



The Caleb Report

March-April 2008

Life Decisions International

vol. xvi • no. 2

SEPARATING THE WEAK FROM THE STRONG

Komen Enjoys Some Success In Downplaying Funding Of Abortion Group

In April 2002, the official newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of St. Louis (Mo.), the *St. Louis Review*, ran an editorial titled, “Planned Parenthood’s Anti-Human Agenda.” The piece addressed the group’s racist and eugenic foundation and noted that, “Planned Parenthood’s notorious legacy most assuredly persists...” The final paragraph was an expression of disgust at the connection between Planned Parenthood and the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation (SKG):

Even more troubling of late are the inroads made by Planned Parenthood in receiving funding from the Susan G. Komen Foundation, founded for the express purpose of eradicating breast cancer. Over the last few years the foundation has awarded Planned Parenthood chapters in Oklahoma, Colorado and Texas large grants for “breast cancer education.” This kind of activity has and will continue to undermine the good work and good name of that foundation and any organization that aligns itself with Planned Parenthood directly or indirectly. Church leaders, Catholic institutions and the laity must speak out against the “mainstreaming” of Planned Parenthood’s anti-human agenda wherever it occurs.



Brinker

One month later, the newspaper criticized St. Louis University President Lawrence Biondi, S.J., for honoring SKG founder Nancy Goodman Brinker. “If it weren’t for the foundation’s recent relationship with

Planned Parenthood this award would have been appropriate...” the editorial stated. “However, the Komen Foundation has recently shown an astonishing inappropriateness in its grant support to Planned Parenthood chapters...The Komen Foundation is an organization founded for the specific purpose of saving lives by funding medical research and it now supports with sizable grants Planned Parenthood, an organization committed to mainstreaming abortion throughout the world.”

Titled, “Komen Foundation’s Divergent Commitments,” the editorial said SGK’s “amazing malfeasance is compounded by its arbitrary dismissal of mounting medical research linking abortion and breast cancer in women.” Several documented facts, all of which SGK has ignored in refusing to acknowledge the link, were listed. The editorial concluded with a strong message:

The Komen Foundation’s astounding rejection of the scientific work concerning the breast cancer/abortion link means its leaders have placed the ideology of “women’s reproductive health,” the ideology of abortion on demand, above their complete commitment to the truth in detecting the causes of breast cancer. As

Karen Malec, president of the Coalition on Abortion/Breast Cancer, has recently contended on this issue, “While breast cancer screening and detection are necessary and of great importance to women, we find it appalling that an anti-breast cancer foundation would help fund Planned Parenthood whose sales of birth-control products and abortion ‘services’ contribute significantly to the breast cancer rates in this country. Planned Parenthood markets itself as a servant of the poor, but it serves low-income women about as well as a tobacco company providing screenings for lung cancer to the poor.”

In November 2005, the Catholic Diocese of Charleston (S.C.) issued a statement titled, “Consistently Pro-Life: A Reasoned Rationale for the Withdrawal of Support from the Race for the Cure.” Published in the official newspaper of the Diocese, *The Catholic Miscellany*, it defended the decisions of both the Diocese and Bishop England High School to end support of SGK fund-raising projects.

“I think that in terms of the school community it has been a very positive experience, because we’ve been able to affirm our Catholic identity,” David Held, principle at Bishop England High School, told *The Catholic Miscellany*. He said the Komen issue was “clearly the most public decision we’ve had to consider. It was obviously the right thing to do and that’s what the lesson for the students is, do the right thing. It’s a simple choice.”



While the facts were strong enough for these institutions to break ties with SGK, they did not want to “impose their view” on others. “The Church did not say, ‘Don’t participate in the event!’ It simply said that in good conscience, it could not proactively support to the effort,” Held said. The school allowed SGK to use its property.

In November 2006, *The Catholic Sun*, the official newspaper of the Roman Catholic Diocese of Phoenix (Ariz.), urged the flock to ask the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation to stop funding Planned Parenthood. The award-winning editorial was observantly titled, “Planned Parenthood Slows Komen’s Race for the Cure”:

Nearly 40,000 women, men and children took to the streets of Phoenix last month in a race that promised sweat and agony, laughter and tears, and camaraderie and perseverance—all in the name of finding a cure for breast cancer.

The event raised an estimated \$1.8 million—money that will go a long way toward research, prevention and early detection of the deadly disease.

This weekend's upcoming 3-day walk promises to have an equally big impact in the way of raising funds and awareness of the cancer that strikes the lives of so many of our mothers, sisters, daughters and friends.

These wildly celebrated events are huge fundraisers for the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation. When a breast cancer cure is discovered, the Komen organization will undoubtedly be recognized as a leader in saving so many women's lives.

Thanks to last year's race, the Phoenix affiliate was able to give more than \$1.2 million to local research, education, screening and treatment programs, according to their Web site. Among many of the worthy organizations that receive grant monies, unfortunately, is the not-so-worthy Planned Parenthood of Central and Northern Arizona. The Komen foundation gave Planned Parenthood \$24,580 this year "for breast health education and early cancer detection in Coconino, Gila, Maricopa and Yavapai Counties."

Some will argue the grant is earmarked for areas other than abortion or contraception, so the affiliation between the organizations is inconsequential. But the sad reality is that the grant money now frees up Planned Parenthood funds for these other areas opposing life and counter to our Catholic faith.

Tragically ironic, too, are the ongoing scientific discoveries linking abortion and breast cancer. So by giving money to Planned Parenthood, Komen is in essence shooting itself in the foot—then trying to race with only one good foot to raise additional funds to stop the bleeding. But the blood, both literally and figuratively, won't stop until the grants to Planned Parenthood end.

...

The Susan G. Komen Foundation and its organizers do so much good in the way of rallying the community and raising awareness of breast cancer, which is why their support for Planned Parenthood remains truly regrettable.



Silver

SGK grants to Planned Parenthood and the rebuff of an abortion-breast cancer link drove Eve Sanchez Silver, an SGK medical research analyst and Hispanic outreach director, to meet with her superiors. Once it was clear that SGK leadership was unwilling to change their position, she resigned (see [The Caleb Report](#), September-October 2004 edition).

Silver told LifeNews SGK appears to be more concerned about helping women *after* they have been diagnosed with breast cancer than in educating them to *reduce the risk* of the disease. "This is an appalling lack of concern for the women the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation is supposed to be helping," she said. Silver explained that the breast does not become fully mature until after 32 weeks of pregnancy. An abortion before that time leaves breast cells exposed to estrogen, which is highly carcinogenic.

In February 2008, the *Arkansas Catholic*, the official newspaper of the Catholic Diocese of Little Rock, ran an article titled, "Diocese asks parishes, schools to break ties to Komen for the Cure: Planned Parenthood funding one reason for concern, director says." The call to Catho-

lics could have had a significant impact on Race for the Cure fund-raising because several parishes and schools had signed up to participate.



The article was published after the Respect Life Apostolate of the Diocese of Little Rock issued a statement aimed at Catholics who had been supporting or planned to support Komen fund-raising projects. The statement acknowledged the "beneficial work" of Komen, but raised concern over the policy allowing affiliates to "offer financial support to abortion providing facilities" and "the continued denial that abortion may well lead to the development of breast cancer." Komen's support of embryonic stem cell experimentation was also identified as an area of concern.

The Respect Life Apostolate statement said its research found that Komen affiliates in 22 states had supported Planned Parenthood for breast cancer screenings. It was noted that PPFA's 2004-2005 *Annual Report* showed some 9,900 *more* abortions and 26,000 *fewer* breast exams. "Based on these documented facts, the Respect Life Apostolate does not endorse Susan G. Komen for the Cure," the statement concluded.

Was the Diocese of Little Rock taking a bold stand? Not quite, said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr. The message fell far short of asking Catholics to have nothing to do with Komen. The Respect Life Apostolate "neither supports nor encourages participation in activities that benefit Susan G. Komen for the Cure," the statement said. "It's not exactly what I would call standing on principle or shepherding the flock," Scott said.

"Our hope is that the Komen Foundation will focus all funds on research to find causes and cure for breast cancer and refuse to give financial or other support to any abortion provider or organization that promotes the destruction of human life," the diocesan statement said.

Alison Levin, executive director of SGK's Ozark affiliate (Fayetteville, Ark.), said no Planned Parenthood centers in the state receive grants. "Komen and its affiliates do not provide any funding for abortions or for any activities outside the scope of our mission to eradicate breast cancer," she said in a statement provided to the *Arkansas Catholic*. "The National Cancer Institute's review of recent scientific literature reveals that no conclusive evidence exists to suggest that abortion increases a woman's risk for developing breast cancer."



Levin

The Respect Life Apostolate urged parishioners to support Catholic hospitals that operate breast centers "Your dollars will go further and will be used locally," its director said.

In March 2008, the Catholic Diocese of Lafayette (Ind.) asked parishioners to forgo participation in the Komen Race for the Cure scheduled for April. “Due to its policy allowing affiliates to offer financial support to abortion providing facilities, its endorsement of embryonic stem cell research, and the continued denial that abortion may well lead to the development of breast cancer, it is not appropriate for Catholics to participate,” a statement from the Diocese said.

“We do not fund Planned Parenthood and there’s no affiliate in Indiana that funds Planned Parenthood,” Dana Curish, executive director of Komen Indianapolis, told WTHR-TV. Nevertheless, Komen chapters gave nearly \$375,000 to Planned Parenthood in 2007 alone. “We cannot continue with this,” she added. “We need everyone’s support and our biggest event is Race for the Cure.”



Otolski Unfortunately, WTHR-TV reported that the Catholic Diocese of Indianapolis (Ind.) is siding with Komen. “We don’t see any kind of conflict with how the money’s being used from what we’ve been able to determine and what they’ve assured us of here,” said Greg A. Otolski, executive director of the Secretariat for Communications.

In March 2008, the Diocese of Little Rock issued a statement reversing its earlier position and endorsing Komen. The change came after Komen officials promised that *local* fund-raising will not benefit Planned Parenthood.

“Despite the efforts of some to make this issue sound complicated, the facts are clear,” Scott said. “The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation allows its chapters to fund Planned Parenthood and several of them do so. The Diocese of Little Rock has essentially said it is acceptable to be associated with an organization that funds an abortion-committing giant so long as *local* dollars are not going to the group. This kind of disconnect is exactly what Komen officials were hoping to achieve and they clearly succeeded.”

“I had been assured that 25% of the money given here in Arkansas goes to the national Komen foundation, which provided grants to Planned Parenthood, a major provider of abortions,” wrote Diocesan Administrator J. Gaston Hebert in justifying the new position. He continued:

If that were true, money donated in Arkansas could have indirectly funded abortions. Regardless of the exceptional work done by Komen...the good accomplished would not have been a legitimate reason to participate in the death of unborn children...However, the reality is that the national Komen foundation does NOT give grants to Planned Parenthood—and, therefore, money given to Komen in Arkansas does NOT, even indirectly, fund abortion. Thus, my major reason for releasing the position statement was NOT valid.

“In other words, as long as *my* specific dollar is not going to Planned Parenthood, it is morally acceptable to be associated with an organization that allows its chapters to support an enterprise that killed 289,750 preborn human beings in 2006 alone,” Scott said. “*Scripture* calls on Christians to have *nothing* to do with evil. If a Komen chapter in California was actually committing abortions with money raised locally, would Monsignor Hebert use the same logic? If the answer is ‘no,’ I would sure like to hear his rationale.”

Apart from the obvious connection between any parent organization and their chapters, the issue in this case is not whether the *parent* directly funds Planned Parenthood, but whether the parent supports a *chapter* that directly funds Planned Parenthood. “The parent could prohibit funding of Planned Parenthood by its chapters, but Komen has steadfastly refused to do,” Scott said.

“I would note that there is [sic] a relatively small number of affiliates of Komen that do give grants to Planned Parenthood...” Hebert continued. Scott wondered if the Diocese would have come to a different conclusion if *every* Komen affiliate, with the exception of those based in Arkansas, supported Planned Parenthood. “Based on the logic used to defend the new position, the answer is that it would not have mattered.”

Hebert acknowledged that in making grants to Planned Parenthood, SGK inherently gives the pro-abortion group “credence and acceptability.” Scott said Planned Parenthood is more interested in this “credence and acceptability” than it is in the money itself. “This is why Planned Parenthood seeks grants from corporations and organizations, despite the fact that it has more than \$540 million sitting in a savings account,” he explained. “Planned Parenthood wants a ‘stamp of approval’—a ‘stamp of legitimacy’—from every possible entity. And the more popular the entity the more eager the Planned Parenthood hierarchy is to establish a relationship.” Scott said that in addition to providing “credence and acceptability,” SGK grants allow Planned Parenthood to improve its public image, even though breast health has nothing whatsoever to do with the group’s mission.



Hebert “I have assurance from those who receive grants here locally from Komen that stringent safeguards are placed upon those funds being used for their designated purpose,” Hebert wrote. “Therefore, the conclusion reached in our statement that grant money could ‘free up funds to support other areas’ appears also to be untrue. But, in any case, let’s remember that in Arkansas no grants are made to Planned Parenthood.”

Hebert is accepting at face value the statements made by SGK personnel. Interestingly, Planned Parenthood uses

the same argument to dismiss objections to corporate support of its programs. "Corporations that donate to Planned Parenthood usually claim the support is 'restricted' for a seemingly altruistic program," Scott said. "This frees up the unrestricted funds that had been supporting the program to pay for controversial projects."

"Our statement implied that there exists a link between procured abortion and increased risk of breast cancer and that Komen dismisses that link," Hebert wrote. "The National Cancer Institute states that there exists no link between abortion and breast cancer. The preponderance of scientific research states that no such link exists, but there is a minority opinion that insists that such a link exists."



"Monsignor Hebert has espoused the position held by Planned Parenthood and its legions with regard to the link between abortion and breast cancer," Scott responded. "And this is Planned Parenthood's position because it serves to advance Planned Parenthood's agenda."

"It is important that the stance of the Catholic Church always be based upon truth," Hebert wrote. "The position statement issued on February 7 was based upon unintentional error. To let that statement stand would be an act of injustice. With apologies to Komen, to those fighting breast cancer and to the survivors, to the Catholic clergy and faithful who were embarrassed by this mistaken policy, I rescind the position statement in its entirety...Again, I offer a sincere apology for the unintended turmoil and misunderstanding created by the statement that has now been rescinded."

"Unbelievable!" Scott said. "The monsignor actually *apologized* to Komen. The monsignor has done a lot of damage to our work and that of other pro-life activists because he is now essentially an apologist for Komen."

Hebert wrote that the earlier statement issued by the Diocese was a "position paper" and not "a mandate." He said that individuals, parishes, schools and groups are "free to make their own decision" as to whether to support Komen. "I will state very plainly," he continued, "after meeting with the Komen officials of the Arkansas affiliates, that these are good people highly dedicated to the finding a cure for breast cancer and preserving life; this is their only goal."

"Telling the flock that you neither support nor encourage participation in an event is not exactly a strong statement," Scott said. "If diocesan officials really wanted to do the right thing, they would have shown some courage and leadership. Isn't that one of the primary reasons why the officials hold the positions they do? If they had done the right thing, the statement would have read, 'The Re-

spect Life Apostolate of the Diocese of Little Rock strongly urges Catholics to refuse to participate in fundraising activities that benefit Susan G. Komen.'"



"Where is the leadership? Where is the one pointing to the godly path? Where is the willingness to take a stand?" Scott asked. "I am sure the people who work for Komen are wonderful and dedicated. They all probably have nice smiles, too, but the issue is the connection with Planned Parenthood. The clergy has got to stop practicing 'leadership through weakness and indifference.'"

Scott said the initial decision made by the Diocese was based on two indisputable facts: 1) The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation allows its affiliates to donate funds to Planned Parenthood; and 2) Consistent with the position held by Planned Parenthood, the Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation has refused to act upon the many studies that have shown a connection between abortion and breast cancer. "This was true *before* the meeting between Rev. Hebert and Komen officials. It is still true *after* the meeting."

"So what has changed?" Scott asked. "Diocesan officials met with some nice and articulate people whose job is to pacify concerns about its unholy alliances and practices. The tactic is wise. All Komen has to do is convince people they should only worry about what it does in their own neighborhood and not be concerned about its activities elsewhere, no matter how awful they may be."

"Much of the statement released by the Diocese of Little Rock will be familiar to pro-life leaders," Scott said. "This is because it is strikingly similar to statements made by Komen itself. It seems that all Komen had to do was a little smooth talking to immunize itself from criticism. This has resulted in a divided and confused Pro-Life Movement. And a divided and confused Pro-Life Movement makes it easier for Komen to continue and even expand its relationship with Planned Parenthood."

"If Komen had to choose between successful fundraising for the fight against breast cancer or an association with Planned Parenthood, would it choose the former?" Scott asked. "The charity is apparently not at the point where its leaders feel they must make a choice. This is largely because they are not feeling enough heat."

Scott said he wanted to thank those Catholic and pro-life leaders who have stood strong on this issue. He noted that Steve Ertelt of Life-News played a key role in keeping the issue before the American people. "Mr. Ertelt has done a good job showing the error and hypocrisy demonstrated by those who now embrace Komen." Scott said Catholic clergy who endured severe



Ertelt

criticism for breaking ties with Komen also deserve recognition for doing the right thing.

LDI has done extensive research on the connection between Komen and Planned Parenthood. Everything published by LDI has been checked and rechecked for accuracy. "We wish Monsignor Hebert had given us an opportunity to respond to what Komen officials told him before issuing the new statement," Scott said, "but he did not do so and now the damage is done."

In fact, Hebert *reinforced* the damage in his March 15, 2008, article titled, "For Lent: The Good, the Bad and the Sickly," which included the following message:

Most readers are familiar with the Susan G. Komen position statement that the diocese issued on Feb. 7 of this year. I need not rehash the ordeal. It was painful for all involved. A restatement has been issued...Our Church is based upon Jesus Christ, who describes himself [sic] as being the Way, the Truth and the Life. Those of us who make up the living Church must always base our actions upon the Way, the Truth and the Life...regardless of the pain involved...

"I look forward to a day when the biggest impediment to our success comes from pro-abortion people rather than those who claim to be pro-life," Scott said.

ACTION: Ask Bishop Anthony B. Taylor to review this matter. **Write:** The Most Reverend Anthony B. Taylor, Bishop of Little Rock, Diocese of Little Rock, 2500 N. Tyler St., Little Rock, AR 72207. Respectfully ask Nancy Goodman Brinker to use her influence to convince Komen that regardless of a person's position on abortion, it is not a good idea to fund Planned Parenthood. **Write:** Hon. Nancy Goodman Brinker, Chief of Protocol, 2201 C St. NW #1238, Washington, DC 20520. In addition, contact your local parish and diocesan hierarchy and urge them to speak out strongly against participation in Komen fund-raising events.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

"When I was growing up...[my] dad was head of Planned Parenthood. And it was very controversial to be involved with that. And so it's fascinating. At the dinner table my parents are very good at sharing the things that they were doing. And almost treating us like adults, talking about that...So I always knew there was something about really educating people and giving them choices in terms of family size."

— Microsoft Founder Bill Gates, "Now," PBS, May 9, 2003

PROTESTS OF TEACHERS' UNION PLANNED



Several "massive, peaceful, [and] highly visible" demonstrations against the "egregious pro-abortion agenda" of the National Education Association (NEA) are set for July 2, 2008. While the chief protest will take place in Washington, D.C., similar events will be held across the country. The demonstrations will be held during the group's annual national convention.

"This is a unique opportunity for the Pro-Life Movement to make millions of American citizens and school employees acutely aware of the NEA leadership's radical agenda," said Bob Pawson, national coordinator of Pro-Life Educators and Students (PLEAS). More than 9,000 delegates from all over the country will attend the six-day national convention in Washington, D.C., beginning on July 1, 2008. Celebrities and politicians will address the convention and Fortune 500 companies will set up exhibit booths. Some 3,000 visitors will also attend.

Pawson said a "tidal wave of news coverage" will help spread the message nationwide. "Hundreds...of reporters from international, national, regional, and local news media outlets always attend and cover NEA's annual meeting," he said. "NEA prides itself on being *the organization* which *does* the picketing; not being the target of picketing." Pawson said this prayer and picket demonstration could be one of the most significant pro-life news events of 2008.



Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, D-N. Y., and/or Senator Barack Hussein Obama, D-Ill., will speak to the convention. In addition, the NEA's political action committee is expected to endorse a candidate for President of the United States.

"We cannot wait for 'somebody else' to do this," Pawson said. "In your hearts, you know that this is a good and Godly idea and that *you* really *do* want to be a part of it. It is up to you/me/us to combine our forces, resources, and talents and get it done."

"It is evident that PLEAS has a good handle on how to organize and execute an effective demonstration," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr., in endorsing the event. "I hope many pro-life Americans will participate." Scott, who has a degree in education and a teaching license, said he is appalled that radicals have taken over the NEA. "It is outrageous that any union, especially a teachers' union, would take a stand in favor of abortion."

INFORMATION: Contact Bob Pawson at (609) 610-3522. You may visit PLEAS' website at www.prolifeeducators.com.

"RACIST" DONATIONS PROVE UNSETTLING

Virtually all pro-life activists have heard the tape or read the transcript of the secretly recorded calls. Planned Parenthood affiliates in Ohio, Idaho, Arizona, and New Mexico agree to accept money for the specific purpose of killing a black preborn baby, despite the fact that the "donor" clearly said he was motivated by racism. The calls were made by James O'Keefe, an advisor to *The Advocate*, a periodical published by pro-life students at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA).



In a call to Planned Parenthood of Central Ohio (PPCO), O’Keefe spoke to Administrative Assistant Lisa Hutton:

O’Keefe: “When I underwrite abortion does that apply to minorities, too?”

Hutton: “If you specifically wanted to underwrite an abortion for a minority person, you can target it that way. You can, you can specify that that’s how you want it spent.”

O’Keefe: “Okay, yeah, ‘cause there’s, there’s definitely way too many black people in Ohio so I’m just tryin’ to do my part.”

Hutton: “Hmm. Okay, whatever.”

O’Keefe: “Well, blacks especially need abortions, too. So that’s what I’m trying to do.”

Planned Parenthood: “Well, for whatever reason, we’ll accept the money.”

“It was a violation of...policy, and it’s very upsetting,” PPCO chief executive officer Lisa Perks, told Cybercast News Service (CNS). “Planned Parenthood has a long history of social justice.” She also suggested the recordings may have been altered. “I wonder how much of the call was given to you [CNS]. I am wondering if the statements were taken out of order or out of context.”



Perks

Autumn Kersey, then-vice president of development and marketing, answered the call made to Planned Parenthood of Idaho (PPI) was answered by:

O’Keefe: Hello, Kersey. I’m—I’m interested in making a donation today.

Kersey: Fantastic!

O’Keefe: What about abortions for the underprivileged minority groups?

Kersey: Oh, absolutely. We have, um, in fact, uh, wonderful, fantastic news. We just received a very generous donation to our women in need fund.

O’Keefe: Wonderful. I wanna—I wanna specify that abortion to help a minority group. Would that be possible?

Kersey: Absolutely.

O’Keefe: Like the black community, for example?

Kersey: Certainly.

O’Keefe: Okay, so—so the abortion could—could be—you know—I could give money specifically for a black baby. That would—that would be the purpose.

Kersey: Yeah. Absolutely. Um, if you wanted to designate that you wanted your gift to be used to help an African-American woman in need, um, then we would certainly, ah, make sure that that gift was earmarked specifically for that purpose.

O’Keefe: Great, because I really face trouble with Affirmative Action and I don’t want my kids being disadvantaged, you know, against, um, black kids. I just had a baby. I wanna put it in his name, you know, um, you know.

Kersey: Hmm. Hmm. Absolutely. That’s fantastic.

O’Keefe: So that’s definitely possible.

Kersey: Oh, always, always.

O’Keefe: So I was just wondering, can I put this in the name of my son?

Kersey: Absolutely.

O’Keefe: The name of my son? Great, um, you know, he’s trying to get into, into colleges and he’ll be applying, you know, and uh, and uh, he’s just, ah, we’re just really big, um, um, we’re really, he’s really faced troubles with Affirmative Action and, you know, we don’t, we just think, you know, the less, the less black kids out there the better.

Kersey: [mild laughter] Understandable. Understandable. Um, David, let me, if I may, get some specific general information so we can set this up the right way. You said you wanted to put it in your son’s name and you would like this designated specifically to assist [an] African-American woman who’s looking to terminate a pregnancy?

O’Keefe: Exactly.

Kersey: Okay.

O’Keefe: Yeah, and wanna protect—I wanna protect my son so he can get into college.

Kersey: Alright, um; excuse my hesitation. I’m, I’m, this is the first time I’ve had a donor call and make this kind of request so I’m excited and want to make sure I don’t leave anything out.

On February 28, 2008, the *Idaho Statesman* reported that Rebecca Poedy, PPI’s chief executive office, issued a written apology for the incident:

A fundraising employee violated the organization’s principles and practices when she appeared to be willing to accept a racially motivated donation. We apologize for the manner in which this offensive call was handled. We take full responsibility for the actions of the fundraising staff member who created the impression that racism of any form would be tolerated at Planned Parenthood. We took swift action to ensure that each of our employees understands their responsibility to communicate clearly with donors about the fact that we believe in helping all individuals, regardless of gender, race, or sexual orientation, make informed decisions about their reproductive health care.



Did Poedy say Kersey “appeared” willing to accept a “racially motivated donation”? Kersey “appeared” downright *thrilled* to accept the money! In any case, the very next day, the newspaper provided a significant amount of space for Poedy to address the controversy—unchallenged. The commentary was titled, “Rebecca Poedy: Handling of racist call was wrong, but so are extremist smear tactics”:

Planned Parenthood adamantly rejects racist policies or practices in the delivery of health care and is a strong advocate for equal access to education and services regardless of circumstance. That’s why it is so disturbing to hear a secretly taped conversation between a racist caller and a Planned Parenthood staff member, which leaves the erroneous impression that the organization accepts racist donations.

Planned Parenthood adamantly rejects racist policies or practices in the delivery of health care and is a strong advocate for equal access to education and services regardless of circumstance. That’s why it is so disturbing to hear a secretly taped conversation between a racist caller and a Planned Parenthood staff member, which leaves the erroneous impression that the organization accepts racist donations.

This is not a question of “racist policies or practices.” This is not a question of providing “equal access to edu-

cation and [health care] services.” This is not a question of accepting “racist donations.” The point is that Planned Parenthood willingly accepted for the explicit purpose of killing a black preborn baby. The commentary continued:

Last summer extreme anti-choice activists called fundraising staff nationwide, posing as racist donors. In Idaho, an employee made a serious mistake when she appeared to be complicit in the donor’s racist request. Although no donations were accepted for racist purposes (the staff member immediately notified a supervisor of a suspicious call from a racist donor and prepared an incident report), Planned Parenthood of Idaho took swift corrective action and instituted a proactive initiative to help the staff respond to people who call with an offensive agenda.

Despite Poedy’s reliance on pejorative words such as “extreme” and “anti-choice,” the fact is that the PPI employee was *willingly* “complicit in the donor’s racist request.” And the donation was not accepted because it was never actually made. Claiming the employee “immediately notified a supervisor” of the “suspicious call” is a convenient defense, albeit one that cannot be proven. Poedy continued:

Planned Parenthood believes in helping all women and men make informed decisions about their reproductive health care. We have a long history of advocating for health care access for women and men regardless of circumstance, and we are proud to be leaders in providing health care to millions of Americans who otherwise have no access to critical health services. Last year alone, PPI provided nearly \$300,000 worth of services free of charge to low-income Idahoans.

Poedy changed the subject by writing that PPI provided low income Idaho residents with “nearly \$300,000 worth of services free of charge.” A more accurate statement would have been, “PPI provided nearly \$300,000 worth of services free of charge to low-income Idahoans because American tax dollars paid the bills.” Poedy was not finished:

In a nation facing a serious health-care crisis, those who use racism in an attempt to undermine access to important health care ought to be swiftly renounced. These race-baiting tactics are not news “expos” but rather the product of the most cynical form of deception and in the worst tradition of dirty politics. I want to be clear that we take full responsibility for our employee’s handling of the call. This employee had an exemplary record with PPI and feels absolutely awful. The statements in the recording absolutely do not represent how we or the employee feel. However, this is a serious matter and the employee has been suspended pending further investigation.

Using racism to “undermine access to important health care”? “Race-baiting”? A “product of the most cynical form of deception”? “Dirty politics”? Poedy is a bit of actress. She also had a bit of rhetorical trickery up her sleeve:

At the same time, let’s remember how this came about. An extremist anti-choice activist posed as a donor, using race-baiting tactics to entrap whoever answered the phone. They then purposely dis-

torted this information and are now providing false information to meet their ultimate goal of attempting to shut us down and prevent women from access to reproductive health care. Given the context and intent of the caller, we cannot be assured the recording presented to the public is an authentic copy of the conversation.

PPI took “full responsibility,” but simultaneously sought to make the *tactic* the issue rather than being an *accessory in a racist act*. She also claimed the “extremist anti-choice activist” had “purposely distorted” the recording and released “false information.” This was followed by her use of the magical pro-abortion sword:

We decry these smear tactics, which work against the public good and even give a bad name to those who oppose us through legitimate means. There is a continuum of behavior by extremists—ranging from unethical deception to outright violence—to use any means necessary to attack Planned Parenthood, and this behavior should not be rewarded.

Ah, there it is—the V-word. Poedy just had to turn to the violence committed by a few in order to deflect criticism regarding the real issue at hand. But there is one part of the statement that is almost laughable. After referring to the recording as a “smear tactic,” she said O’Keefe and his colleagues had engaged in “unethical deception.”

Is it possible that Poedy is unaware of the countless times a pro-abortion activist entered a pregnancy help center posing as a pregnant client—intent on smearing their work? Is she ignorant of the many times a pro-abortion activist recorded calls to such centers hoping to speak to someone—*anyone*—would lie or mislead the “client?” Poedy ended with a little grandstanding for the purpose of changing the subject—again:

We understand that it is our responsibility to be vigilant in our expression of the Planned Parenthood mission of respect, social justice and equality for all. We remain fiercely proud of our 37-year legacy in Idaho, which has brought needed health care to thousands statewide and has been the backbone of reproductive health care and education for women, men and teens in Idaho. We recognize that we have not lived up to our mission in this incident and for that we are sorry and sincerely apologize. We commit to redoubling our efforts to always be a clear voice of justice and equality in a social climate where bias and discrimination persists in the history—and fabric—of our nation.



Interestingly, with the exception of a few who are “shooting the messenger” or trying to shift focus to the “deception” involved in making the recordings, pro-abortion advocates have not exactly rallied around their beleaguered allies. For example, in its article titled, “Idaho Planned Parenthood agreed to racist donation,” the response to the controversy by the pro-abortion website *feministing.com*:

Planned Parenthood of Idaho is taking (justifiable) heat after an employee agreed to take a donation aimed at aborting black fetuses.

...

On the recording provided by The Advocate, an actor portraying a donor said he wanted his money used to eliminate black unborn children because *"the less black kids out there the better."*

Kersey laughed nervously and said: "Understandable, understandable...Excuse my hesitation, this is the first time I've had a donor call and make this kind of request, so I'm excited and want to make sure I don't leave anything out."

...[This] was part of an anti-choice effort to "catch" abortion providers taking funds from obviously racist donors.

What's so awful about this, in addition to Kersey's horrifying response on the call, is that this *plays directly into anti-choice talking points* about abortion and race.

...

While feministing.com said Kersey laughed "nervously," as though this would be some kind of defense, there was little more that could be said on her behalf.

"African-Americans today are targeted by the abortion industry and suffer deeply because of it," O'Keefe told CNS. "Planned Parenthood makes a profit off of their operations. We wanted to reveal their racist past—and the practical racism of their policies today—reflected in their other operations. Planned Parenthood must be held accountable for their actions, both past and present."

"I do not believe most people who work for Planned Parenthood are racist," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr., "despite the fact that they paint every pro-life activist with the same unflattering brush." Scott said his suspicion is that greed was the primary motivating factor. "They saw a chance to get a donation and that's their job. They chose to turn a blind eye to the reasons behind it."

At the same time, Scott said the fact that Planned Parenthood continues to praise the philosophy and employ the tactics of its founder, elitist and eugenics advocate Margaret Higgins Sanger, is bound to raise more than a few eyebrows. "Sanger wanted to destroy certain groups of people. Planned Parenthood employed specific means to do so. Today, the same groups of people are told these means will 'free' and 'empower' them. Which is it? It must be one or the other. Planned Parenthood employees who do not seek to destroy minorities need to face the fact that, in the end, they are doing just that."

NOT PLANNED PARENTHOOD, BUT...



You see a person wearing a tee-shirt with the message, "Make Love Not Babies" on the front. What first comes to mind? It must be a Planned Parenthood "wearable with a message." In most cases you would be correct, but not this time. The tee-shirt is from clothier Abercrombie & Fitch.

When LDI inquired as to the current availability of the item, we were told it had "sold out...for the season" and will not be restocked. We were, however, given a sug-

gestion for tracking down the horrendous piece of clothing. "Since the inventory in our stores changes on a daily basis, your best bet would be to stop by your local store to look for that item," we were told.

If we were to find the tee-shirt at our local Abercrombie & Fitch store, we would not be buying it; we would be expressing our outrage to management. After all, it is the Planned Parenthood message and philosophy.

THE PRAYER PROJECT

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:

March—Australian Prime Minister **Kevin M. Rudd**, and **Brendan Nelson**, leader of the opposition Liberal Party;

April—U.S. Senator and presumptive Republican nominee for President **John S. McCain III** of Arizona, who supports funding embryonic stem cell experimentation;

May—CBN founder **Marion G. "Pat" Robertson**, who has endorsed pro-abortion presidential candidate Rudolph W. L. Giuliani, R-N.Y., as well as U.S. Senator **Samuel D. Brownback**, R-Kan., former U.S. Senator **Fred D. Thompson**, R-Tenn., and former Governor **Willard Mitt Romney**, R-Mass., all of whom endorsed Senator John S. McCain III after dropping out of the race for President;

June—**Hillary R. Clinton**, D-N.Y., and **Barack H. Obama**, D-Ill.; and

July—**Simon P. Cowell**, "American Idol" judge and chief executive officer of the pro-abortion International Save the Children Alliance.

CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

BolchalkFREY While miracles are always possible, it looks like it may be difficult to change the philanthropic agenda of boycott target BolchalkFREY Marketing Inc. In a press release titled, "Planned Parenthood Wins Award for Campaign Created by Tucson Advertising Agency," BolchalkFREY boasts that it won a HEMMY (Health Educators Media Makers Yearly) from the Arizona Public Health Association. The program, called "Real Life. Real Talk," was designed to target Hispanic parents and included radio commercials in English and Spanish, newspaper advertising, posters and a "teen reality video."

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. This publication may be copied so long as the appropriate citation(s) are included. It may be quoted so long as proper acknowledgment(s) are provided. Write: P.O. Box 439, Front Royal, VA 22630-0009 (USA). Phone: (540) 631-0380. All past editions of *The Caleb Report* are available on LDI's website (www.fightpp.org).

© 2008 Life Decisions International