



# The Caleb Report

September-October 2005

Life Decisions International

vol. xiii · no. 5

**IN THIS ISSUE:** Dr. Phil Touts Planned Parenthood: “Media Shrink” Presents Dichotomy; Enters Into Alliance With Pro-Abortion Group / PPFA Boss “Demands” Answers / Water, Food, Shelter...Pills / The Prayer Project / “Boycott Backfires”—Say What? / Update: Corporate Funding Project / Grocery Chain Yanks Teen Magazine / All Trick, No Treat / Quotable Quote / Bad Choice (And Taste) Shopping

## DR. PHIL TOUTS PLANNED PARENTHOOD

“Media Shrink” Presents Dichotomy; Enters Into Alliance With Pro-Abortion Group

Phillip C. McGraw, Ph.D., came to the attention of most people through his guest appearances on “The Oprah Winfrey Show.” Affectionately known as “Dr. Phil,” he soon became a favorite and frequent guest on the program, as well as a guest on other shows.



Winfrey

McGraw roused the interest of millions of people with his “get real” approach to problems. In 2002, *People* magazine named McGraw one of the “Most Intriguing People,” Barbara Walters included him in a “Ten Most Fascinating People” television special, and *Newsweek* ran a cover story on the doctor. Another major event took place in 2002. Oprah Winfrey’s production company, Harpo Productions, created for McGraw a syndicated talk show of his own that it aptly called “Dr. Phil.”

As a professional psychologist, McGraw has published many articles and practiced in several areas of clinical psychology and behavioral medicine. He has a B.S., M.A., and Ph.D. in clinical psychology from North Texas State University with a dual area of emphasis in clinical and behavioral medicine. He has been board-certified and licensed since 1978.

McGraw has authored five books that reached the top spot on the *New York Times*’ list of bestsellers. His books have been published in 37 languages with over 22 million copies in print. McGraw is unquestionably the quintessential celebrity.

McGraw’s popularity has not shielded him from criticism. Marty Klein, Ph.D., a professor at Santa Clara University, has been a licensed marriage and family therapist for 24 years. He faults the television star for acting like he knows everything. In every situation,

Klein wrote, it is McGraw who decides “who the victim is, insists that that person’s needs are the ones that must be met, and tells both parties exactly what to do. This doesn’t ‘empower’ or ‘transform’ anyone, to use Oprah-ese.”

Klein refers to McGraw as a “media shrink,” which is certainly not meant in a positive way. After all, McGraw is trying to counsel real people about very serious problems in an environment that must be entertaining and fast-paced; it is only a one hour show. “Counseling sessions” must be about topics of interest to viewers and create the kind of atmosphere that makes for good ratings. Far too often the needs of the “client” take a back seat to the need for McGraw to demonstrate his wit and showcase his one-liner approach to problem-solving.



Klein

Consider the “Dr. Phil” episode featuring Tripp and Michelle. Plagued by erectile dysfunction, Tripp had been unable to consummate their two-and-a-half year marriage. “It’s like a cancer eating me from the inside out,” he said. The couple believed the problem stemmed from an abortion Michelle had while they were engaged. “I felt that the decision to terminate the pregnancy was forced upon me,” she told McGraw.

Tripp admitted to being the source of Michelle’s discontent. “When I made the decision to have the procedure, I think I lost a lot of her trust,” he said. Tripp believed a fear of failure had kept him from engaging in sexual relations with his wife. They had not been intimate since the day the abortion was committed. McGraw’s advice was that Tripp and Michelle needed to forgive each other. He told the couple stand, face

each other, and ask for forgiveness. McGraw ended his “counseling” by saying, “It’s time to move on.” While the forgiveness scene made for emotional television, did McGraw really believe the deep seeded problems facing the couple had been “fixed”?

Rachel’s Vineyard International, an organization that helps women and men find healing after abortion, addressed McGraw’s “counseling” of the hurting couple:

Several times during the show, the abortion was referred to as a bad choice. It was evident that Michelle and Tripp both deeply regretted their choice. Dr. Phil encouraged them to forgive one another and try to get their marriage back on track, although he did not give them any advice on how to do that.

Whether people are being “treated” or simply used by McGraw seems to be immaterial since “Dr. Phil” consistently ranks as the second most watched talk show in the United States. The bottom line is that this recipe for entertainment works, even if the concoction is poisonous to those who face serious mental illness or emotional problems.



John and Teresa Heinz Kerry (left, of course) with Phil McGraw and his wife, Robin, after a taping of a “Dr. Phil” show last year.

McGraw’s opinion about abortion is not completely clear, though it seems he may be opposed. At first glance, his opinions seem to expose a dichotomy; yet it is one shared by many people in North America. McGraw appears to be against surgical abortion but supports birth

control, some of which can be abortifacient, for minors as well as adults.

McGraw’s website (drphil.com) does not list abortion as an option for dealing with an untimely pregnancy; only adoption and raising the child are presented. At the same time, he touts Planned Parenthood as the last word in independent research on issues relating to sexuality. McGraw spoke at the 2002 iWOMAN conference in Indiana, which has also had speakers such as *Roe v. Wade* attorney Sarah Weddington, Dana Reeve (wife of the late actor Christopher Reeve), along with several other advocates of “choice.”

In an episode of “Dr. Phil” broadcast in October 2005, two women, both of whom regularly watch the program, took opposite sides on the question of distributing condoms in schools. The guests were not experts, and neither was the host.

During the program, McGraw asked Laura, who opposed handing out condoms in schools, if she was

“persuaded at all by the argument that kids are going to do it [have sex] anyway?” She responded:


No, I’m not persuaded by that. I realize that some kids will probably do that, but I think we can stop it by education. I think we can at least nip it in the bud. Numbers are declining, as a matter of fact. But in the schools that have had these programs, they’ve shown that it does not reduce pregnancy or STD [sexually transmitted disease] rates at all, so it’s basically ineffective.

McGraw vehemently disputed the guest’s claim and insinuated he knows much more about the subject than she does. “That is absolutely not true. It is on the decline. Unwanted pregnancy is on the decline,” he said. The woman responded: “I think it’s because kids are less sexually active than before, because the information is out there.”

McGraw threw supposedly “independent studies” in Laura’s face, referring to his position as “fact”:

The fact is that the research does not support what you’re saying. If you look at the massive studies that are nationwide, if you look at the Planned Parenthood studies, the fact of the matter is that kids who go through a thorough sex education program of which making condoms available with some anonymity... that kids do use them when they have them. And they don’t necessarily have sex sooner. They don’t have sex more often. They don’t have more sexual partners when they’re involved in a sex education program that involves instruction and availability of condoms.

This response does three things. It makes McGraw look like he knows more about the subject than he actually does, which he obviously finds very important. (When was the last time McGraw said, “Your opinion is as good as mine”?) It advertises and legitimizes Planned Parenthood. And it peddles the group as an agenda-free, independent research agency. Planned Parenthood “studies,” which are actually conducted by its Alan Guttmacher Institute affiliate, are usually long on opinion and agenda and short on “study.”



McGraw’s most recent bestseller.

To her credit, Laura did not let McGraw’s comment go without a response. “Is that because of the instruction or is that because of the availability of condoms?” she asked. “I think it’s because of the instruction; that maybe they’re being more careful and they’re waiting.” McGraw continued the discussion:

If kids take that as an implicit endorsement, that's a really bad message that you send to them. On the other hand, the reality is kids do have sex out of wedlock, way ahead of time, before they can predict the consequences of their actions. And I'm not so sure that I wouldn't rather have two extra kids having sex before I would've wanted them to, rather than one bringing a child into the world that they are now responsible for and not prepared to take care of.

Why does it sound as though McGraw is saying, "Every child a wanted child"—a slogan created by Planned Parenthood for a specific, agenda-advancing purpose?

"If kids are irresponsible anyway, so they're going to do it anyway, they're probably not going to use condoms or use them correctly," the guest said. Naturally, McGraw had a retort, which he labeled "truth":

The truth is, every clinical study that's been done has shown that kids that do go through a thorough sex education program have used them, not 100 percent of the time, but darn close in the ensuing year, and pregnancy in those schools went down. You have to look at the evidence. You have to look at the results. Everybody says, "We should teach abstinence." No question, absolutely we should teach abstinence, but abstinence programs are not successful.



The McGraw children in 2002: Jay (left) & Jordan.

Did he say "every clinical study"? Every clinical study done by whom? And how? By the way, you read it correctly; McGraw *wrongly* asserted, just as Planned Parenthood does, that

"abstinence programs are not successful." He goes further:

If you teach that having sex is a moral failure that alone does not reduce unwanted pregnancy. It needs to be part of the education program, but we have to do this as part of a comprehensive program. We have to teach these kids these things. Everybody says, "Maybe we shouldn't teach the kids we should teach the parents, because the parents don't know what to say." Then teach the parents. Make that required. Bottom line, I think it is dead wrong to just deal condoms out with your lunch, but I do think that you need a comprehensive program with the parents, with the kids and part of that is instructions [sic] on using them and making them accessible. Research tells us you are going to reduce disease level, you are going to reduce pregnancy. Does it solve the problem? Absolutely not. Is there a downside of suggestibility? Things aren't clear cut oftentimes, so you've got to decide what the risk-reward ratio is.


In an earlier program, McGraw asked Alex, a 15-year-old girl who is raising a baby, if she was on birth con-

trol. Alex said she was not because her mother did not approve. "My mom thinks that by putting me on birth control she will be saying that it's okay for me to run around and have sex with everybody, which is not my intention at all," Alex said. "I just want to be protecting myself in case I ever do end up in that predicament. I know what consequences come from having sex and I don't want to end up pregnant again."

McGraw asked Alex why she needs birth control if she is not going to be sexually active. "I'll be 16 years old in a week and I can't say that I won't ever be in that kind of position again. I want to be responsible."

So let us tell Alex to put hormones and chemicals into her body so she is "protected" in case something "just happens." It is sort of like having an insurance policy; it is the responsible thing to do. When a sexual situation presents itself, and it will, why would Alex choose not to have sex? After all, having been "responsible," all reasons to say "no" had been anticipated and eliminated. Thanks to the insurance policy, Alex does not have to say "no."

It is inherently irresponsible to be an unmarried minor and involved in a sexual relationship at the same time, especially when there is already a child who needs to be cared for. Instead, McGraw addresses Alex's mother about the pill. "If you do give her the pill, that's like an implicit endorsement. In a roundabout way it's kind of like permission, that's your fear. The other end of the spectrum is, if you don't, Nathan's [Alex's infant son] going to have a brother or sister."



McGraw poses next to one of his "big" sellers.

"So you're saying, 'I think it's the responsible thing to do because I can't be sure what's going to happen a year from now, or two years from now, or three years from now,' right?" McGraw asked the teen mother. "My mom thinks that by putting me on birth control is condoning the fact that she thinks I am going to have sex," Alex responded, "but it's not that at all. I mean, is it

wrong to want to be responsible?" McGraw gives a good response but does not pursue it: "Well, responsibility doesn't start with the pill, it starts before that."

Alex's mother, Erin, said her daughter has admitted using her body for power. "She's an attractive young woman and she knows that that is a powerful statement. She said, 'I like the attention that I get and I do have power and control over people' with her looks

and her body.” Alex responded, “Find me one woman that does not like that.”

“Sex is a powerful tool and women can wield that and use it over men,” Erin told her daughter, “but it’s not something that you should be doing at 16 and that’s what I’m concerned about. You haven’t kind of made that connection yet; that you are not capable and ready emotionally to be having sex.” (Is Erin telling her daughter it would be okay to use sex as a “powerful tool” when she is older?) McGraw finally comes to the rescue with *the* right answer:

I think this is a very intelligent young woman [Alex]. I think she got snuck up on before and didn’t realize the gravity of what she’s doing. I think she does understand that, and I think if she has had sex since Nathan was born, it was with protection. But, I cannot believe the naïveté with which I hear you guys [the parents] responding...I think you have no choice; I think you have to put this girl on birth control...But the truth is [that] the dynamic of this situation is that she is at risk to become pregnant again.

McGraw said the goal is to get Alex through the rest of high school and college and to a place where she is mature enough to decide if she wants to add to her family. “The chance that that’s going to happen without birth control is, in my opinion, zero,” he said. “The question is not if you put her on it, the question is when you put her on it. I just think that’s a risk you can’t take. I don’t like the message it sends. But I think the consequences of being wrong are too great to ignore.”

Consider the following text from McGraw’s website:

*Know the Facts About Teens and Sex*

You may find them shocking, but these are the facts about teenage sexual activity. Use this information to become a force in your child’s life and encourage him/her to make good choices.

- Ten percent of all 13-year-olds have had sexual intercourse.
- 50 percent of all teenagers have had sex by the time they enter the 10<sup>th</sup> grade.
- One in every five teenage girls will become pregnant during high school.
- Half of all teenagers don’t believe oral sex is sex.
- By the time they finish high school, two-thirds of all young adults will have become sexually active.

Every one of these so-called “facts” is nothing more than Planned Parenthood drivel. Trusting a Planned Parenthood study on sex is like trusting a Phillip Morris study on smoking. Is it possible that McGraw is completely ignorant of Planned Parenthood’s agenda?

Conversely, it is possible that McGraw is fully aware of the agenda and has no problem with his role in advancing it?

Taking advantage of his fame, the multimillionaire created a foundation to fight what McGraw calls “silent epidemics.” The Dr. Phil Foundation is “committed to helping children and families at risk” and “devoted to rewarding remarkable children who are working hard to overcome tremendous obstacles and give back to their family and community.”



McGraw’s Foundation is currently focusing on funding “Beat the Odds,” a program of the pro-abortion Children’s Defense Fund (CDF). The program supports young people who are “beating the

odds” through academic excellence, working to help themselves and giving to others. McGraw has used his television show and website ([drphilfoundation.com](http://drphilfoundation.com)) to raise money for the Foundation and promote the CDF program. The Foundation is giving 100 percent of the funds it raises to CDF.

A press release issued by the Dr. Phil Foundation states that the new charity “has a strong commitment to improving the lives of children and families.” McGraw said he is “passionate about the belief that we’ve got to give our young people a chance. There are so many kids out there that are excelling despite the huge obstacles they face on a daily basis.” McGraw said many of these children “just need an opportunity where they can showcase their talents and abilities...and our *Beat the Odds* program is there to do just that.” (Note: McGraw refers to “our” Beat the Odds program, but it is actually part of CDF.)

The founder and chief executive officer of CDF is Marian Wright Edelman. “Working with the Dr. Phil Foundation will help focus the public on ways we can all begin to make a positive difference in young people’s lives,” she said. “We are so looking forward to a long and productive relationship with this valuable friend of America’s children.”



**Edelman**

McGraw was not the first “celebrity” to embrace CDF. The group received enormous public recognition and free publicity after Bill Clinton was elected president in 1992. This was due to Hillary Clinton’s passionate involvement with the group.

“In addition to helping these outstanding young people, this collaboration will bolster CDF’s efforts to raise public awareness of some of the daunting obstacles faced by many children,” the Foundation press release said, “including drug and alcohol abuse in the home, homelessness, foster care problems, inadequate health care, school challenges and the nation’s troubled juvenile justice system.”

“Not every CDF program is intrinsically destructive to children. Not every Planned Parenthood project is intrinsically destructive to children,” said LDI President Douglas R. Scott. “But everything these groups do, no matter how small or innocuous on the surface, promotes an agenda. And that agenda is unquestionably destructive to children.”

Scott said McGraw should not have become associated with a group riddled with so much baggage. “The stated goal of the Dr. Phil Foundation is laudable; the unstated consequence, promoting and legitimizing the Children’s Defense Fund, is horrendous,” he said.

**ACTION:** Tell Dr. Phil what you think by writing to him at Phillip C. McGraw, Ph.D., “Dr. Phil” 5482 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1902, Los Angeles, CA 90036.

### P.P.F.A. BOSS “DEMANDS” ANSWERS

Shortly after President George W. Bush nominated a replacement for retiring United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O’Connor, the Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc. (PPFA) called on the Senate “to conduct a thoughtful and fully deliberated process that thoroughly examines [Harriet] Miers’ judicial philosophy.” PPFA said the nominee “must be prepared to demonstrate her commitment to constitutional protections for women’s health and reproductive rights.”



Miers

Harriet Ellan Miers, 60, is counsel to the President. She had previously served as an assistant to the President and deputy chief of staff. Miers has worked as co-managing partner of the Dallas, Texas, law firm Locke Liddell & Sapp. In 1992, she became the first female president of the Texas Bar Association (TBA) and from 1989-1991 was a member of the Dallas City Council. In 1994, Miers was general counsel for the transition team of Governor-elect George W. Bush. Miers led the team searching for O’Connor’s replacement, but while she was seeking suitable nominees, others in the administration were considering her.

“We are concerned about the nomination of Harriet Miers and we demand she answer questions regarding

her views of fundamental reproductive and privacy rights,” said PPFA Interim President Karen Pearl. “We expect Miers to make clear her views on reproductive rights during the hearing process, and the Senate should not confirm a nominee who is not willing to do so. Confirming a Supreme Court justice should not be an exercise of partisanship or clever gamesmanship—but rather an honest, thoughtful, thorough examination.”

PPFA noted that as head of the TBA, Miers was a leader in an unsuccessful effort to reverse the American Bar Association’s (ABA) pro-abortion position. PPFA lamented that had the effort been successful, the ABA would have taken a neutral stand on abortion—a position PPFA would not tolerate.

Pearl referenced the September 2005 confirmation of now-Chief Justice of the United States John G. Roberts, Jr., by the Senate Judiciary Committee:

During Justice Roberts’ confirmation, much of his paper trail was hidden by the Bush administration, and Roberts was allowed to avoid legitimate questions about his judicial philosophy. As a result, senators allowed protections for women’s health to be subject to a guessing game. We cannot allow this to happen again. The public deserves to know if a nominee to our nation’s highest court supports the rights that affect Americans everyday lives. Planned Parenthood calls on the Bush administration and senators to conduct a hearing with utmost transparency by demanding all relevant records and answers to questions.

Pearl and her ilk have cause for concern. In November the Supreme Court will review a lower court decision in *Ayotte v. Planned Parenthood*, which PPFA states “spotlights the urgency of the threat to reproductive freedom.” At issue is a New Hampshire law passed in 2003 which required parental notification at least 48 hours before committing an abortion on a minor. The law did not include a “health” exception but did have a judicial bypass provision. Resorting to its usual overly dramatic rhetoric, PPFA said the lack of a “health of the mother” exception “would have forced physicians to wait to provide emergency medical care until the young woman was facing imminent death.”

Pearl said PPFA’s message “is clear”:

Does she [Miers] agree with the overwhelming majority of Americans that *Roe v. Wade* is settled law? Does she believe that the Constitution protects women’s health and safety? Will she be a pit bull to defend and uphold our right to choose? Or will she allow our most cherished rights to be torn apart, putting American women in harm’s way?



Hecht

According to the *Dallas Morning News*, Miers donated \$150 to the Texans for Life Coalition in 1989. Lorlee Bartos, who managed Miers' campaign for the Dallas City Council, described her as being "on the extreme end of the anti-choice movement." Texas Supreme Court Justice Nathan Hecht, a longtime Miers friend, told the newspaper she shares his pro-life views. Former George W. Bush speechwriter David Frum told the *National Review* that Miers is "firmly pro-life."

Pro-family response to the Miers nomination has been mixed. Dr. James C. Dobson, founder of Focus on the Family, is one of the most prominent supporters of the nominee, citing his trust in President Bush and a confidential briefing he received from the White House. Dr. Richard Land of the Southern Baptist Convention expressed similar faith in the President.



Land



Sekulow


Jay Sekulow of the American Center for Law and Justice told the *Los Angeles Times* he knows Miers and she "typifies the kind of judicial philosophy the president was looking for." He called her a "great pick" and expressed confidence that conservatives would support Miers in greater numbers after they learn more about her.

Concerned Women for America has taken a wait-and-see stand. "We give Harriet Miers the benefit of the doubt, because thus far President Bush has selected nominees to the federal courts who are committed to the written Constitution," said Jan LaRue, the organization's chief counsel. "Whether we can support her will depend on what we learn from her record and the hearing process."



LaRue

Public Advocate President Eugene Delgaudio, who opposed Senate confirmation of Roberts, has also expressed disappointment in the nomination of Miers, calling it "a betrayal of the conservative, pro-family voters whose support put Bush in the White House..." Delgaudio referred to the President's nomination of "a political crony with no conservative credentials" as "inexcusable," especially since there were several "proven judges" who were qualified to serve.



The possibly gifted—confirmed, The definitely gifted—rejected: Roberts (left) and Bork

"Pro-abortion Democrats made clear their cavalier and uncaring attitude about the integrity of the Supreme Court, the Constitution, and the confirmation process when they rejected the highly qualified Robert H. Bork nearly two decades ago," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott. "Their position: the overtly prolific and scholarly need not apply."

"Anyone who has a solid record by ruling on abortion cases; anyone who has written extensively; anyone who has openly and articulately expressed himself, no matter how brilliant, will be rejected if pro-abortion Democrats can help it." Consequently only the enigmatic stand a chance of being confirmed.

"Instead of searching for the very best this country has to offer we look for those who have little or no solid record. This harms both the Supreme Court and the country," Scott said. "Those who conspired to prevent confirmation of Judge Bork were unpatriotic, unjust, and uninterested in truth. It was a textbook example in the 'exercise of partisanship' and what they believed to be 'clever gamesmanship.'"

As for the Miers nomination, Scott concurs with Dobson's assessment. "The truth is that we have to rely on the President to be a man of his word. What other choice do we have?" As for the availability of known conservatives passed over by President Bush in favor of Miers, Scott said that "being known as one who is on the political right does not necessarily mean a vote to overturn *Roe v. Wade*." He pointed to Justice Anthony Kennedy who betrayed preborn human beings by voting to uphold *Roe* to illustrate the point. "A conservative can use *stare decisis* as an excuse just as much as a liberal can," Scott said.

Scott expressed disappointment over the President's public statement that he has never discussed *Roe v. Wade* with Miers. "Pro-abortion activists in and out of Congress have a litmus test. They say, quite boldly and unapologetically, that only those who support *Roe v. Wade* should be on the Supreme Court," Scott said. "But I wonder, if the Court had legalized the killing of girls up to the age of three, wouldn't the President ask every person under consideration what he or she thought of the decision? Wouldn't it unquestionably be used as a litmus test? If the answer is 'no,' what would the Court have to do; how far would it have to go to warrant a litmus test? It seems to me that abus-

ing their constitutional authority to legalize the wanton killing of preborn human beings is enough.”

It is important to remember that even if Roberts and Miers were to vote for the reversal of *Roe v. Wade*, the Court would still be at least one vote shy of doing so. Moreover, when *Roe v. Wade* is reversed, the Pro-Life Movement must be prepared to do battle in Congress and in every state because the issue would have been returned to the elected representatives of the people. The only way to prevent this from happening would be for the Supreme Court to declare that preborn human beings are “persons” as the term is used in the Constitution and thereby afforded the protections enumerated therein. Simply put, short of a miracle, this will not happen.

### QUOTABLE QUOTE

“In the old days, back when I was a kid, you really had to be something to get to be on the Supreme Court...Now it’s just kinda like something for your buddies to do...[The President was so ecstatic that the pizza he ordered arrived piping hot that he asked] the Domino’s delivery guy if he’d like to be on the Supreme Court.”

— talk show host David Letterman speaking about the nomination of Harriet Miers

### FOOD, WATER, SHELTER...AND PILLS?

“In emergency weather situations the focus is on protecting yourself, your loved ones and your home,” said Peter J. Durkin, chief executive officer of Planned Parenthood of Houston and Southeast Texas Inc. (PPHSET). “Many times, essential medication is left behind in the bathroom cabinet.”



For one week only, in an effort to increase its customer base, PPHSET donated a month’s supply of birth control pills or an emergency birth control kit to survivors of Hurricane Katrina. “We want the women from Louisiana and Mississippi to know

that Planned Parenthood is here to serve them in their time of need,” Durkin said.

Durkin is not alone in viewing birth control as both “essential” and “medication.” Planned Parenthood of New Mexico Inc.’s Jenny Black put it this way: “In the rush to escape Hurricane Katrina, many people probably didn’t have time to grab the bare necessities.” Yes, Planned Parenthood views “emergency” birth control in the same way most people look at food, water and



Durkin

shelter. And why do we think that not even one person left homeless by Katrina or Rita was concerned about birth control?



Katrina entering Mississippi (exclusive photos). Would anyone be thinking, “Oh, I wish I had grabbed my birth control pills so I can have sex”?

Some Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc. (PPFA) affiliates sold birth control to survivors at a reduced cost rather than provide it gratis. Planned Parenthood was willing to give free or reduced cost “care” to people for a very short period of time, but this was certainly not done without expecting some kind of dividend down the road. What better fundraising tool is there than a photograph of desperate men, women and children who had been devastated by a hurricane? Every PPFA affiliate used the deadly natural disasters to raise money. And its national headquarters, which is better at taking in money than even the federal government, led the way:

#### *Help Those Affected by Hurricane*

Support Planned Parenthood and their patients during this time of great need. By clicking here, 100% of your tax-deductible contribution will go directly to helping Planned Parenthood affiliates and health centers in this region serve women and families who have nowhere else to turn.

Planned Parenthood clinics in the states of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Texas are doing everything possible to attend to the needs of patients in the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. Women and families escaped the storm with their lives, leaving behind birth control and other items critical to their well-being. Those desperate for care are rushing to their nearest health center to get the care and treatment they need. Despite the horrific events of the past few days, affiliates and health centers in this region are determined to serve all those that come through the door...

The thoughts of the entire Planned Parenthood family are with our patients, staff, and friends who are in the areas affected by this devastating hurricane.

Will every dollar raised in the names of Katrina and Rita really go to “care” for survivors? Not a chance. We do not want to sound cynical, but we are cynical.



The world's savior?  
“Emergency birth control”

This kind of self-serving opportunism is common for Planned Parenthood. After the fall of Romania’s brutal dictator Nicolae Ceausescu in 1989, PPFA donated \$22,000 to buy abortion equipment for use in the country. The International Planned Parenthood Federation Inc. had 40,000 condoms airlifted to Romania to end the “family planning emergency.” And following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, PPFA’s New York City affiliate offered a week of “reproductive health care.” Needless-to-say, in all of these cases men, women and children needed food, water, shelter and compassion; not pills and attempts to lure them into a Planned Parenthood facility.

There’s more. The Menlo Park, California-based William and Flora Hewlett Foundation donated \$1 million to PPFA to “help its affiliate health centers provide counseling and essential health care services to women, families and displaced residents affected by Hurricane Katrina.”

Apparently forgetting her group has nearly one-third of a *billion* dollars sitting around in a savings account, Interim PPFA President Karen Pearl insinuated it could not have afforded to “help” hurricane survivors without support from the Foundation and individual donors:

This grant from the Hewlett Foundation and donations from our private supporters will make it possible for Planned Parenthood to provide essential contraceptive and health care services to those who have been displaced by this devastating catastrophe. From our nearly 90 years of experience, Planned Parenthood knows the importance of providing urgently needed reproductive and primary health care services to help those who have been uprooted by disaster to get their lives back on track.

The Hewlett Foundation, which controls assets worth in excess of \$6.3 *billion*, claims its grants are meant to “help solve social and environmental problems at home and around the world.” Its primary areas of concern are population control, environmental protection, and global development. The Foundation has been a longtime and *very generous* supporter of PPFA. Foundation



Brest

President Paul Brest said the most recent grant will provide “critical aid” to hurricane survivors and “help ensure that the health care needs of tens of thousands of women and families are met.”

A PPFA press release referred to the “growing importance of providing services to the increased number of rape victims in the aftermath of the hurricane, including medical treatment, counseling, emergency contraception and abortion services.” The statement also said its work would “allow women and families to focus on rebuilding their lives with the security of access to high-quality health care services.”

## 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: *September*—Senator **William H. Frist**, M.D., R-Tenn.; *October*—**Dian J. Harrison**, president/chief executive officer of Planned Parenthood Golden Gate Inc.; *November*—**Phillip C. McGraw**, Ph.D., host of “Dr. Phil”; *December*—**Atoosa Rubenstein**, editor-in-chief of *Seventeen*; and *January*—**Marian Wright Edelman**, founder and chief executive officer of the Children’s Defense Fund.

## “BOYCOTT BACKFIRES”—SAY WHAT?

It is really rather difficult for a corporation to become a boycott target. If a corporate chief executive officer wishes to avoid the public relations nightmare that ensues when an association with a pro-abortion group is made public, he or she need only agree to stop funding Planned Parenthood.

Once it is *confirmed* that a corporation has donated to the world’s most prosperous abortion-advocacy empire, a letter is sent to its chief executive officer asking that support cease. Accompanying the letter, which is initially sent to major corporations via certified mail, is educational material about Planned Parenthood. After all, many business leaders support Planned Parenthood out of sheer ignorance. They are completely unaware of what this group with the innocuous name is really all about and we do not want to boycott a corporation when its chief executive funded the pro-abortion giant unwittingly. Many business leaders are surprised to learn of Planned Parenthood’s sinister side.



Himmelstein

LDI's goal is to privately and quietly convince corporate leaders to stop funding Planned Parenthood. "In short, given the controversy surrounding support for Planned Parenthood, it made perfect sense for any corporation to get out, at least if it could go quietly, before the letters started and the press got wind of things," wrote Jerome L. Himmelstein, a professor of Sociology at Amherst College (New York), in his book, *Looking Good & Doing Good: Corporate Philanthropy and Corporate Power*.

"It is by far preferable to convince a corporation to stop funding Planned Parenthood without making it a boycott target," said LDI President Douglas R. Scott, who founded the Corporate Funding Project in 1988. "This approach allows corporations to avoid a backlash from pro-abortion people."

LDI does not release a statement to the general public when a chief executive officer agrees to stop funding Planned Parenthood. "Our goal is to stop corporate support of Planned Parenthood; it is not to make headlines. We will let corporate officials say anything they wish about the change in philanthropic practice. We will not publicly disagree or take credit," Scott said. This approach has been appreciated by chief executives and led many funding Planned Parenthood.

The concluding paragraph of LDI's initial letter to corporate leaders appeals more to their responsibility to shareholders, employees, and the company overall as opposed to the moral issues involved:

This is not about making a personal decision; it is about making a wise business decision. Regardless of any individual's personal views, it is not in the best interest of any company to become embroiled in such a contentious issue [abortion]. Doing so is simply bad business, which explains why the leaders of 118 corporations, some of whom personally and avidly support Planned Parenthood, have stopped giving the group donations in the name of the corporation. Besides, with a *savings account* of more than \$276.5 million, it is not as though the group needs the money.

"We do not start by emphasizing the moral issue because doing so usually generates a negative response from corporate leaders," Scott said. "But when we show that a good chief executive would never get involved in such a controversy, they tend to open their eyes and ears." Scott said that when this approach fails, boycott participants have done an excellent job making the moral arguments.



Merriam

The Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc. (PPFA) has taken note of the fact that LDI has intensified its research on support of Planned Parenthood affiliates by businesses that operate in limited areas (local or regional). PPFA's website featured an article by Heather Merriam titled "Boycott Backfires," which referenced LDI's letters to businesses supporting Portland, Oregon-based Planned Parenthood of the Columbia-Willamette Inc. (PPCW). Merriam described LDI's correspondence as "harassment letters." She said business leaders received the letter at the same time PPCW was seeking gifts-in-kind for a fund-raiser. "[N]ot the best timing" for PPCW, Merriam wrote.

"We were concerned that business supporters would feel intimidated or uncomfortable," said David Greenberg, PPCW's chief executive officer. But Merriam wrote that "most" business leaders expressed anger at having been "harassed by this radical group." While "most" expressed anger, Merriam did not say how many refused to donate to Planned Parenthood.

Merriam noted the *Portland Mercury's* placement of LDI's letter on the front page of its March 31, 2005 paper. "In the following issue, *The Mercury* dedicated its 'letters to the editor' section exclusively to PPCW," Merriam wrote. "In the next issue, the paper donated a half-page ad encouraging *Mercury* readers to support Planned Parenthood as well as pro-choice businesses. LDI responded by posting the *Mercury* letters section on its Web site, with commentary on every letter." (Readers of *The Caleb Report* may recall it was the editor of the *Mercury* who opined his "love" of abortion; see *The Caleb Report*, May-June 2005.)

"The boycott hasn't really hurt us. If anything, it has helped us," Nancy Bennett, PPCW's vice president of public affairs told Merriam. "But we think that it is unfortunate that businesses are harassed by fringe groups such as these." Bennett conceded that, "Businesses are thrown off a bit the first time [they receive a letter from LDI]. But the second time, they are likely to give more, and make their support of Planned Parenthood more public. By shining a spotlight on the boycott threat, PPCW received even more public attention and additional donations."

Merriam, who is resource representative with PPFA's Affiliate Leadership and Development Group, gave an example of a brewery that donated a keg of beer for a PPCW fund-raiser. "This donation was reported on the brewery's tax form, which is how LDI discovered

that it was a Planned Parenthood supporter,” she wrote. (Note: This is a fabrication; it is *not* how LDI learned of the donation.)



Cooper

In an article titled “Family Planners Stand Up to Right Wing Boycott,” pro-abortion stalwart Cynthia L. Cooper referred to the “well-funded conservative Christian boycott” and to LDI as a “thorn in Planned Parenthood’s side.” (Did she say “well-funded”?) Interim PPFA President Karen Pearl told Cooper that “some” companies have resisted LDI’s pressure: “One corporation heard about another corporation turning us down and was so outraged that they, in turn, donated what we had asked the other corporation for.”

Always interested in truth and realizing Planned Parenthood was clearly missing the point, “Family News in Focus” (related to Focus on the Family) released a story that included Scott’s response to PPFA’s assertion that the boycott had backfired. “It’s really quite surprising how ignorant some people are about economic boycotts,” he said. “Planned Parenthood leaders seem to think the primary purpose of the boycott is to keep money out of their already overflowing coffins. But the fact that pro-life people have cost Planned Parenthood over \$35 million over the past decade is a *secondary* reward and effect.”

Scott explained that the primary reason for publishing *The Boycott List* is so people who care about human life will not unwittingly support a business that donates to Planned Parenthood. “We do not want the money of pro-family people to go to these businesses,” Scott said. “Pro-abortion devotees are free to give money to Planned Parenthood and patronize businesses on *The Boycott List*, but neither will get the hard-earned money of people who believe all human beings are created in God’s image and are therefore inherently precious.”

“It is not as though the names of businesses supporting Planned Parenthood are unknown to pro-abortion activists,” Scott said. “But we know that business leaders continue to receive letters from pro-life individuals long after the pro-abortion crowd has moved on to other things.”



“This is largely a ‘war of attrition’ and over the long haul the boycott can impact a chief executive officer on both a business and personal level,” Scott said. He pointed to the Dayton Hudson Corporation (now Target Corporation) as an example. Soon after announcing it would end support of Planned Par-

enthood, the company rescinded its decision, claiming pro-abortion activists had launched a counter-protest. (The entire episode was nothing but a ruse on the part of Dayton Hudson as persons within the company were instrumental in orchestrating the “counter-protest.” The company used the staged counter-protest as an excuse for resuming its support of Planned Parenthood.) Several months after pro-abortion people stopped pressuring the company, it cut off funding of Planned Parenthood for good.

“Pro-abortion people became complacent and moved on,” Scott said, “which is something pro-life people never do because we have a God who sustains us. Pro-life people realize that if we give up Planned Parenthood wins and this is simply unacceptable.”

Scott expressed his appreciation for the integrity of “Family New in Focus” and Focus on the Family. “There are only a few national organizations I can wholeheartedly support and Focus on the Family is certainly one of them,” he said.

**ACTION:** Visit LDI’s website for a list of local Planned Parenthood supporters: [fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=regional](http://fightpp.org/show.cfm?page=regional). If you reside in or visit any of the areas where these businesses exist, be sure to let their respective owners know how you feel.

#### **UPDATE: CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT**

The Charles Schwab Corporation, Safeway Inc., Willis Stein, and the Portland Brewing Company are no longer boycott targets.

LDI is implementing a new strategy to help advance the Corporate Funding Project. In an effort to increase the number of letters going to corporations, *The Caleb Report* will henceforth include a recommended letter writing schedule. This strategy will commence the first full week of November.

Due to space limitations, please refer to your copy of *The Boycott List* for the names of chief executive officers and their corporate addresses. We believe that if every LDI Partner will adhere to the schedule as closely as possible, it could have a major impact on our work. And, of course, feel free to write to even more corporations if you are able to do so!

#### **GROCERY CHAIN YANKS TEEN MAGAZINE**

Albertsons Inc., the second largest supermarket chain in the United States, quickly pulled the October 2005 issue of *Seventeen* after receiving complaints from customers. The magazine was yanked from the 2,500 stores owned by the company, including Albertsons, Acme, Shaw’s, Jewel-Osco and Sav-on Drugs, all of which are located in twelve western states.

At issue was a two-page article titled, “Vagina 101: What’s Normal and What’s Not,” which included a color drawing labeling eight parts of the vagina and two color photographs of a vagina. A spokesman for the magazine said its writers address issues of concern to readers and subjects are discussed in an open and objective way. (Are these issues really “of concern to readers” or those the editors believe *should be* “of concern to readers”?)



Some people who opposed the company’s action noted that magazines such as *FHM*, *Stuff*, *Maxim*, *Cosmopolitan*, and *Jane*, which include sexually charged articles and photographs, were not pulled from Albertsons’ stores. But these publications are not marketed to children. *Seventeen* admits to

pursuing readers as young as twelve, but its owners surely do not mind if an eight year old were to read the magazine. (The tobacco companies have nothing on *Seventeen*! One has got to get customers hooked when they’re young.)

The Texas State University (San Marcos) *Star*, a student publication, took issue with Albertsons’ decision. Its editor argued that the nature of the photographs “somehow seems irrelevant, since it all serves one explicit purpose, which is hardly explicit—sex education.” The editorial continued:

This all seems further proof that while our modern society often touts the visage of sexual openness and acceptance, health issues exclusive to women are still only being discussed behind gynecologist’s doors.

Articles such as these are informative and reassuring for girls who are too self-conscious to ask...questions.

...

Is the nation so squeamish about basic health concerns? God forbid teenage girls view photographs of what they can see for themselves with a mirror.

Those in an uproar about what is being sold to their children should take a closer look at the magazine’s content, which teaches how to “catch” boys and spend exorbitant amounts of money on trendy clothes—are these subject matters more appropriate or useful for their daughters?

...

We believe more media should embrace a straightforward approach to sexual health matters, instead of pulling a teen magazine from the shelves over a few prudish complaints.

*The Durango Herald* reported that Albertsons was not the only company to pull *Seventeen*’s October issue. City Market followed suit. “I think it’s a good idea because I have a 12-year-old granddaughter,” Carol Dowe told the newspaper in support of Albertsons’ decision. Dowe once made her granddaughter return a copy of *Seventeen* due to its unsuitable content. “We looked at it and said this is not appropriate for 12-year-old girls to be reading. It is very sexually explicit.”

Predictably, a Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc. (PPFA) official expressed the group’s “outrage.” (Challenge to Planned Parenthood: just once, try to be opposed to something without using the word “outraged.”) Scott J. Spear, M.D., chairman of PPFA’s National Medical Committee, said, “It is nothing short of astounding that Albertsons would censor this basic sexual health information.” Albertsons spokesman Danielle Kilpatrick dismissed the ludicrous suggestions of the constitutionally ignorant that the company’s action violated the letter or spirit of the First Amendment. She said Albertsons may decide what it sells. Besides, the magazine can be found in most school libraries.



Spear

“Too often, young people don’t know where to turn for accurate information about their reproductive health care,” Spear said. “In removing the magazine, Albertsons has done a disservice to teens by blocking access to information that serves to keep them healthy. Young women deserve better, and Albertsons should quickly reconsider their decision.” (Note: We are not talking about “young women.” An 18-year-old is a “young woman.” A 12-year-old is a *child*.) Spear used the opportunity to plug PPFA’s website for teenagers (teenwire.com).

PPFA Interim President Karen Pearl called the *Seventeen* article “a helpful guide to gynecological health.” After promoting teenwire.com, she said, “I don’t think I’ve ever seen this kind of honest, detailed information in a mainstream teen magazine that reaches a mass audience. I’m proud of *Seventeen* for publishing this feature, and I’m proud of them for standing up to Albertsons and standing by their decision to run the piece...In this current climate, where abstinence-only extremism prevents teens from learning basic information about their bodies, we need resources like *Seventeen* and teenwire.com to pick up the slack. Albert-



Pearl

sons should wake up and face the facts: a well-informed teen is a healthy teen.”



Gustafson

LDI has been critical of *Seventeen* for many years and we are not alone. Several individuals and organizations are beginning to look closely at the agenda being promoted by magazine publishers, particularly when they target a teen readership. Writing for the Parents Television Council last year, film and media critic Rod Gustafson closely examined the content of several teen magazines, including *Seventeen*:

[Y]ou can't help but notice contradictory messages from all corners of teen society. "Shake Your Booty," says a one-pager in *Seventeen* where readers share their best guy pickup messages. "The secret is tight, low-rise, white jeans. If you don't get him with those, it just wasn't meant to be!"

Yet in that same magazine, a two-page spread reports the findings of a survey with teens who experienced intercourse for the first time...

A penchant for all things sexual seems to be the recurring trend in *Seventeen*, where editorial copy floats terms like "hook-up" (meaning a casual sexual encounter) with the same significance as a warm good night kiss. One article titled *The Not-Quite Boyfriend* has a female author stunned that her non-committal man, whom she frequently shares a bed with, has been seeing someone else under the sheets...and never confessed. In the end, the author admits she is still attracted to this guy.

Another advice column answers the question of whether it's okay to "hook up with a guy friend's roommate?" After [noting]...idiotic consequences like: "You wake up in your friend's room in the clothes you wore the night before", the reply concludes, "But that doesn't mean it can't work. I've hooked up with friends' roommates—it was kind of fun to wake up in my friend's room, like a slumber party!"

Upping the sexual agenda even further is the... "Real Life" column and this month's entry: *My Father is an Internet Pervert*. Expecting the typical tragic story of a dad who is addicted to cyber-porn, I was amazed to discover the boldly pictured 18-year-old was the victim of a hideous incestuous relationship in which her father posed as various predators on the Internet with the purpose of luring his own daughter. Unnecessary details of his sexual activities with her are included, along with her name and picture. While Internet safety is a valid concern, this tale borders on exploitation.

If people had been paying attention and acted on what they read and saw, more issues of *Seventeen* would

have been pulled from store shelves, as would magazines such as *YM*, *Teen People*, and *CosmoGIRL*.

In a related matter, *Seventeen* has joined with MTV to create a new reality show. The program follows 17 "accomplished and ambitious young women" as they compete in weekly "character-testing challenges." The judge is Atoosa Rubenstein, *Seventeen*'s editor-in-chief. The winner will be featured on the cover of an upcoming issue of the magazine.



Rubenstein

*Seventeen* is published by The Hearst Corporation, which is a boycott target due to its funding of Planned Parenthood. Hearst, which owns several television stations and newspapers, publishes other magazines including *Cosmopolitan*, *CosmoGIRL!*, *Esquire*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Harper's Bazaar*, *Marie Claire*, *O-The Oprah Magazine*, *Popular Mechanics*, and *Redbook*.

**ACTION:** Tell Albertsons you appreciate its courageous stand. Write to Mr. Lawrence R. Johnston, Chairman, President & CEO, Albertsons Inc., P.O. Box 20, Boise, ID 83726.

## ALL TRICK, NO TREAT

It is that time of year again and the pro-abortion United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) is pushing its "Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF" program. Two massive hurricanes will surely make fund-raising much easier this year.

"In recognition of the catastrophic impact of Hurricane Katrina on hundreds of thousands of American children," UNICEF announced that "the U.S. Fund for UNICEF will direct half of the proceeds from the 2005 Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF campaign to help Katrina's youngest survivors...UNICEF is also actively encouraging direct donations to its Hurricane Katrina fund."



Aiken

The 2005 Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF spokesman is UNICEF "ambassador" Clay Aiken, who narrowly lost to Ruben Suddard in the second season of "American Idol." Appearing before a congressional subcommittee, Aiken asked Congress to give 130 million American taxpayer dollars to UNICEF.


"Everyone deserves the best start in life, which is what UNICEF is working to provide the world's most vulnerable children," Aiken said. "Education is essential to a child's development. I hope that as an ambas-

sador I can encourage people to join UNICEF’s mission to make education a reality for children throughout the world.” Since the Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF program began in 1950, it has raised over \$127 million to fund the group’s agenda-advancing activities.

**RESOURCE:** For more information about UNICEF’s anti-life agenda and activities visit: [lifesite.net/waronfamily/unicef/](http://lifesite.net/waronfamily/unicef/) and/or [lifesite.net/ldn/2002/oct/021030a.html](http://lifesite.net/ldn/2002/oct/021030a.html).

## BAD CHOICE (AND TASTE) SHOPPING

“Choice Awareness Bracelets” are “fun and fashionable.” Well, that is the way the Planned Parenthood Federation of America Inc. (PPFA) describes them. The blue silicone bracelets have the word “choice” on one side and PPFA’s website address on the other.



There is nothing like a “Kiss Me I’m Pro-Choice” t-shirt to attract attention. “These fun and flirty fitted tees are marked with a kiss, playfully asserting a powerful message in support of women’s rights,” reads the product description. The front: “Kiss Me I’m Pro-Choice”; the back: “plannedparenthood.org,” PPFA’s logo, and “www.waronchoice.com.”

Corny but not corny enough you say? Try this! “Planned Parenthood is proud to offer the newest in a line of social fashion statements,” the sales pitch begins. “Stop the War on Choice” t-shirts are “reminiscent of the flower power days, peacefully asserting a powerful message in support of women’s rights.”



Okay, so they are rather goofy to say the least, but this next one is just plain appalling—a baby jumper with the words “Parenthood. Plan It!” on the front and the PPFA logo with the common pro-abortion slogan, “Every child a wanted

child” on the back. A PPFA affiliate is selling baby jumpers and t-shirts for toddlers with the words “Brought to you by Planned Parenthood.” (Shouldn’t that be “Brought to you *despite* Planned Parenthood”?) “Choice” wrist bands, baby beanies (pictured), and knit caps are also available. Planned Parenthood leaders fail to realize that their supporters are not likely to have a need for these items. (Is it our imagination or is that baby trying to run away?)



Marketed to teenagers is the “Emergency Contraception” ink pen. Also for sale are teenwire.com school supply kits, “Sex Ed 101” t-shirts, rulers that read, “Does Size Matter?”, and PPFA beach balls (pictured with PPFA condoms, a PPFA tote bag, and SportSafes).

There’s much more one can buy to make Planned Parenthood even wealthier. How about “Mifepristone, The Abortion Pill ‘Grab-bit’” pen holders, “emergency contraception” t-shirts (the back reads, “Because Accidents Happen”), “Choice on Earth” holiday t-shirts (pictured), Margaret Sanger bookmarks, and condom lollipops.



We would surely be remiss if we failed to mention that one can now order “delicious, milk chocolate” birth control pill packs with the Planned Parenthood name and logo.” And the chocolate is shaped just like a birth control pill container (pictured)!

Just what will the wicked think of next to make a buck?

*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](http://www.fightpp.org). This publication may be copied so long as it is done in full. It may be quoted so long as proper citation is provided with the quotation. Write: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161. Phone: (540) 631-0380.

© 2005 Life Decisions International.