Interestingly, or should we say “astonishingly,” pro-abortion Senator Dick Durbin, D-Ill., has compiled a list of Senate votes and claims that Kerry and other abortion advocates vote with the Catholic Church more often than lawmakers who oppose abortion. Durbin’s survey consisted of votes on those issues the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) has taken a position.

Included in the survey were votes ranging from banning human cloning and partial-birth abortion to limiting the use of mercury in thermometers. Despite the obviously vast difference in importance, Durbin weighted them equally. According to his calculations, Kerry voted in favor of positions taken by the USCCB more than any other member of the Senate.

Kerry has been a consistent and vocal advocate of unrestricted abortion. “Yet Durbin would have us believe that this life-and-death matter is morally equivalent to *every* other issue,” Scott said. Kerry continues to claim he is “personally” opposed to abortion, but he is voting and advocating for it for the good of the country. “Why do I doubt Kerry when he claims to be personally opposed to abortion?” Scott asked. “How would his voting record be different if he personally loved abortion?”

Who placed second in Durbin’s survey? He did. And the most laughable of all is that Kerry’s biggest fan, Senator Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., placed third. All three men not only vote pro-abortion, they vociferously advocate for it. “In doing so, they stand alongside some of the most anti-religion bigots in the country,” Scott said.

H.L.I. REPELLING INSURGENTS

As reported in the May-June 2004 edition of *The Caleb Report*, Human Life International (HLI) has been under attack from a former employee who has decided to take the name “Family Life International” (FLI), which is part of HLI’s heritage. The former employee has convinced a handful of HLI affiliates to join him and end their association with HLI. He has also accused HLI of failing to carry on the vision of the organization’s founder, Fr. Paul Marx. The rogue “leader” placed full-page advertisements in *The Wanderer* and two other publications in an effort to woo donors.

“HLI cooperates with any pro-life organization that does honest pro-life work,” said HLI President Fr. Thomas J. Euteneuer, “but in this case we felt the need to speak out about the divisive campaign and to dispel the confusion for our donors, family and friends.” HLI’s Board of Directors placed a statement in *The Wanderer* in an effort to “clear up any confusion about FLI or HLI.” The statement effectively squashes the claim that HLI has been ineffective and lost the vision of its founder.

Highlights of the statement in *The Wanderer* follow:

In the June 17th edition of *The Wanderer*, an advertisement...gave the wholly erroneous impression that Human Life International’s unique charisma and mission have been supplanted by another “pro-life, pro-family” organization claiming the mantle of our venerable founder, Fr. Paul Marx. It was even strongly suggested...that our two-decades-old, battle-hardened, front lines pro-life organization has been negligent in fighting the International Planned Parenthood Federation—an irresponsible assertion that we reject categorically. Insinuations of this type and the confusion that this advertisement has generated among our affiliates, donors and other pro-life leaders around the world oblige us to speak out and set the record straight.

We note for the record that since this campaign began a month ago, the “morning after” pill has been legalized in Peru and abortion is on the verge of being legalized in Sri Lanka, places where we could have been investing significant amounts of time and resources were we not at home defending ourselves from a copycat organization. At a time when all are clamoring for unity and clarity of purpose in the pro-life movement such a campaign of confusion and division is not the work of Christ and will benefit no one but Planned Parenthood and its ilk.

...
“As gold is tested by fire...” (Ps 66:10). All communities of faith go through the pains of growth and purification in order to mature, and HLI is no different. It has survived its period of greatest testing

and has come out stronger than anyone could have imagined. This is entirely due to the grace of God and the favor of Our Lady. We as the governing body of this organization have faithfully fulfilled our duty before God and man to redress the historical difficulties that once threatened our mission, and we have done so with a clear conscience. For the past three years, our President and CEO, Fr. Thomas Euteneuer, has worked closely with us to restore order in our house, and we now see the long-term effect of that sacrifice in a unified operation, internally and externally, and a mission that is bearing abundant fruit. HLI is now, in the words of the psalmist, “gold tested by fire.”

“By their fruits ye shall know them” (Mt: 7:20). Without any desire for self-promotion, we wish to give witness to a few of the most significant achievements by HLI pro-life missionaries and saints throughout the world that have come to fruition in recent times. Since these matters concern pro-life action in other countries, many if not most American pro-lifers may not be aware that HLI is having such a dramatic impact for life outside of the U.S...

HLI’s Board of Directors continued by outlining many impressive examples of the organization’s work throughout the world, including Mexico, Kenya, the Philippines, Uruguay, and Colombia. The Directors noted that the list of examples could be “multiplied exponentially” if one considers HLI’s accomplishments throughout its...existence. “As we approach our *Silver Jubilee* year, which will begin in 2005, we rejoice that we are remaining ‘Faithful for Life’ and following in the footsteps of the intrepid ‘Apostle of Life,’” the Directors wrote. The statement continued:

“From the rising of the sun to its setting...” (Ps113:3). To confirm this truth further we need only point out the sheer volume of pro-life missionary activity that the HLI central office and the HLI affiliates carry out uninterruptedly in virtually every time zone of the world. To paraphrase what was said of Queen Victoria’s British Empire, “the sun never sets on the HLI family.”

“Go out and make disciples of all the nations...” (Mt 28:19). HLI’s God-given mission is growing. In the past two years HLI has added eleven new affiliates to our network, and we have recently launched new initiatives in the Caribbean and West Africa where there presently exists no organized pro-life movement. Nor do we intend to scale back our efforts anytime in the near future. As we never tire of saying, in many countries of the world there would be no pro-life movement at all if it were not for HLI. We have been sent forth to carry the *Gospel of Life* to the nations and remain committed to this mission with the same zeal and grace that filled the soul of our beloved founder

Father Marx when he set HLI on its journey nearly 25 years ago.

So...Fr. Marx’s legacy is alive and well at HLI.

As we conclude this statement, we express our most profound sentiments of gratitude to all of you who have been our staunchest supporters for nearly a quarter century and whose generosity—we emphasize—has not been squandered by HLI. Indeed, you have made us HLI...

A statement from HLI is one thing, but when one of the very newspapers that took the new FLI’s advertisement supports HLI, it means a lot. Alphonse J. Matt, Jr., editor and publisher of *The Wanderer*, included a statement of his own which followed that written by HLI’s Board of Directors:

I would like to explain why Human Life International asked us to publish their message in this issue. As noted in the opening paragraph above, *The Wanderer* published an advertisement in the June 17th issue announcing the launching of Family Life International...Our advertising director accepted the ad, assuming it was...not a direct challenge to the almost twenty-five-year-old organization Human Life International, founded by Father Paul Marx. *The Wanderer* published a series of critical reports a few years ago concerning the administration of HLI. Since that time an almost entirely new board of directors has assumed control of HLI, and its president, Fr. Thomas Euteneuer, is doing outstanding work in leading HLI.

It is our belief that it is profoundly counter-productive for pro-life groups to openly compete for supporters among a narrow constituency. God knows the culture of death continues to dominate our civilization, and it is far better to develop new constituencies with new programs to oppose this evil than to engage in futile me-tooism.

Apparently believing the scheme had been successful, the new FLI brazenly asked HLI’s leadership to “work with” them in the name of unity in the Pro-Life Movement. In other words, the new FLI asked HLI to accept the new form in which FLI now exists (as a separate entity) and to ignore the ongoing deeds of the new group’s leader. “This is par for the course,” Scott said. “The man used underhanded, dirty tactics to harm HLI, and then he had the audacity to seek cooperation and legitimacy from the group that was wronged.” Scott said there is no way that HLI should accept such actions.

Scott said that the new FLI leader is flaunting the names of the HLI affiliates he convinced to join his scheme right in the face of HLI’s leadership at the same time he is calling for unity. “This guy did not care about unity or working together when he was doing his evil deeds,” Scott said. “No one would

want to work with a person who cannot be trusted.” Scott has called on the former HLI employee to stop what he is doing and seek forgiveness.

One HLI staff member was so happy that LDI had defended the organization that he wrote to tell us:

After many weeks of confusion and anger and just plain heartbreak over the FLI situation, it warms my heart to see that others can discern what is happening here. Thanks so much for the vote of confidence and the support. I’ve been here for nine years now, longer than anyone else here, believe it or not, and I have seen it all happen. So it is greatly encouraging to get a little glimmer of light now and then. Thanks for being the light.

The author of the message, Brian Clowes, called LDI’s coverage of this matter “a piece of art.” We told Clowes that LDI was defending HLI for only one reason—HLI is morally right.

ANOTHER SELF-SERVING SURVEY

A nationwide survey shows that newer “reproductive health options” such as birth control patches, rings, new sterilization methods, and others are “poorly covered by insurance companies” when compared to “more traditional” methods such as the birth control pill. The study revealed that while newer options and technologies are approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), numerous insurance companies are not extending coverage for them as they have for procedures and products that have been in use for many years.

According to the survey, nearly 80 percent of benefits managers rated their insurance coverage of “reproductive health” as “excellent” or “good,” but many newer products and procedures were not covered by their respective insurance plans. The survey was sponsored by three rabidly pro-abortion groups: Association of Reproductive Health Professionals (ARHP), Black Women’s Health Imperative (BWHI), and Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA).

“While many new contraceptive options are now approved in the U.S., the significant delay in insurance coverage of these options is severely limiting women’s access,” said Pablo Rodriguez, M.D., associate chief of obstetrics and gynecology at Women & Infants Hospital in Providence, Rhode Island, and a member of ARHP’s board of directors. “The ‘cookie cutter’ approach to women’s health care is no longer necessary because now we can more closely match the unique needs of women with the many safe and effective contraceptive options available. Women from all social environments, races,

and economic conditions benefit from having a broader range of contraceptive options because they help reduce the rates of unintended pregnancies and abortions.”

When looking at reversible options, the highest level of insurance coverage was for oral birth control. Nearly 80 percent of insurance companies pay for oral birth control, which the survey’s three sponsors referred to as “an older form of birth control.” Between 40 and 50 percent of companies cover newer options such as birth control injections, the “ring” (NuvaRing), or the “patch” (OrthoEvra). So-called “emergency contraception” (Plan B), also known as the “morning after pill,” was covered the least often.

When examining coverage of irreversible birth control options, including hysteroscopic sterilization (Essure), tubal ligation, and vasectomies, the survey showed that the newer option, Essure, which is less expensive and less invasive than traditional procedures, was least frequently covered by health insurance plans. It is worth noting that funding for the survey was provided by Conceptus Inc., which markets Essure. So the survey basically states that insurers should pay for the product of the corporation that funded it. This serves as a disguised advertisement for Conceptus Inc., as it is presented in the form of a “study.”

“Improving access to newer types of reproductive health options, especially when they demonstrate cost savings, should be a priority for healthcare payers,” said Vanessa Cullins, M.D., PPFA’s vice president for medical affairs. She continued:

Many newer contraceptive methods have the same efficacy and safety as more traditional methods, but often have novel delivery systems that ultimately improve a woman’s proper use of and satisfaction with a method. The survey shows that many newer methods are not adequately covered. For example, only one third of insurance companies covered a newer, less invasive and more cost effective permanent contraception procedure for women, called hysteroscopic sterilization, versus traditional tubal ligation, which requires an incision and that women undergo intra-abdominal surgery.”

The survey revealed that while coverage of fertility procedures was a top request by employees, it was limited. In-vitro fertilization was only covered by 28 percent of companies while ovulation induction drugs and procedures, artificial insemination, and uterine arterial embolization also had low levels of coverage at 26 percent each.

Lorraine Cole, Ph.D., president and chief executive officer of BWHI, commented on the matter:

— Adam Westphal

There is a clear need for insurance companies to examine their current reproductive health coverage options. The gaps between the discovery of medical advances and their delivery to patients typically have the greatest impact on racial/ethnic minority groups. Access to a full range of reproductive health care options is important for all American women, but is particularly critical for African-Americans who are four times more likely than white women to die from a pregnancy-related cause.”

The survey examined the healthcare coverage decision-making process for new “reproductive health” products and procedures. The majority of decisions is driven by the insurer, not benefits managers, employees or even recommendations by the American Medical Association (AMA). In fact, according to the survey, nearly one-third of employees make requests for coverage of “reproductive health” options, but their input has limited impact as they are frequently denied access to newer products and procedures.

The survey findings support results from a report issued by PPFA affiliate The Alan Guttmacher Institute (AGI). Titled, “U.S. Insurance Coverage of Contraceptives and the Impact of Contraceptive Coverage Mandates, 2002,” the report stated that birth control coverage has increased significantly over the past decade, but the sponsors of the most recent survey argue that “there is still a need for greater access to women’s contraceptive options.” They also claim the results of the survey “highlight the importance of better overall contraceptive coverage as well as equalizing coverage across a broader range of methods to help women prevent unintended pregnancy.”

IN YOUR OWN WORDS

LDI often provides space for its supporters (and detractors) to have their say about various issues:

“I am...excited about being part of such an organization.”

— Donald Wheeler

I have spent more than half an hour trying to order online 4 copies of the list of the targeted buildings [sic] for boycotting. I cannot seem to get my paypal account to work with your site, and I wanted to let you know what a pain it is to try and order your material online. I have given up trying to order the list online, and I’m not going to bother trying to get it through the mail. I do a lot of work for the pro-life cause in Des Moines, Ia, and this list would help me greatly—however, I do not have the time to screw around with a site that is uncooperative for the consumer.

All he needed to do was ask for help. Sometimes a website may be down for maintenance or due to a technical problem. In any case, they are usually restored within a few hours. We at LDI did not invent the Internet; it just takes some patience.

While searching to learn if Verizon is a supporter of Planned Parenthood, I found your site. My initial joy was followed by anger that the list is not on your site, but is being sold.

Outrageous! I know that your organization needs funding and I have no objection to selling products in general. But selling the list as a “product” will do nothing but hinder the progress you had hoped to obtain.

Putting the list of PP supporters on a freely available website will exponentially increase its visibility. The link will be forwarded by pro-life activists and so forth. It will be written about in weblogs [sic] and quoted in newspapers.

These things will not happen when you sell the info: too many barriers are erected. Human nature, being what it is, people (such as myself) will not take the time to place the order, wait for the info and pass it on to others, especially when the “others” will be obligated to do the same (order...pay...wait)...

— Stanton R. Gould

Anyone who would like to know why LDI’s Board of Directors has established the current policy regarding how *The Boycott List* is distributed need only check our website: fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=gift. Gould apparently thought it was too much trouble to visit this particular page, even though he was already visiting the website.

I have spent some time reading through your works on the above subject. I am so pleased that an organization like yours is doing such a great work on behalf of humanity.

The Planned Parenthood Federation has also sold those ideas of death to many countries around the world and are [sic] consciously and/or unconsciously killing many children in the transition from the womb to the earth.

I am writing to congratulate your organization and pray that your efforts can be extended to other parts of the world, especially in Africa, where they have stronghold of our women and even the government.

May God continue to guide your efforts, until victory over the “Culture of Death” is announced and a new “Culture of Life” is established for all people of the world. We are behind your efforts...

— Raphael Ogar Oko
Teachers Without Borders—Nigeria

UPDATE: CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

In Section II of *The Boycott List*, which begins on page 5, please delete the following products as they are no longer being boycotted:

ANIMAL/PET CARE: Palamega Complex tablets, Proticall.

FOOD & DRINK: Paas Easter egg decorating kit.

HEALTH: Afrin, ChlorTrimeton, Coricidin, Correctol, Di-Gel, Dr. Scholl's, Drixoral, Feen-A-Mint, Gyne-Lotrimin, Lotrimin AF, Mexsana, Muskol, Solarcaine, St. Joseph aspirin, Tinactin.

PERSONAL CARE: A & D products, Clear Passage, Coppertone, Cushion Grip, Dr. Scholl's, Duofil, Duration, Feen-A-Mint, Gyne-Lotrimin, Lotrimin AF, Mexsana, Muskol, Ocular, Solarcaine, St. Joseph aspirin, Tinactin.

Despite previous private assurances that it would never give to Planned Parenthood, pharmaceutical giant Pfizer Inc. was added to the June 2004 edition of *The Boycott List* for doing just that. "Needless-to-say, we are very disappointed that Pfizer Inc. has decided to support Planned Parenthood," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, who administers the Corporate Funding Project.

In a May 13, 2004 letter to Henry A. McKinnell, Jr., Pfizer's chairman & chief executive officer, Scott noted that abortion is one of the most controversial issues in the world. "By supporting Planned Parenthood, Pfizer has thrust itself into the middle of this volatile issue," he wrote. "It seems that regardless of the personal views of the employees at Pfizer Inc., it is not in the best interest of any corporation to become embroiled in such a controversial issue. Doing so is simply bad business."

Responding on behalf of McKinnell was Richard Luftglass, Pfizer Inc.'s director for U.S. Philanthropy. He wrote that the Company "does not provide unrestricted direct contributions to Planned Parenthood." He went on to say that, "From time to time, in some local communities where Pfizer has facilities, the local sites or employees provide grants in support for programs such as health education, public awareness and community health."

Scott responded to Luftglass' points: "It is immaterial to us whether or not gifts to Planned Parenthood are 'unrestricted' or 'direct.' A restricted grant is merely a matter of bookkeeping. *Any* support of Planned Parenthood releases unrestricted funds for abortion-related activity. And how a gift reaches the pro-abortion group is nothing more than an issue of philanthropic procedure."

Luftglass wrote that Pfizer Inc. recognizes that "individuals and organizations have different perspectives on social and health issues such as abortion. As a company," he continued, Pfizer believes it would be inappropriate to "take a position in this area."

Scott challenged Luftglass' reasoning. "It is inherently impossible to fund the world's leading abortion advocacy group while simultaneously claiming a neutral position on abortion. Pfizer's support of Planned Parenthood gives the group legitimacy," Scott wrote. "If the Ku Klux Klan were to open a non-racist reading program to all young people, would Pfizer or any other corporation fund it while claiming to take no position on racism? Of course not."

Scott sent material to Luftglass that demonstrates Planned Parenthood's insidious nature and asked Pfizer's leadership to examine it. "Does Pfizer *really* want to be associated with such a group?" he asked.

Luftglass concluded his letter by claiming that a boycott of Pfizer would harm sick people. "Pfizer's products are important therapies for diseases such as cancer, heart disease, schizophrenia, depression, HIV/AIDS, and infections. A boycott of Pfizer medicines would be detrimental to the interests of patients everywhere," he wrote. "We hope you will consider the negative impact of such a decision [to boycott the company]."

"We are not boycotting Pfizer because of the good products the company markets. We are boycotting Pfizer because it supports Planned Parenthood. Let this be a moral dilemma for Pfizer," Scott told Luftglass. "If you honestly believe that our boycott could harm patients, ask yourself this question: 'Do we care more about preventing a detrimental impact on patients everywhere, or do we care more about funding the world's leading pro-abortion group?'" Scott said that Pfizer alone that will be responsible for answering that question and the subsequent impact it may have on the company and patients respectively. He also noted that LDI has never urged people to boycott a product that is necessary for good health when doctor-approved alternatives are unavailable.

In Arizona, pro-lifers are upset that Tucson's baseball team, the Sidewinders, were forced to give money to Planned Parenthood—for the second consecutive year. The donation was required under the Sidewinders' lease with Pima County, which mandates that proceeds from four games a year go to charity. The county chooses the charities. The donation was expected to be between \$2,000 and \$3,000.

In order to show their opposition to the money going to Planned Parenthood, "Face the Truth Arizona" picketed outside Tucson Electric Park where the Sidewinders play. Pima County supervisors have not been willing to answer questions as to why Planned Parenthood was selected.

The Tucson Sidewinders baseball team is the AAA affiliate of the Arizona Diamondbacks. The baseball club had nothing to do with the decision to send support to the pro-abortion group.

CONVENTION SPEAKERS CAUSE STIR

Pro-abortion activists are thrilled with the lineup of speakers at the Republican National Convention. Rudy Giuliani, the former mayor of New York City, will be one featured speaker. Others include Governors Arnold Schwarzenegger of California and New York's George Pataki. All three are pro-abortion.

Several other pro-abortion Republicans will be given a prominent place at the convention. New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg can be expected to be publicly praised. Former New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman, who also served as head of the Environmental Protection Agency under President George W. Bush, is expected to be an integral part of Convention activities. The former finance chairman of the Republican National Committee, Lew Eisenberg, is playing a major role in financing and organizing the event.

At this writing not one pro-life Republican is scheduled to speak during prime time television coverage. In fact, Kate O'Beirne, Washington editor of the *National Review*, has reported that the only announced Convention speaker who agrees with Bush on major issues is Senator Zell Miller, a *Democrat* from Georgia. "When the only Reagan Republican to enjoy a prominent supporting role at the party's Convention is a Democrat, the GOP has a serious identity problem," O'Beirne wrote. "Given the political ambitions of some of the speakers, the party faithful should pray that Rockefeller Republicanism is not back in the future." It is clear that the entire tragedy that is abortion is going to be ignored. Democrats stand and loudly proclaim their position on life issues. Is the Republican Party ashamed of its position?

While Miller's speech at the Republican National Convention may be considered by some to be something of a coup, Democrats will have their own. Ron Reagan, the liberal who gave his father a lot of trouble when he was in the White House, will speak in favor of embryonic stem cell experimentation.

President Ronald Reagan had opposed federal funding of such experimentation. Michael Reagan, the late president's eldest son, supports his father's position.

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: *July*—Senator and presidential candidate **John F. Kerry**, D-Mass.; *August*—former First Lady **Nancy Reagan** and her son **Ron Reagan**, who are campaigning in favor of embryonic stem cell experimentation (pray, too, that the family be comforted); *September*—U.S. Supreme Court Justice **Anthony Kennedy**, who has betrayed unborn children by voting to reaffirm *Roe v. Wade*; *October*—**Teresa Heinz Kerry**, multimillionaire pro-abortion activist wife of Senator John F. Kerry, D-Mass.; and *November*—comedian **George Carlin**, who has spoken in favor of abortion and made bigoted comments about pro-life people, especially Catholics.

PRO-ABORTION "CATHOLICS"

Catholic bishops in the U.S. have approved a policy statement declaring that pro-abortion politicians are "cooperating in evil" and allows bishops to deny communion to such lawmakers if they choose to do so. The bishops did not say that pro-abortion lawmakers should be denied the Eucharist. However, the bishops reminded Catholics that they are not worthy to receive Communion until they examined their consciences, including their "fidelity to the moral teaching of the church in personal and public life." Apparently, then, any pro-abortion person who "examines" his conscience and has no problem with supporting or even committing abortions is welcome to the Eucharist.

The bishops clearly stated that "the Catholic community and Catholic institutions" should not give "awards, honors or platforms" to those who profess to be Catholic but "act in defiance of our fundamental moral principles." Catholic universities, for example, should not give honorary degrees or speaking invitations to pro-abortion politicians.

The decision has been called a "copout" by some because, as even the pro-abortion *New York Times* pointed out, the statement gives support to bishops "on both sides of what has become a very public debate..." As the newspaper reported, the statement "lends support to both those who would sanction defiant politicians and those who draw the line at teaching and persuading. It says, 'Bishops can

legitimately make different judgments on the most prudent course of pastoral action.”

“It’s obviously a compromise statement,” said Leslie Tentler, professor of history at the Catholic University of America and director of its Center for American Catholic Studies. “The general tenor seems to me very much one of conciliation. Look at the verbs and nouns they use: ‘teach, persuade, dialogue, engagement’ with politicians. On the other hand they don’t slap the hands of the bishops who say they would deny politicians Communion. They point out what’s absolutely true, and that is that bishops can make decisions on matters of this sort in their own dioceses.”

The new policy makes two huge assumptions. The first is that pro-abortion politicians are ignorant about Catholic teaching on the subject or they have no idea what they are doing. The second is that some pro-life person has the ear of the offending politician so education, persuasion, dialogue, and engagement can take place. In other words, is the pro-abortion politician listening and is someone teaching? If elected president, who will John Kerry meet with on a regular basis so his views may be challenged and he may be educated? In fact, does any “famous” person subject himself to such a challenge of thought?

“We were under the gun,” a bishop told *The New York Times*. The bishop asked to speak anonymously because they were instructed to decline requests for interviews, which is precisely what the bishop was doing (not exactly a sign of honor). “It was clearly in the headlines, and at the center of public discussions. Catholics and politicians and everyone else were concerned about it. Not to respond would have given an indication we didn’t know what we were doing.” Yet some are wondering aloud if the bishops did know what they were doing.

“I think the ball will be in the court of pro-abortion politicians to explain to all of their constituents why they are in this position,” said George Weigel, senior fellow at the Ethics and Public Policy Center. “This puts the onus of responsibility exactly where it belongs, which is on people who claim to, and let’s hope want to, live authentically Catholic lives, but are going to be told in no uncertain terms, ‘You are not doing that.’”

One person who opposes denying Communion to pro-abortion politicians, Cardinal Roger Mahony of Los Angeles, reiterated his position after the bishops’ meeting. “The archdiocese will continue to follow church teaching which places the duty on each

Catholic to examine their consciences as to their worthiness to receive Holy Communion. That is not the role of the person distributing the body and blood of Christ.” It was Mahoney who accepted an invitation to speak at the Democratic National Convention in 2000.

Before approving the policy statement, several bishops received a letter from Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger who heads the Vatican’s Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. An Italian newspaper reported that the letter said those Catholics “living in grave sin” or “reject the doctrine of the church” should abstain from taking the Eucharist. “If they don’t refrain,” said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, who is not Catholic, “why can’t I receive the Eucharist, too? I mean, the only difference is that they *claim* to be Catholic.”

Where does all of this leave people like John Kerry? “What I believe personally as a Catholic as an article of faith is an article of faith,” Kerry said. But as a public official it is not “appropriate in the United States for a legislator to legislate personal religious beliefs for the rest of the country.” But cannot it be argued that laws against murder, theft, rape and so forth are also based on “personal religious beliefs”? This is certainly true about laws prohibiting polygamy. If a law banning abortion is supposedly bad for the country, why is it a position held by the Church in the first place?

The bishop’s statement debunked Kerry’s argument, which is one of the most commonly employed excuses for promoting abortion. “The separation of church and state does not require division between belief and public action, between moral principles and political choices, but protects the right of believers and religious groups to practice their faith and act on their values in public life.”

Not surprisingly, “Catholics for a Free Choice” (CFC), a group of people who masquerade as Catholic as they “protest,” released the results of a survey of 2,239 people who identified themselves as “Catholic.” It showed that 76 percent oppose denying Communion to pro-abortion “Catholics.” (As usual, CFC thinks every church decision should be made by a vote.) Needless-to-say, most of those interviewed for the survey have not seen the inside of a Catholic church for many years. “Maybe CFC should survey men and women who are not ‘protesting’ Catholic teaching,” Scott said. “After all, they are the true Catholics.”

QUOTABLE QUOTE

“I think that tonight we have to make it clear that we are not going to turn back the clock. There is no overturning of *Roe v. Wade*...There is no outlawing of a procedure necessary to save a woman’s life or health and there are no more cutbacks on population control efforts around the world. We need to take on this President and all of the forces of intolerance on this issue. We need to honestly and confidently and candidly take this issue out to the country and we need to speak up and be proud of what we stand for.”

— Senator John F. Kerry, D-Mass., speaking at a dinner sponsored by NARAL Pro-Choice America. Kerry later told an Iowa newspaper that he *personally* opposes abortion, does not “like abortion,” and believes life begins at conception.

“FREE” BIRTH CONTROL DISTRIBUTED

Planned Parenthood of South Palm Beach and Broward Counties in Florida has expanded a program that provides free birth control to people between ages 12 and 18, the *Miami Herald* reports. Parents are not told if their son or daughter receives birth control.

The Planned Parenthood affiliate expects to “serve” hundreds of young people in the first year. “We’re booked a month in advance and teens can’t wait,” said Carla Shulman, an affiliate spokesman. Of course, the “free” program is funded by American taxpayers.

BETTER CHECK THAT MAILING LIST

LDI President Douglas R. Scott recently received a call from his sister in Kent, Washington. She had some interesting news. “Planned Parenthood sent me some literature and they’re asking for money,” she told her brother. “They obviously don’t have a clue who I’m related to.” Apparently not.

The Caleb Report, an official periodical of Life Decisions International (LDI), is published six times per year. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every LDI Partner or members of its Board of Directors/Advisors or staff. Visit us at: 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.

© 2004 Life Decisions International.