



# The Caleb Report

May-June 2008

Life Decisions International

vol. xvii • no. 3

## “IT’S NOT T.V., IT’S BIRTH CONTROL.” NBC’s “The Baby Borrowers” Subject Of Intense Criticism

“Wife Swap,” “Too Close For Comfort,” “Dancing With The Stars,” “Welcome Back Kotter,” “Whose Line Is It Anyway?” “Dog Eat Dog,” “Coupling,” “All in the Family,” “Three’s Company,” “Supernanny,” “Celebrity Fit Club,” “Trading Spaces,” “American Idol,” “The Office,” “Who Wants To Be A Millionaire?” and “Hell’s Kitchen.” What do these television programs have in common? They all originated in the United Kingdom (UK), sometimes under a different name.



“The Baby Borrowers” is the American version of the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) hit in which young couples care for a baby for several days. Soon afterward, each couple takes in a toddler (or two). The toddlers are “exchanged” for preteens, then teenagers and finally senior citizens. In addition, one teen is required to get a job, which means that just one “caregiver” is present during much of the day. The purported purpose is to give teenagers the opportunity to experience adult life. The BBC described the program as a “social experiment.”

“It really is adult life on fast forward...,” co-creator and executive producer Richard McKerrow told *Variety*. “We really want the young people in the series and indeed everyone who watches to appreciate that parenting is one of the hardest and most important tasks you’ll ever undertake. We also want people to think carefully about when they want to have children and with whom they want to have children.”

**BBC** The use of small children on “The Baby Borrowers” generated a great deal of criticism in the UK, but McKerrow said complaints died down after the show aired. “There was initial consternation from some organizations about the notion of ‘lending’ babies to teenagers for a reality show. However, those criticisms were made by people before they had seen the show and without asking us about the extensive and impeccable health and safety measures put in place.”

In January 2007, the *Daily Mail*, which is published in the UK, reported that “The Baby Borrowers” had “outraged child protection experts.” In one episode a 10-year-old went without food for a day. On another occasion a

baby had to be removed from the care of one couple as their relationship fell apart because most of the arguing was done in front of the child.

“Local authority officials were so concerned about the ‘very real risk’ of physical and psychological damage to the children that they urged the BBC to cancel the series,” the newspaper reported. The BBC ignored the protests and refused requests to allow social workers on the set to monitor filming. The corporation insisted it had taken “extraordinary” steps to ensure the safety of the children and claimed it had worked with a specialist charity, Teens and Toddlers, to ensure the series was handled with “sensitivity.”

Teens and Toddlers, which offers classes for teenagers that teach the “harsh reality of parenthood,” denied having a connection with the program. Director Peter Hein said he felt “uncomfortable” when asked if they would get involved. “We were not sure about the supervision and professionalism of those involved. We didn’t get enough details. We declined to be involved further.”

Norfolk’s Local Safeguarding Children Board said the county council refused BBC requests to endorse the show. “The whole project was misconceived,” said Dr. Caroline Ball. “We asked BBC to reconsider making the program from the start because we felt it was irresponsible exploitation.”



McKerrow said the idea for the show came from merging two issues—living life at a fast pace and ignorance among teenagers about the consequences of unplanned pregnancy. But the Associated Press (AP) reported that, in the U.S., NBC and The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy are “educating teens about unplanned pregnancy while enchanting them with ‘The Baby Borrowers.’” The non-scripted series “comes with a clear message: Don’t get pregnant.”



Lawrence

“The Baby Borrowers” has received a rocky reception in the U.S. In January 2008, *Las Vegas Review-Journal* television critic Christopher Lawrence wrote about plans to air what NBC is also calling a “social experiment.” After describing the program, he wrote, “I know, it sounds like I’m making it up.” Lawrence continued to express his dismay:

Now NBC is putting babies in harm's way, under the supervision of what it calls "nervous, fumbling teens"...

I wouldn't trust random teenagers alone with my laundry. But five sets of parents surrendered their little bundles of joy for what NBC repeatedly insists is a "social experiment."

Executive producer Tom Shelly said every precaution was taken during production. Forty-two cameras placed throughout the homes made it possible for parents to watch their "loaned" children at any time on monitors. Parents could also intervene whenever they felt it was necessary. Of course, parents would only be able to intervene if they happened to be watching the right monitor at the right time.

According to Shelly, trained paramedics and nannies were on standby, but they were barred from assisting unless an emergency arose. He also said background checks and psychological testing were done on all participants. "There isn't a safer place for a child in the whole country," said McKerrow.

"When Shakespeare said 'neither a borrower nor a lender be,' little did he know what we'd end up exchanging," wrote Robert Bianco for *USA Today*. "And that's the mind-boggling question at the center of NBC's 'The Baby Borrowers.'"



**Bianco**

Calling the program "TV's latest life's-a-joke assault on the boundaries of bad taste," Bianco found it hard to believe any parent would "lend their infant out as a reality-show challenge." He said producers want to tease viewers with "the quickly dismissed possibility that the babies might be at risk while ignoring the cold, hard fact that they are at risk, no matter what safeguards exist."

"If the borrowers drop those babies, how could the show's 'shadow nannies' catch them before they hit the floor?" Bianco opined. "And even if the babies aren't in danger, what is the up side for them in this arrangement? They certainly don't seem very happy about it."

Bianco accused NBC of promoting the show as if it were some kind of "electronic birth control." He said that even if "societal improvement" was the goal the program would not do much to achieve it. But, Bianco emphasized, "societal improvement" was *not* the goal.

"Any teenager who has watched a reality show knows these kids were chosen to fail, and to be ill-behaved brats while doing so," wrote Bianco. "What manipulation can't achieve, editing does. The show lovingly dwells on every snit-fit and flaw, particularly that adolescent know-it-all attitude that causes them to respond to criticism as if it were an assault on the deference they assume is their

natural due. Still, try to keep in mind that they've been lent to the show as well—and by adults who should know better."

The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) issued a statement calling for NBC to pull "The Baby Borrowers" due to health and safety concerns. "Separating babies and toddlers from their parents for extended periods of time can lead children to feel distress and anxiety," the statement read. After prolonged separation, a child can feel distrust for his or her primary caregiver. Separation can damage a healthy attachment and a child's sense of safety." AACAP expressed concern that the program promotes "baby borrowing" as an "acceptable parenting practice" that will "prompt imitation."



**Glowinski**

"Should this practice be emulated without the benefit of the observing camera," said Anne Glowinski, M.D., MPE, a child and adolescent psychiatrist and member of AACAP's Infancy and Preschool Committee, "it is important to note that teenagers may be more likely than adult strangers to abuse or neglect infants and toddlers."

Zero to Three, an advocacy group, claimed the show "exploits very young children in the pursuit of entertainment." A statement released by the organization said, "Legitimate social experiments are not conducted on national television or on reality shows. 'The Baby Borrowers' may have a catchy theme, but it exploits young children with potential harmful consequences. This is no social experiment. It is an extremely misguided endeavor that puts at risk our most vulnerable citizens, young children who need our love and protection."

Like Robert Bianco, Zero to Three was critical of NBC's "safeguard"—having a nanny nearby in case a problem should arise. "The nanny is no more familiar to that child than the two strangers who will be caring for him for three days. The nanny does not know him or what his signals mean—such as what he needs when he cries out in the middle of the night or how he shows he is hungry, tired, or is overwhelmed and needs a break from play," the statement said. "Moreover, even though the parents of these young children are watching via closed-circuit television, the babies are not aware of that and have no way of knowing how long the parents will be gone."

After NBC announced it was producing an American version of "The Baby Borrowers," Jan Hunt, M.Sc., director of The Natural Child Project, objected in an open letter to NBC:

As a parent, child psychologist and family counselor, I am deeply concerned about the premise of your new show "The Baby Bor-

rowers," and for the present and future emotional health of the babies and young children whose lives will be so strongly affected.

Sudden removal from their parents and placement with strangers for long periods of time is from a baby's point of view no different than a kidnapping. It has been well-established that babies who suddenly lose their primary caregiver can quickly go into mourning and emotional depression. They have no sense of time and no way to know that they will ever be returned to the only family they have known. They will inevitably express their fear and confusion in the only way they can, with tears, screams, and regressive behavior. Will their cries and behavior be understood and respected by teenagers with little or no experience with babies and their critical need for compassion and reassurance? I fear not, because anyone who understands the potential for the lifelong repercussions of such a situation would never participate in this...show.

Babies do not have the mental capacity to anticipate the return of a mother who has gone; they cannot use imagination or project into the future...

As traumatic as this experience will surely be for these babies and children, the effects will not end when they return home. Will their parents then understand and empathize with their inevitable sadness and regressed behavior? Probably not, because few parents are aware of the critical importance of early childhood experiences. There is every reason to believe that this kind of trauma will have long-term effects, making it harder for these children to trust their parents or indeed, anyone else...

The first months and years of life are absolutely critical for establishing the capacity for love and trust. Babies are human beings who deserve to be treated like human beings, not objects to be callously exploited for "entertainment"...Babies and young children deserve our utmost love and compassion!



**Stanek**

Jill Stanek, editor of "Pro-Life Pulse," an online blog, would "really like to sink this show fast." She said it is one thing for adults "to agree to be made fools" on so-called reality television, but it's another when a show "exploits babies, children, sick elderly, and the teen stars themselves, all unknowingly part of a 'safer sex and abort if hexed'" indoctrination campaign.

Stanek noted that the show's website has a link to The National Campaign, where people may obtain "facts, special discussion guides, tips for parents, and more." Stanek offered her analysis:

Leadership of the National Campaign is stuffed with liberal think tank and foundation members as well as an unhealthy sprinkling of staff and "clergy" from Planned Parenthood, Catholics for Free Choice, Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice, and The Guttmacher Institute. The pièce de résistance is the who's who list of pro-abort politicians involved.

The intention of this show is to scare teens from pregnancy but not sex. To do so it bastardizes the concept of conception and child-rearing of loving married couples surrounded by strong support groups. Unmarried babysitters cannot possibly equate.

Wearing an "empathy belly" only stilt's one's posture; it does not for a fraction of time emulate the 9-month bonding experience between mother and preborn child.



**Sean, 18, holds a "borrowed" baby**

Stanek is right. The rabidly pro-abortion National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy is playing a key role in the making and promotion of "The Baby Borrowers." In promoting the show, NBC used the slogan, "It's not T.V. It's birth control." The Associated Press has reported that the message of the show is, "Don't get pregnant," but the actual message is, "Don't have a baby."

"Producers justify such programming by saying it reflects what is really going on in schools and in the lives of young people," Scott said. "But who appointed them to put it on television? There are many horrible things going on in the world that are not televised. Television should be entertaining and educational. It should not move the reprehensible into the mainstream—into the area of acceptability."

NBC and The National Campaign previewed the series at the homes of several adolescents before its debut. The National Campaign often works with the entertainment industry on the development of public service announcements and teen pregnancy storylines.

"It's a format that they're used to," National Campaign senior manager Amy Kramer said after the screening. "It looks like a lot of other shows teens watch, but they get also this incredible message. It's not a 'very special' episode of something. It's not hitting them over the head. It's like real life."

The preview was attended by 17-year-old Sam Weidman and 20 friends, as well as his parents. Several others were also present, including Shelly, McKerrow, and representatives from The National Campaign. After watching the premier episode, the show, teen pregnancy, birth control and abortion were discussed.

Weidman said his friends were initially skeptical and did not want to attend the screening. "I was nagging them and bribing them with food to come, but I think they ended up being glad they came. I think this stirred them and their beliefs up. They all wanted to talk about it, which I guess was the whole point of the show."



"The Baby Borrowers' is not a 'social experiment,'" said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr., "unless producers are trying to find out how much the American people will tolerate. Rather, it is 'social engineering.'" He pointed to several facts to support the analysis:

- The goal is to convince teenagers that birth should be avoided rather than pregnancy and the sexual activity that leads to pregnancy.

- Closely examine the name of “The National Campaign to Prevent Teen and Unplanned Pregnancy.” The group does not just want to prevent “unplanned” pregnancy; it opposes teenage pregnancy, period. This is Planned Parenthood’s agenda under a different name.
- “I think this stirred them and their beliefs up,” teenager Weidman said of “The Baby Borrowers.” There were no experts present who opposed The National Campaign’s agenda. Consequently, no one was there to challenge the belief system of those who support the program’s message and back those who opposed it.
- The program is taking “Baby Think It Over” to another level. Created by Realityworks Inc., the vinyl doll was given to a teen to show the “realities” of having a baby. A computer inside the doll tracked and recorded its care (rocking, diapering, feeding, burping, handling, etc.). Detailed data could be down-loaded after the simulation, including exact times of missed care events, and specific mishandling such as improper head support and positioning, and rough handling. The doll would spit up, cry at regular intervals, even in the middle of the night, soil itself, and so forth.



While the doll allowed teenagers to experience the “negatives” of having a baby, it was not able to show any positive aspects. Even the Baby Think It Over logo depicts a screaming child. In “The Baby

Borrowers,” teenagers are expected to care for a child that is not their own flesh and blood and bonding in a 72-hour period is virtually impossible. While not as bad as Baby Think It Over, “The Baby Borrowers” focuses on the “downside” of childrearing.

- How much discussion has centered on the show’s inclusion of preteens, teenagers, and seniors? Absolutely none. This proves that the real purpose of the program is to alter the way people—especially youth—think about parenthood. Consider the words of “The Baby Borrowers” creator McKerrow. “I’m a great believer in education by stealth,” he told *U.S. News & World Report*, “which is why I wanted to create an entertaining show rather than an educational video.”
- BBC said the program was designed to see how young people respond to being a parent at a time when Britain had the highest teenage pregnancy rate in Europe. The excuse was mirrored by producers of the U.S. version. This is rather misleading because one city, county, state/province, country, and continent will *always* have the “highest teenage pregnancy rate” when compared to others. The comment is further evidence that the older children and senior citizens were included only to criticism. After all, they could argue that the baby segment is just one part of the “experiment.” In the same way, Planned Parenthood argues that putting preborn human beings to death is only a “small part” of its operation.

NBC will air a follow-up special after the August 6, 2008 finale of “The Baby Borrowers.” The network claims the

special will include “a spirited debate punctuating an interactive town hall reunion that will bring together the reality series’ cast and producers—as well as other news-making guests...”

An NBC press release noted that, “Last December, The Center [sic] for Disease Control reported that in 2006, the number of teenagers giving birth rose for the first time in 14 years.” It was stated that the program “has sparked much debate while also bringing the important social issue of teen pregnancy to light.”



**Plestis**

“The coincidence of this unique series has drawn media attention to the very important subject of the recent rise in teen pregnancies as well as to recent related news ranging from the high school students in Gloucester to pregnant teen celebrities such as Jamie Lynn Spears,” said Craig Plestis, executive vice president of Alternative Programming, Development and Specials, for NBC Entertainment. “This special should shed more light on a controversial subject that deserves more personal discussion beyond the social experiment that we provided to entertain audiences this summer.”

“Through this emotional, dramatic journey, each young couple got a unique opportunity to peer into the future and see what they (and their partners) might be like if they remain together and decide to build a family,” read NBC’s statement. “Tested by the everyday ups and downs of taking care of others and maintaining a relationship, most of the teens found themselves looking at all of their relationships and notions of parenthood in a new light.”

**ACTION:** To comment on “The Baby Borrowers,” write to: Mr. Jeffrey A. Zucker, President & CEO, NBC Universal, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, NY 10112, and send a copy to NBC’s parent company: Mr. Jeffrey R. Immelt, Chairman & CEO, General Electric Company, 3135 Easton Tpke., Fairfield, CT 06828.

### CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

There is a new person at the top at boycott target eBay Inc. Write to: Mr. John Donahoe, President & CEO, eBay Inc., 2145 Hamilton Ave., San Jose, CA 95125.

### “WHAT WERE THEY THINKING?”

You are watching television and an advertisement catches your eye. Three smiling and attractive young women are on the screen. The woman in the center says, “I like it big.”

The scene changes to an older woman who is a clerk in a general store. “Really big!” she says.

The scene changes once again. This time an attractive woman says, “Well, I like it really big and fast!” What exactly are these women talking about? The same woman is immediately shown from a different angle. “...so I go to Ritz Camera for big, big enlargements,” she says.



David M. Ritz, chairman and chief executive officer of Ritz Camera Centers Inc., appears in the commercial to talk about photo enlargements offered by his company. Ritz concludes his pitch by holding up a large poster of the clerk in the general store saying, “Who says size doesn’t matter?”

Sexual innuendo has been used to sell many products, but is not Ritz Camera supposed to be a “family friendly” establishment? Did corporate officials really have to stoop to such a level?

The ad, which may be viewed online (You Tube), is not exactly a hit. One consumer wrote a comment after viewing it:

hmm, not sure about this one...The other commercials are great, but I searched this one out 'cuz my wife made a comment that she didn't like it.

I know we live in the day and age of Viagra commercials on TV, and a zillion sexual references per minute...But, call me old fashioned, please...the other...[ads] are classier.

A private corporation, Ritz Camera Centers Inc. started in 1918 as a one-man portrait studio. It is now the largest photographic chain with nearly 1,200 stores. Stores operate under names such as Ritz Camera, Wolf Camera, Kits Camera, Inkley’s, and The Camera Shop. The company also sells products online. Subsidiary Boater’s World Marine Centers has about 250 stores that sell gear and apparel for fishing and boating.

“What were they thinking?” asked LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr. “The advertising agency or individual responsible for the ad should be fired.”

**TAKE A STAND:** Urge Ritz Camera to drop the offensive ad and refrain from doing such ads in the future. *Write:* Mr. David M. Ritz, Chairman & CEO, Ritz Camera Centers Inc., 6711 Ritz Way, Beltsville, MD 20705.

### DIOCESE OF LITTLE ROCK SURVEY

In the March-April 2008 edition of *The Caleb Report*, we reported extensively on the decision by the Diocese of Little Rock (Ark.) to withdraw its opposition to Susan G. Komen for the Cure, despite the association between the group and Planned Parenthood. As weak as the opposition was, the decision to criticize Komen had been praised by pro-life leaders.

Unfortunately, the courage expressed by officials at the Diocese of Little Rock was short-lived. But maybe we should not be surprised, especially when taking into consideration the results of several surveys conducted by official diocesan newspaper, the *Arkansas Catholic*.

Shortly after the decision to withhold support from Komen was announced, readers were asked, “Have you

ever donated money to Susan G. Komen for the Cure or participated in the Race for the Cure?” Twenty-six percent say they had supported Komen but would not do so in the future. Nine percent said they had never supported the organization and did not plan to do so. Six percent said they had not donated to Komen but may do so in the future. And a whopping 60 percent said they had supported Komen in the past and will do so again.

Remember, the survey was conducted *after* the Diocese had released a statement criticizing Komen’s connection to Planned Parenthood and *before* the criticism was rescinded. The facts did not seem to matter to most of those who responded.

The results are in line with other poll questions that relate to life issues. For example, the newspaper asked, “How much do candidates’ stands on life issues influence your vote...?” While 31 percent said his/her vote is based “entirely” on life issues, 69 percent said such issues influence their vote “strongly” but “other issues also apply.” There should have been a third option. “Life issues do not matter to me.” We wonder how many of the 69 percent would have selected the third option.



“[T]he Mass for Life and March for Life will be held Jan. 20 in Little Rock. What’s your involvement in these events?” the newspaper asked.

Twenty percent said they will not or did not attend this year but have done so at least one of the events in the past. Eighty percent had never attended either event. And how many of those who responded to the survey attended at least one of the events this year? Zero.

The survey results are surprising when one considers the answers the respondents gave to questions about how they practice their faith:

- Do you keep your Lenten intentions (fasting, prayer, sacrifice, etc.) on Sundays? *Always:* 21 percent; *Sometimes:* 43 percent; *Never:* 36 percent.
- Where do you say the rosary? *In a church/chapel:* 30 percent; *In the car:* 30 percent; *In the bedroom:* 20 percent; *In the den/living room:* 10 percent; *Rarely or never say the rosary:* 30 percent.

### PERVERTING NATIONAL POETRY MONTH

**WARNING:** This article includes offensive material. Please exercise appropriate discretion.

Did you know that April was National Poetry Month? Did you know April was also National STD (Sexually Transmitted Disease) Awareness Month? The hierarchy at Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) sure did. On April 8, 2008, they sent a message to supporters who use MySpace saying they wanted to “honor” both events by asking people to send in “poems on safer sex and STD prevention.” PPFA provided two examples:

So very itchy  
 Oh Noes! I have Pubic Lice!  
 Time to throw out sheets  
 Unprotected sex  
 Very risky, not worth it  
 Always be prepared  
 Eww, gross. Syphilis  
 Cure with antibiotics  
 Often no symptoms  
 Please protect yourself  
 Every partner every time  
 Condoms do save lives

The second PFFA-provided example:

There once was a girl from Belize  
 Who discovered it burned when she peed  
 To Planned Parenthood she went  
 Though money couldn't be spent  
 And now she is STI-free!

Astonished? Wait until you check out some of the work PFFA received and posted online for young people to read. The first was written by MySpace user "Tiina," a 30-year-old woman from Philomath, Ore.:

Your partner's ready and wildly receptive,  
 You both remembered a good contraceptive,  
 So, slip off your clothes and get down to business  
 But, just one more thing before you begin this.  
 Don't be the ones with an unsafe sex flubber,  
 Just take the time to slip on a rubber.  
 Pregnancy's not the only thing to prevent,  
 If you're not careful an STD could present.

"Yoga Girl" is a 41-year-old from Washington, D.C., submitted a short poem:

Syphilis, syphilis, I think I have syphilis  
 It started with a little kiss  
 and now it hurts to take a piss  
 oh my god, I have syphilis

"Elysse," a 28-year-old woman from Milwaukee, Wisc., wrote:

What is it that I've got?  
 It started with some tenderness  
 Near a rather private spot?  
 Now its developed into something more.  
 I fear a trip to the Dr.  
 may be needed  
 For it has in fact become quite sore.  
 I hope it isn't serious.  
 But without relief soon  
 In short order I'll be delirious.  
 I didn't ask for this!  
 Nor did I take any precaution  
 Oh why, oh why, am I so promiscuous?  
 Alas my Dr. confirmed my greatest fears.  
 There is no cure for my condition  
 I'll carry this for the rest of my years.

## 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:

*May*—CBN founder **Marion G. "Pat" Robertson**, who 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 embryonic stem cell experimentation supporter Senator John S. McCain III after they dropped out of the race for President; *June*—**Hillary R. Clinton**, D-N.Y., and **Barack H. Obama**, D-Ill.; *July*—**Simon P. Cowell**, "American Idol" judge and chief executive officer of the pro-abortion International Save the Children Alliance; *August*—Msgr. **J. Gaston Hebert**, former administrator of the Diocese of Little Rock, Ark., who embraced Komen Race for the Cure despite its connection to Planned Parenthood; and *September*—**Jeffrey A. Zucker**, president and chief executive officer of NBC Universal, who authorized the airing of "The Baby Borrowers."

### QUOTABLE QUOTE

"I have to do anything within my power to keep my child safe. And if that means sacrificing myself that means sacrificing myself."

— crime victim "Melissa," "I Survived..." BIO-TV, aired June 2, 2008

### IN YOUR OWN WORDS

LDI provides space for its supporters and detractors to have their say about various issues. If you have a comment/opinion on any issue relating to LDI or life issues, do not be shy! Send it to us!

### R-E-S-P-E-C-T

We have the highest respect for your organization and your integrity.

- Roger & Gayle Church

### Understands

A person who asked why LDI does not freely distribute *The Boycott List* was satisfied by our explanation:

Thank you so much for explaining why you were charging for this list. I have been trying to find a quick list on the Internet for a while and was very annoyed...Now I understand fully and commend you for your great efforts.

- Christina Burkemper

### Will Not Boycott Unless LDI Does It Her Way

In the past, we've bought your list multiple times, as well as multiple copies in a year. But no more. I feel your method of using paper and snail-mail in the Internet age is a trifle foolish.

To be sure, like most nonprofits, you must balance fulfilling God's mission with the resources you've been given. However, your efficacy, and your fulfillment of God's calling to you, would grow significantly, perhaps by 10x or more, if you were to make your infor-

mation available online. Think of the possibilities in terms of having fightpp appear on search engines, the ability for your supporters to search on specific products (not only companies), as well as the ability for supporters to enter commonly bought items and have your site automatically flag the bad ones, providing alternatives from life-affirming (or at least neutral) companies. This could be taken to a whole new level!

In the computerized era in which we live, please prayerfully consider this! In terms of your business model, the Internet access may be coupled either with a voluntary donation or fee.

- Olaf Vancura, Ph.D.

### **Feedback: "Diocese Of Little Rock Entranced By Komen"**

LDI received two responses regarding our article criticizing the Diocese of Little Rock for withdrawing its opposition to the Susan G. Komen Race for the Cure (see *The Caleb Report*, March-April 2008):

I work at a diocese [sic] in California. I read your article attacking the diocese in Little Rock for choosing to tell the truth about Komen Race for the Cure. I hope you don't expect to be invited to speak at any diocese or Catholic group because its [sic] obvious that you have deep anti-catholic prejudice and intolerance, but maybe the hand full [sic] of radical catholics [sic] will invite you cause [sic] you all think the same. Stop attacking the Catholic Church!!! *Stop trying to destroy the Catholic Church by making us intolerant of others!!!* Its [sic] *unchristian* and god [sic] will judge you *harshly!!!*

- B. Mitchell

This is distressing information. I went on to read other articles and was especially disturbed with the Diocese of Arkansas/Komen situation. I am Roman Catholic and so disappointed when our Leaders let us down this way. I believe he was sincere, and misguided, but I don't see an excuse for that. As you said, he could have contacted you or Priests for Life, etc., to really find out what the situation is.

I wondered if you possibly wrote the Diocese after the fact, to enlighten them, and try to correct the error. Also, will you encourage us to write them in your next newsletter?

- Nancy Lally

Yes and yes. We have written Bishop Anthony B. Taylor and asked him to review the matter. We asked pro-life people to do the same in the March-April 2008 edition of *The Caleb Report*. We are happy to provide the contact information once again. *Write:* The Most Reverend Anthony B. Taylor, Bishop of Little Rock, Diocese of Little Rock, 2500 N. Tyler St., Little Rock, AR 72207. In addition, we urged pro-life advocates to contact their local church hierarchy and urge them to speak out strongly against participation in Komen fund-raising events.

In his response to the controversy, Bishop Taylor said he has not had time to "fully review" the Susan G. Komen statement released by the diocese prior to his installation as bishop on June 5, 2008. "I am confident, however, that the statement was issued after much prayer and consultation with others by Monsignor J. Gaston Hebert, the previous diocesan administrator." If Hebert did a lot of "consultation," it was with the wrong people.

### **Removing Ourselves From Society**

Terry Jondahl wondered how it was possible to be truly pro-life in today's society:

I much appreciate your work & I have made several business & financing decisions base on the information that you provide. My wife and myself have been active in local pro-life oriented/gospel presentation drama productions with our church.

I do have a question; by the reasoning used in most of the articles I have read on your site (re: Diocese Of Little Rock Entranced By Komen) I would have to totally disassociate myself from anything pertaining to the United States & any local/state government agency as tax dollars are used to fund Planned Parenthood. I would have to refuse to pay taxes of any sort & clearly have to move to someplace that had nothing to do with any government that has any association with any other government that has any.

Do you get my meaning? This is a serious query, I am not being facetious nor critical. I believe selective targeting can be effective on some scale but if we are to be consistent with our separation then the above actions are not outlandish but they also are totally unworkable.

Any thoughts?

LDI has always advocated doing all that is possible to achieve a pro-life society. But we do not believe one should do that which is unreasonable. What is our definition of "unreasonable?" Any action or inaction that:

- would do more harm than good and/or achieve nothing (violence, going to prison to "make a point," etc.)
- is morally/biblically wrong (violence, lying, etc.)
- is poorly planned and/or executed.

We believe failing to pay taxes could land a person in prison and create financial ruin for his/her family. Little if any good could come from doing such a thing. In the case of Komen and the Diocese of Little Rock, we did not suggest leaving any particular church. We simply asked pro-life activists to encourage those in a position to right the wrong to do so.

### **"It's Great!"**

Julaine K. Appling of Wisconsin Family Council wrote to ask about LDI's brochure, "On the Record: The Philosophy of Planned Parenthood":

How do I get mass quantities of the above-referenced pamphlet? It's great—and we want to mail them out to thousands in Wisconsin!

### **Thanks For The Encouragement**

Thank you for all that you guys do. You are a blessing and are a huge part of this battle to save unborn babies. God bless you. We WILL see the day SOON, I believe, when abortion is overturned and revival is in America again.

- Kristen Mettlen

### **Very Appreciative—Which We Appreciate!**

I became acquainted with your organization through Pro-Life Wisconsin and ordered a boycott list earlier this year. Upon receiving

it, I was shocked to find out how many organizations/products are included and can't imagine how many hours went into researching and preparing the list. Thanks for all you do to advance the pro-life cause and help pro-lifers make informed choices!

- Mary Ann Budish

### **Sending Two Letter Per Week**

Hi! We are partners and have never given you our email, so here it is! Thanks for all you do, I send two letters a week and it is so gratifying to see names removed from the list!

- Paula & Art Veneklas

### **No More Support For Doctors Without Borders**

Steve Seeger was disappointed to learn that Doctors Without Borders is in the Dishonorable Mention section of *The Boycott List*. To his credit, after receiving details, Seeger chose to do the right thing:

Well I can tell you that "Doctors Without Borders" will never receive a donation from myself or any of the network of people that I "watchdog" with. May god continue to bless your vigilant efforts! I will be making a donation to Life Decisions International. Thank you for the work that you do...

### **THE REAL SALVATION ARMY**



There has been a great deal of confusion and even some debate regarding The Salvation Army's position on abortion. After all, The Salvation Army is in the "Dishonorable Mention" section of *The Boycott List* because it "defends abortion in cases of rape, incest, fetal deformity, etc."

Pro-life activists who contact The Salvation Army regarding its position are asked to read its official statement, which is reprinted here in full:

The Salvation Army believes in the sanctity of all human life and considers each person to be of infinite value and each life a gift from God to be cherished, nurtured and redeemed. Human life is sacred because it is made in the image of God and has an eternal destiny. (Genesis 1:27) Sacredness is not conferred, nor can it be taken away by human agreement.

The Salvation Army deplores society's ready acceptance of abortion, which reflects insufficient concern for vulnerable persons, including the unborn. (Psalms 82:3-4)

The Salvation Army holds to the Christian ideals of chastity before marriage and fidelity within the marriage relationship and, consistent with these ideals, supports measures to prevent crisis pregnancies. It is opposed to abortion as a means of birth control, family planning, sex selection or for any reason of mere convenience to avoid the responsibility for conception. Therefore, when an unwanted pregnancy occurs, The Salvation Army advises that the situation be accepted and that the pregnancy be carried to term, and offers supportive help and assistance with planning.

The Salvation Army recognizes tragic and perplexing circumstances that require difficult decisions regarding a pregnancy. Such decisions should be made only after prayerful and thoughtful consideration, with appropriate involvement of the woman's family and pastoral, medical and other counsel. A woman in these circumstances needs acceptance, love and compassion.

When an abortion has taken place, The Salvation Army will continue to show love and compassion and to offer its services and fellowship to those involved.

In May 2007, *Der Bund*, a regional newspaper in Berne, Switzerland, published an interview with Salvation Army General Shaw Clifton. One of the questions asked by the newspaper regarded abortion:

*Der Bund*: You involve yourselves with questions such as abortion. I am assuming that The Salvation Army is against it?

*Clifton*: That's too simple. We are not as conservative as our catholic brothers and sisters. There are situations in which abortion is the lesser evil, for instance in cases of severe deformities of the fetus, [or] rape. We try to support women who find themselves in this situation and to be loyal to them, even if they make decisions that we ourselves might not have made.

The Salvation Army has a separate official statement that addresses birth control:

The Salvation Army believes that sex and its proper use is a gift, created, ordained and blessed by God and intended to find expression only within the context of a loving marriage relationship. The Salvation Army believes that sexual expression within marriage has a number of divinely intended purposes including: procreation (Genesis 1:28, 9:1,7); companionship (Genesis 2:18); unity (Genesis 2:24, Matthew 19:4-6) and pleasure (Song of Songs).

The Salvation Army supports the desire of many married couples to limit the number of children in their family and believes that there are morally acceptable, contraceptive solutions available to achieve this end.

The Salvation Army encourages the use of birth control methods that are contraceptive (i.e. that prevent conception) versus the use of methods that are abortifacient (i.e. that prevent implantation after fertilization). The Salvation Army is opposed to abortion as a means of birth control.

The Salvation Army does not oppose sterilization as a means of contraception. However, because it is generally irreversible in nature, such a procedure should be undertaken only after full consideration is given to spiritual, moral and practical ramifications.



**Clifton**

While public statements made by The Salvation Army often cite *Scripture*, Clifton said the *Word of God* cannot be taken literally. "You see, we are not fundamentalists when it comes to interpreting the Bible," he told *Der Bund*. Citing evolution as an example, Clifton said he "can quite happily live with the idea of... 'evolution', and science gives us fairly conclusive evidence on the age of the earth."

*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.fightppp.org](http://www.fightppp.org)).

© 2008 Life Decisions International