



# The Caleb Report

September-October 2004

Life Decisions International

vol. xii • no. 5

*IN THIS ISSUE:* The Fading Shock Factor: Groups Focus On Desensitizing The Public / "I'm Not Sorry" / Komen Advisor Resigns / Standing Tall For A Cause / Quotable Quote / The Prayer Project / Family Releases Statement / Update: Corporate Funding Project / In Your Own Words / Study Links T.V. And Teen Sex / Buffett Money And Gates' Folly / Magazine Polls Youth On Abortion

## THE FADING SHOCK FACTOR Groups Focus on Desensitizing the Public

Virtually everyone has heard by now. Planned Parenthood is selling t-shirts that say, simply, "I had an abortion." It is one of many items offered at the Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) online store. "Planned Parenthood is proud to offer yet another t-shirt in our new social fashion line: 'I Had an Abortion' fitted T-shirts are now available," the PPFA website product description reads. "These soft and comfortable fitted tees assert a powerful message in support of women's rights."

"I have heard people refer to the t-shirt as 'grossly offensive,' 'shocking,' and 'shameful,'" said LDI President Douglas R. Scott. "But why do we act as though this kind of conduct is a surprise when it comes from a group like Planned Parenthood?"

PPFA is striving to eradicate what little stigma is still attached to the killing of preborn children. Its president, Gloria Feldt, issued a statement on the controversial t-shirt:

The shirt is not a cavalier statement, but a way to challenge the silence and shame around an experience many women have shared, however difficult that decision may have been.

One in three American women will have an abortion before the age of 45, and anti-choice extremists are doing everything they can to turn that choice into a scarlet letter, and ultimately to criminalize this option. In that effort, some anti-choice activists have publicly disclosed that they had an abortion, only to cast this option in shame.

Women who have abortions are the same women who have children, and they make both of those decisions with thought and heart and moral deliberation.

As an organization, Planned Parenthood does more to prevent unintended pregnancy and the need for abortion than any other group. However, abortion is neither shameful nor dishonorable, and it should remain safe and legal.

Feldt's statement is rather odd since Planned Parenthood has called abortion a "very difficult" decision and admitted that it involves "killing." But now PPFA seeks to make abortion an abstract medical procedure rather than a grave moral question.

Lori Mariner, who works for Planned Parenthood in Bettendorf, Iowa, defends the sale of the t-shirt, saying it was created "after a request came from women who'd had abortions and that was the original idea for both women who'd requested it and Planned Parenthood, to try to get rid of the taboo—that abortion is a dirty little secret that should be hidden." Mariner, whose job with Planned Parenthood involves "teaching healthy choices" in churches and schools, said the t-shirt "was not designed to celebrate abortion, but to open up some honest communication about this very difficult decision."

Scott said the PPFA hierarchy has two goals in mind. "The first is to give Planned Parenthood free publicity. The second is to do exactly what Gloria Feldt hopes it will do—make abortion the equivalent of a tonsillectomy or getting a tattoo in the minds of people. It happens thousands of times every day and few people say anything about it." Scott also said that the "honest communication" Planned Parenthood claims it wants will allow the group to achieve these goals by desensitizing people to the horror that is abortion.

Scott said PPFA has moved far away from calling abortion a “personal matter” between “a woman and her doctor.” Its new approach is even more sinister. “Abortion is now being touted, advertised, hyped, flaunted, plugged, publicized, and peddled,” he said. “Abortion is being sold in the same way Nike pushes shoes or Calvin Klein markets clothing. It is being presented as nothing of consequence.”

Scott said PPFA leaders need to make up their minds. “On the one hand, abortion is nothing more than a minor procedure with a moral component equivalent to that of having a tumor extricated. It is an act of courage and should be worn as a badge of pride and honor,” he said. “On the other hand, abortion is a momentous personal decision that should not be made without a great deal of thought and advice from family, friends, clergy and medical professionals. It cannot be both.”

The t-shirt belongs to a new category of clothing called “wearables with a message.” Scott said he would not be surprised if the message on the t-shirt is eventually changed to something even bolder such as, “I had a product of conception removed,” or “My pregnancy has been cured.”

“What did we expect?” Scott asked. “Did we expect Planned Parenthood to sell t-shirts that say, ‘I killed my unborn baby,’ or ‘My family forced me to have an abortion,’ or ‘I paid Planned Parenthood to kill my baby’? While such t-shirts would be just as offensive, shocking and shameful, they would be more accurate and thought-provoking. If Planned Parenthood were really interested in ‘honest communication,’ we would see these kinds of messages.”

Anyone who is shocked by the t-shirt knows little about Planned Parenthood. Scott emphasized that no one should be surprised by PPFA’s antics. “This is the same lucrative business that last year killed more than 227,000 preborn human beings. This is the same group that is responsible for the death of Holly Patterson. This is the same censor that refuses to tell women about the link between breast cancer and abortion. This is the same oppressor that lies about the abortifacient nature of many of its birth control methods. This is the same ogre that vehemently fights against abstinence education. This is the same monster that tells young people that engaging in oral sex or anal sex can still constitute the practice of ‘abstinence.’ This is the same tyrant that tells teenagers to ‘kick the crap’ they learned from their parents ‘to the curb’. And this is the same dynasty that refers to pregnancy as a ‘sexually transmitted disease’ that is ‘treated’ by abortion.”

“What shocks and upsets me is that any group can be guilty of all of these things and consistently get away with it,” Scott said. “By comparison, the t-shirt is nothing.”

While Planned Parenthood claims it did not create the t-shirt, officials at its national office have defended the decision to sell and profit it. A few PPFA affiliates have denounced the decision. “This is going beyond pro-choice. We’re offending people,” Brian Lewis, director of public policy for Planned Parenthood Health Systems of North Carolina, told the *Charlotte Observer*. “This has so many repercussions. This is not what America needs.”

Rebecca Poedy, executive director of Planned Parenthood of Idaho, told KBCI-TV in Boise that she is “very disappointed” with the national group’s decision. “I think the issue to focus on here is the effort that Planned Parenthood goes to, to prevent unwanted pregnancy. I think this is just a poor decision and we are just not supportive of it,” she said.

Scott said he believes the few PPFA affiliates that have spoken out against the t-shirt are doing so just to make themselves look less zealous. “These Planned Parenthood leaders are worried about ‘offending people’ and ‘repercussions,’” he said. “They say the t-shirt ‘is not what America needs,’ but these same people see nothing wrong with abortion itself. Now how sick is that?”

“The truth is that Planned Parenthood is merely selling a t-shirt that is intended to change how people think and feel about abortion. It is the way the Planned Parenthood hierarchy already thinks and feels about abortion,” Scott said. “The more people Planned Parenthood can brainwash into believing that abortion is no big deal, the more they will turn to the group for abortions.”

PPFA is not the first to sell clothing designed to diminish the seriousness of abortion. For example, *cafeshops.com* sells t-shirts with the following message: “I just had an abortion and all I got was this lousy t-shirt” and thongs that read, “Abortion is a Property Right.” What’s the most shocking part of all? The t-shirt, as well as one which reads, “I Love Abortion,” comes in infant, toddler and junior sizes. The seller comments on the product: “Two things a guy wants to see when he takes off a girl’s clothes: a thong and the slogan ‘I Love Abortion.’”

If you think this is bad, you will be stunned to learn that *cafeshops.com* sells a lunchbox that reads, “Babies make an excellent lunch meat.” This might fly in

Communist China, but it does not get a pass in the Free World.

Scott predicted that regardless of how many people buy PPFA's t-shirt only a handful will actually wear it. "It's not the specific words that are upsetting; it's the blatant attempt to make people think abortion is a victimless act," Scott said. "But deep down, no matter what they try to tell themselves, those who have an abortion or advocate for abortion know they are taking an innocent human life. Buying the t-shirt will be easy, but wearing it will be much more difficult."

It is important to realize that everything death peddlers do is calculated. Abortion was very gradually accepted. Physician-assisted suicide is slowly becoming accepted. "What was once shocking and unthinkable is now commonplace," Scott said. He pointed to the outcry of several years ago when it was discovered that abortion facilities were selling human body parts. "Now you hear virtually nothing about it."

Scott said that our opponents "wait out the uproar and sooner or later the issue fades from the headlines and most people forget about it. And even when the issue comes to mind it is most often accompanied by an 'oh well' attitude. This has already happened with the PPFA t-shirt issue."

Commenting on PPFA's t-shirt, comedian and talk show host Dennis Miller suggested two related "wearables with a message." One message would be "World's Best Grandma, Almost." Another would read, "I Would Have Been the Big Sister."

### **"I'M NOT SORRY"**

PPFA's "I had an abortion" t-shirt represents a more flagrant expression of their attitude about abortion. But this is not the first time such sentiments have been expressed.

ImNotSorry.net is a website where "women can share their positive experiences with abortion." A warning greeting visitors to the site begins, "The stories posted on this site may contain graphic descriptions of medical procedures..." But if the killing of preborn human beings is a "medical procedure," the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, was a "flight procedure."

The website is the brainchild of Patricia Beninato of Richmond, Virginia. "I had an abortion," the 37-year-old customer-service representative said, "and I'm glad I did."

It is worth reading the extensive text that explains why the website was created. (Note: The first three paragraphs below were presented as one very long

paragraph on the website. We have broken it into several paragraphs to make it easier to read):

[I]t seems that the "pro-lifers" (or, as we like to call them, anti-choicers) are gaining the upper hand when it comes to attention. If you watched TV at all on January 22...[anniversary of Roe v. Wade], all you seemed to see was some anti-choicer foaming at the mouth about all the "innocent babies that have been slaughtered." When you did see someone expressing a pro-choice opinion, which wasn't often, that person was often apologetic, implying that women who choose to undergo an abortion are guilt-ridden for the rest of their lives.

If you surf the Internet, you'll find literally dozens of sites filled with stories about bad abortion experiences. The stories all have a sameness—"oh, I didn't want to kill my baby, my mean old boyfriend/husband/parents made me do it and the doctors and nurses at the clinic were rude and I bled for weeks and I feel so *guilty* and I'll never be able to forgive myself."

Type in "pro-abortion stories" in your search engine and you'll find...the same sites, because there are no such sites. Of course, there are a lot of women who do feel sadness and regret after an abortion, and those feelings do need to be respected.

However, there are women, perhaps just as many or more, who have much different feelings—feelings of relief, of conviction that they made the right decision, yes, maybe even of joy. They have no regrets or remorse. They don't get bummed out on the anniversary of the procedure; they don't look longingly at a kid playing and think that their fetus would be that old by now. They recovered from the procedure easily and got on with their lives. Those feelings need to be respected as well—but they're not. If a woman dares to say in public that she felt anything other than horrible about getting an abortion, she is treated like someone who says that maybe Osama bin Laden isn't such a bad guy after all or that Hitler had the right idea. Even many in the pro-choice movement subtly encourage the mindset that no decent woman really wants an abortion and that it's done only when there's no other alternative.

ImNotSorry.net was created for the purpose of showing women that exercising their legal right to terminate their pregnancy is not the blood-spattered guilt trip so many make it out to be. It is not intended to make women's decisions for them, but to provide information to make the choice that will be best for them. This site exists to tell women that it's *okay* not to feel sad or ashamed after an abortion. You are not a baby killer. You are not irresponsible. You are not selfish. And, above all, you are not evil.

The website includes several sections, including news reports, stories submitted for placement on the website, and ways in which people may become active in

the Pro-Abortion Movement. Of course, there is also a section titled “FAQ,” where one may find answers to frequently asked questions.

The “Get Active” section applauds those women who been supportive by telling their friends about the website. They are praised for getting the message out that “abortion isn’t the basket-case-maker the anti-choice crowd would have the world believe.”

The applause is followed by an announcement that some interest has been shown in the establishment of an “I’m Not Sorry Day,” which would be “celebrated” on January 23 of each year. “Several writers and feminists...have contacted me about this,” Beninato wrote. “I think it’s a great idea and something that is badly needed to counteract the anti-choicers’ recent stridency. There’ll be some media action, possibly a documentary among other things.”

Supporters of ImNotSorry.net are asked to notify Beninato if they learn of any local “anti-choice” demonstrations. This will enable her to spread the word on the website so “pro-choicers in the area can get the opportunity to counteract the propaganda!”

The most startling part of the “Get Active” section may be what comes at its end—mention of a project called “Reach Out”:

If you are a woman who wants to get an abortion but doesn’t have transportation to a clinic or just want someone to go with you and hold your hand (or send you an encouraging e-mail), drop us an e-mail... Anyone who’d like to help can also send an e-mail with their contact information to the same address, which we’ll then forward, and things can go from there...For those who want to be in-person “shepherds,” please include how far you’re willing to travel. Unfortunately, it must be asked that anyone under the age of eighteen not utilize the in-person aspect of Reach Out, although we will happily give you e-mail support. This is due to possible legal ramifications.

The “FAQ” section consists of exactly what one would expect—misinformation about abortion. Some examples are provided:

*How can a woman be happy about killing an innocent baby? Don’t you have a heart or a conscience?*

First off, let’s clear up some stuff. Per Planned Parenthood, 88 percent of all abortions performed in the United States take place in the first trimester—and out of that number, 80 percent are performed in the first six weeks. If you listen to the anti-choicers, they would have you believe that full-term babies are being ripped out of wombs and having their heads bashed in, when in fact what’s being removed is *an alien-looking clump roughly the size of a kidney bean*. Many anti-choicers will of course say that we’re

avoiding reality by believing that what’s removed during an abortion isn’t a baby. We reply that many people avoid reality by believing that every woman gets gooey over babies and wants to be a mother. [This woman is worse than the Presidential candidates at addressing the actual issues.] We have no doubt that the moment the human race figured out that babies were the result of sex, someone began coming up with birth control and abortion (emphasis added).

Another example shows that we are not exactly dealing with Dr. Phil here:

*What about adoption? Why didn’t you consider that as an alternative?*

One of the anti-choicers’ favorite arguments against abortion is that women who have abortions are depriving prospective adoptive parents. However, one only has to take a look at the literally hundreds of thousands of children in foster or state care to know that is not the case. Unfortunately for the great majority of these children, they will not be considered for adoption because they have committed a grave sin—they’re no longer babies. It is rare that you’ll hear a prospective adoptive parent sigh, “Oh, I just want a seven-year-old so much!”...Another reason for not going with adoption that’s been cited by many of us is the thought of the now-grown child showing up on our doorstep expecting an Oprah-type happy reunion with their “real mom” or weepily [sic] demanding to know why we gave them up. As far as we’re concerned, whoever signs the adoption papers is the parent, and we’re completely for adoption records being sealed other than the medical history of the bio-parents. If you’re going to give the kid up for adoption, accept that and move on. Don’t write letters, don’t send gifts, don’t go for visits, and respect that fact that the kid is no longer yours. Adoptive parents also need to stop giving kids ideas that they are not his/her “real parents.”

The next example shows just how cynical one can get. It also demonstrates a major ignorance about God and the things of God:

*But children are a precious gift from God! Who are you to reject what God has given you?*

Looks like it’s time for a little elementary sex education. Children are conceived through sexual intercourse between a man and a woman with either no or failed contraception. We’ve slept with men who thought they were God, but the actual Big Guy himself [sic] has no hand in it. And there’s quite a few people on the planet who (hang on to your hats) don’t believe in any sort of deity. We would like to believe that if there was a supreme being of some sort, it [sic] wouldn’t sit around saying, “Hmm, I think that I’ll give this 14-year-old girl who still sucks her thumb and sleeps with her teddy bear a baby. And hey, what about that woman who was just raped? A baby would

cheer her right up, I bet. How about the low-income woman who uses birth control faithfully? Hey, babe, you just won the Rate Of Failure Lottery!” And if it [sic] did do those things, well, who’d blame us for rejecting it?

The answer to the following question will surely leave you with your jaw hitting the floor:

*Well, if you didn’t want to get pregnant, you should have kept your legs closed! Why didn’t you just say no?*

Ah, now we’re getting to the real issue. Remember, it was only very recently that women have been “allowed” to enjoy sex, and a lot of people are still suspicious of women who are free in their sexuality, a leftover from the joyless Puritans who founded this country. Quite frankly, we’d prefer it if the anti-choicers would just come out and say, “Since our religion or upbringing tells us that enjoying sex is a sin and we’re so sexually repressed we squeak, we think that any woman who has sex for any reason other than to conceive is a whore. And that includes rape, which wouldn’t happen if you didn’t lead that guy on by looking in his direction for two seconds or wearing that short little skirt or owning a vagina.”...

Not surprisingly, ImNotSorry.net sells t-shirts. The front: “Celebrating the right to choose.” The back: “imnotsorry.net”. One may also purchase ImNotSorry.net mugs, stickers and caps.

While it is clear that the ImNotSorry crowd is both ignorant of the facts and grossly misguided, we cannot let the following text go unexposed. Each quotation comes a different part of the “FAQ” section of the website:

[A]bortion, quite frankly, isn’t that big a deal for many of us.

We need to teach kids that masturbation is a healthy sexual expression, that it’s not for “losers that can’t get any” or a sin, and is 100% guaranteed not to cause pregnancy or disease.

[O]ne of the favorite abortion myths anti-choicers like to propagate is that abortion affects fertility.

Having children should not be used as “punishment” for a birth control failure or an error in judgment.

We hope that every pro-life person will pray for the people involved with ImNotSorry.net.

### **KOMEN ADVISOR RESIGNS**

When Eve Sanchez Silver first read that The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation was awarding grants to Planned Parenthood, she thought it had to be a lie. But Silver would learn that in 2003 the Foundation awarded \$475,000 to 21 Planned Parenthood af-

filiates nationwide. And funding of the pro-abortion group continues to this day.

Foundation officials would normally be expected to ignore Silver’s concern, but she was not some unknown raving pro-life activist. Silver was a charter member of the Foundation’s National Hispanic/Latina Advisory Council.

Silver was strongly committed to the Foundation. As a two-time breast cancer survivor, She had a personal interest in its work. Silver wanted to help the Foundation eradicate breast cancer as a life-threatening disease.

After investigating the allegations that The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation was funding Planned Parenthood, Silver spoke with Foundation officials and begged them to end the association with the abortion-committing entity. When it became clear that her plea was falling on deaf ears, Silver resigned and canceled several speaking engagements around the country that would have required her to speak highly of the Foundation.

“I cannot reconcile the Foundation’s decision to affirm life with one hand and support its destruction with the other,” she said. “Breast cancer is no respecter of persons, but abortion is. The multi-cultural nature of our councils makes our people the very focus of that destruction. I cannot sit idly by.”

Silver said that even her pro-abortion colleagues were babbled by the Foundation’s actions. They wondered why funding was not going to more grassroots initiatives instead of “handing money to a huge, established organization” like Planned Parenthood. Silver said she also wondered what other “abortion-related agendas” the Foundation may be supporting. She expressed concern about “the black-out on the 16 statistically significant epidemiological studies” that link abortion to breast cancer. “Is one hand washing the other?” she asked.

Silver said that funds for breast cancer services from The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation will only serve to white-wash Planned Parenthood’s abortion agenda. She said that money garnered through the Foundation’s Race for the Cure event is “earned by sneakered women struggling to raise money for research and grassroots groups.” And this does not include Planned Parenthood.

“It is my final advisory to The Susan G. Komen Breast Cancer Foundation that it withdraw its continued financial support of Planned Parenthood, a multi-million dollar, international abattoir, that is systemati-

cally focused upon the abortion and destruction of life,” Silver said in a press release. She urged people to send their sneakers to the Foundation’s headquarters and “tell them you will not run in The Race for the Cure again until they quit funding Planned Parenthood and *all* abortion related facilities.”

## STANDING TALL FOR A CAUSE

Virtually everyone knows that few corporations would ever vocally support the Pro-Life Movement. One that is doing so is Curves International, the fitness center for women. Pro-abortion groups, many of which have decried our boycott as unfair and immoral, have called for a boycott of Curves.

Many corporations openly support causes dear to their respective decision-makers. They have no problem standing up for what they believe is right. For example, among those corporations sponsoring the Human Rights Campaign’s (HRC) National Dinner on October 8, 2004, included: Volvo, Shell Oil, Oracle, PepsiCo, Motorola, Corning, Bank of America (also a boycott target for its support of Planned Parenthood), Accenture (global management consulting, technology services and outsourcing), Williams & Jensen (Washington, D.C. law firm), Hyatt (hotels & resorts), Verizon, American Mortgage Express, and First Savings Mortgage.

Two organizations, the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) and the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), were also sponsors. HRC is the largest national “gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender advocacy organization” in the United States.

Corporations giving general support to HRC include: IBM, Volvo, Mitchell Gold (furniture), American Airlines, Olivia (cruises and resorts), Beaulieu Vineyard, Nike, Showtime (a subsidiary of Viacom), Washington Mutual Home Loans, Coors Brewery, Replacements Ltd. (temporary employee placement), Centaur Entertainment, John Hancock (financial services), Capital One (financial services), Cingular (subsidiary of Bell South), and [boxofficetickets.com](http://boxofficetickets.com).

## QUOTABLE QUOTE

“Sex, as we know, can involve one or two, but what about even more? The *ménage à trios* (three-way) is not an uncommon arrangement. An orgy can involve an unlimited quantity of potential lovers. Groups can be mixed-gender or same-sex, friendly or anonymous. The risk of pregnancy and of STD [sexually transmitted disease] transmission, including HIV [human immunodeficiency virus], increases with each additional partner. A pleasant and supersafe [sic] alternative to

this is group masturbation—sometimes called a circle jerk or Jack-and-Jill-Off. Orgies and group sex were common in the Middle Ages. Promiscuity was popular with both the peasantry and the nobility. Since divorce was forbidden by the [Catholic] Church, adultery was very common and socially accepted.”

— *A&F Quarterly*, published by clothier Abercrombie & Fitch Inc., Christmas 2003 edition

## 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*—U.S. Supreme Court Justice **Anthony Kennedy**, who has betrayed preborn children by voting against overturning *Roe v. Wade*; *October*—**Teresa Heinz Kerry**, activist pro-abortion wife of Senator John F. Kerry, D-Mass., who controls the Heinz family fortune; *November*—comedian **George Carlin**, who has spoken in favor of abortion and made bigoted comments about pro-life people and Catholics; and *December*—the man who wins the presidential election in November.

## FAMILY RELEASES STATEMENT

On September 23, 2004, The Terri Schinder-Schiavo Foundation issued a statement in response to the decision of the Florida Supreme Court to strike down a law passed last year to prevent the starvation murder of Terri Schinder-Schiavo. As part of its unanimous ruling, the Court said “Terri’s Law” violates the constitutional separation of powers. The following statement was released on behalf of Schinder-Schiavo’s family:

For years now lawyers and judges—all of them total strangers—have besieged our family, stating in courtrooms and the media that our severely disabled daughter, Terri, must be starved to death. We have been told that she must die in order to protect her right of privacy.

And now the Florida Supreme Court tells us that a law crafted to save Terri’s life is unconstitutional when it is applied to her. None of this makes any sense to us.

The ruling by the Florida Supreme Court today was not unexpected; nevertheless the family is disappointed at the outcome. We would like everyone to understand the reason the Florida Legislature and Governor Bush interceded in Terri’s case was to protect Terry from a serious miscarriage of justice.

The Governor specifically wanted answers to the following questions, all of which are extremely troubling:

(1) Why Terri's purported desire to die was hidden from the jury in the 1992 medical malpractice case, during which Michael Schiavo testified that Terri would need compensation to live out her life;

(2) What did Michael Schiavo mean when he purportedly said at Palm Gardens Nursing Home such things as, "When is she going to die?" "Has she died yet?" "When is that bitch going to die?" "Can't you do anything to accelerate her death?";

(3) What Michael Schiavo knows about the multiple traumatic injuries of relatively recent origin that were found to be present in a bone scan conducted on Terri by Dr. Campbell Walker in March of 1991?;

(4) Why were nurses' notes which documented Terri's rehabilitation potential deleted from her chart at Palm Gardens?;

(5) Why were observations of the nursing assistants regarding Terri's level of function and responsiveness deleted from her chart?; and

(6) What would Terri's desires be regarding who should make end-of-life decisions for her if she knew that Michael Schiavo was living with another woman who has borne two children by him?

The family knows that Terri never expressed desire to be starved to death, and the Legislature and Governor thought the case troubling enough to get involved directly.

We profoundly regret that the Florida Supreme Court felt compelled to ignore these questions and opted instead to issue a technical legal decision that doesn't protect Terri from the cadre of crusaders who are so desperate for our daughter to be starved to death.

The family knew that this outcome was probable and so we are pursuing other legal avenues, which we hope will save Terri's life.

Contributions and/or help in this fight may be made at Terri'sfight.org. The family appreciates all those who have supported their fight to save Terri, and again express to them our sincere gratitude.

The family also will forever be grateful to Governor Bush and his legal team for their devotion to saving Terri's life.

Now what makes the Supreme Court justices think they are the only ones who can decide if another branch of government is encroaching on its territory?

Michael Schiavo, who has insisted that his wife be killed, expressed joy at the Supreme Court's decision. But Schiavo's ex-girlfriend made his true motives known when she made a call to a radio talk show: "As soon as he got near the door, her [Terri Schinder-Schiavo] head was already looking at the door, because she would recognize his voice. She would start crying when he got ready to leave. He was like, 'She

has ruined years of my life, and she has taken all this time and obsessed my whole life with this.'" Schiavo dated the woman for a year following his wife's injury.

**ACTION:** Thank Florida Governor Jeb Bush for all he has done on behalf of Terri Schinder-Schiavo and urge him to take all necessary steps to save her life. Write to: Honorable Jeb E. Bush, The Capitol, Tallahassee, FL 32399-0001. E-mail: fl\_governor@eog.state.fl.us or jeb.bush@myflorida.com. Phone: (850) 488-4441.

### UPDATE: CORPORATE FUNDING PROJECT

The Old Spaghetti Factory, Red Robin Gourmet Burgers, and Office Depot (see more information below) are no longer boycott targets.

An LDI supporter who used to work for Helene Curtis has informed us that its parent company, Unilever, is now the owner of several other products. We appreciate receiving the tip. Please add the following products to Section II of *The Boycott List* and to the *Checkbook List*:

**FOOD & DRINK:** Adolph's, Boursin, Carb Options, & Chicken Tonight.

**PERSONAL CARE:** Calvin Klein (fragrances & cosmetics), Degree, Lifebouy, Lux, Pears, Q-tips, Rave, Suave products, & Vaseline.

The patience of LDI President Douglas R. Scott reached its limit when executives of Office Depot began spreading misinformation about the boycott against the company. In response to an LDI supporter who had contacted the company regarding its support of Planned Parenthood, Brian M. Bartlett of Office Depot's Executive Customer Relations Team, offered an explanation. As is common with corporate public relations employees, the first tactic was an attempt to diffuse the impact of the gift to Planned Parenthood:

Office Depot is strongly committed to the principles of corporate social responsibility. Our philanthropic partnerships and local support programs are designed to demonstrate our commitment to our core values of Caring and Making a Difference and Taking Care of Kids. We proudly support such organizations as City of Hope National Medical Center, America's Second Harvest, the Canadian Association of Food Banks, Toys for Tots, the American Library Association, Keep America Beautiful and the National Alliance for Autism Research—all of which make a positive impact on children's lives. While we certainly respect the rights of any law abiding organization to share their views, as a matter of practice we do not take or support political stands through our contributions.

We recognize that a small financial contribution was made to a local Planned Parenthood chapter in 2002 under the Viking Office Products brand name. However, this donation was not made through established channels and does not reflect Office Depot's charitable contributions policies.

Under our established policies for charitable contributions, donations to Planned Parenthood, or other similar organizations that do not meet our clearly established criteria, are simply not permitted.

I hope that I have addressed your concerns, and that you will reconsider your request to stop shopping with us under our Office Depot/Viking Office Products brand.

Finally having had enough, Scott sent a letter to Office Depot's Director of Community Relations, Mary Wong:

On December 12, 2003, we wrote to you in response to your letter of November 7. Our letter was followed by several phone calls. Our December 12, 2003 letter, the follow-up telephone calls, as well as our letter to Mr. M. Bruce Nelson of April 15, 2004, were obviously ignored as we did not receive the courtesy of a response to any of them.

In our letter of December 12, 2003, we requested vitally important clarification to yours of November 7, 2003:

You write that support for Planned Parenthood by Office Depot's subsidiary, Viking Office Products, "was not made through established channels and does not reflect Office Depot's charitable contributions policy [sic]." We must request clarification so that we may know how to respond to the information provided in your letter.

Have all involved parties been informed that Planned Parenthood is ineligible for support in the future—via established channels or otherwise? If this is the case, we will be able to drop this matter. However, if it is even remotely possible that Planned Parenthood will receive a gift from Office Depot or any of its related companies in the future, we will not be able to do so.

In a show of good faith, we did not place Office Depot on our internationally released *Boycott List* in November 2003. We made this decision based on the hope that Office Depot would agree to make Planned Parenthood—one of the most highly controversial groups in the country—ineligible for donations outside of its matching gift program.

In our April 15, 2004, letter to Mr. Nelson, we emphasized our disappointment with Office Depot for choosing to be uncooperative. We had hoped to keep this entire matter from becoming public by settling it before the release of the June 2004 edition of *The Boycott List*. We gave Office Depot until May 7, 2004 to respond to our questions or, as the letter stated, we would assume that the company had "no intention of

making Planned Parenthood ineligible for future support" and that the Office Depot is "proud of its past support of the nation's number one abortion-committing empire and that the company is pleased to have its name associated with the group and its deadly activities."

Since being added to *The Boycott List*, Office Depot personnel, including you, have embarked on a campaign of misinformation and half-truths. These include, but are by no means limited to, your expression of shock that Office Depot is a boycott target when speaking to those who contact the company about this matter. Moreover, you fail to mention the unreturned phone calls and ignored letters that sought clarification of your chosen rhetoric during such conversations.

We want to make our position very clear. Until such time that Office Depot states that Planned Parenthood will receive no support in the future, outside of the established employee matching gift program, the company shall remain a boycott target. It is grossly insufficient to say that previous support of the abortion-committing behemoth was "not made through established channels and does not reflect Office Depot's charitable contributions policies."

We will take steps to ensure that people know of Office Depot's disingenuous behavior. Further-more, if Office Depot does not agree to make Planned Parenthood ineligible for support as described above by August 31, 2004, we will implement appropriate measures, including the preparation of Shareholder Resolutions, the issuance of press releases, picketing of Office Depot stores nationwide, and so forth. However, should Office Depot satisfactorily meet this deadline, we will quietly drop the company from *The Boycott List* and let our supporters know that it is no longer a boycott target.

We regret that your actions, along with those of Mr. Brian M. Bartlett, have led to this further response on our part. We would have preferred a professional and honest dialogue to your misrepresentation—by omission and commission—of the facts. Be assured that you are not the first corporate official to employ such tactics. Be just as assured that in no case did such tactics prove beneficial to the company.

The letter, which was sent by certified mail, was copied to Bartlett and Office Depot Chief Executive Office M. Bruce Nelson.

Office Depot's August 13, 2004 response to Scott's letter was sent by Federal Express. In the letter, Wong continued with the same kind of rhetoric that had been used by Bartlett. The first paragraph listed organizations that Office Depot "proudly" supports. She went on to write that the company donates "products, services, and funding to...non-profit organizations who [sic] focus their charitable work on impacting the

health, education, and welfare of children.” (Is not this exactly what Planned Parenthood *claims* to do?) Yet Wong said that because the pro-abortion group also does other kinds of work, it falls outside of the company’s giving guidelines.

Wong said that a \$100.00 contribution was made to Planned Parenthood in 2002. (Office Depot had been telling concerned customers that a “mere” \$20.00 had been donated.) She said the gift was made outside the “proper corporate channels.” So far, Wong had essentially regurgitating the same mantra that the company had been spewing for many months.

“Office Depot officials refused to say they would make sure that Planned Parenthood does not receive funds outside ‘proper corporate channels’ in the future,” said Scott. “But Mary Wong did add one important and decisive part to her August 13 letter. She said that Office Depot will initiate ‘disciplinary action up to and including termination of employment’ against any employee who makes a donation to Planned Parenthood on behalf of the company.” Scott said this assurance was the key factor in the decision to drop Office Depot as a boycott target. He also said LDI will closely monitor compliance.

### IN YOUR OWN WORDS

LDI often provides space for its supporters (and detractors) to have their say about various issues. We have received an unusually high volume of correspondence over the last couple of months. Here is a sampling:

This [the Corporate Funding Project] is an awesome thing you’re doing and we want to participate as fully as possible. Thank you!

— Judy Smith

Your materials (especially *The Boycott List*)...[are] invaluable tools for us to help and to challenge our parishioners to build the culture of life in our community and in our nation.

— Joseph A. Schmidt, St. Mary Church

Thank you for your good work! We’re so glad you put out *The Boycott List*! May God bless you in all you do to help the unborn!

— Margaret Schumacher

I confess my frustration as to why God allows a place like Planned Parenthood to exist. Why He doesn’t just open the earth and swallow them up is beyond me. But He is God and I am not, so [we] will continue to pray daily for your organization...

May He bless your efforts, to His honor & glory, so that many hearts will be changed. God bless each of you.

— Ronald A. Youngclaus

You and your staff are great!

—Gregory J. Littleton

Thanks for your conscientious attention to your communication...and, especially, all the good work you are doing in the name of our Lord Jesus.

— Rev. Billy Stoudenmire

Thanks for your continual persistence in pursuing these new companies which are added to *The List*. It is great to see them go off *The List* within a short period of having been added. Keep up the good work.

— Elizabeth Faricy

I am so happy to see that Office Depot is being removed from *The Boycott List*. Although it is good that I can now shop there again, it is even better to know that Planned Parenthood will have one less corporate contributor.

— Nancy Rigby

God bless you for all your fantastic work on behalf of His littlest ones. You have no idea what an inspiration you are.

— David M. Kothman

Mr. Kothman wrote a subsequent letter in which he commented on two articles from the July-August 2004 edition of *The Caleb Report*:

First, those of us who understand and support your mission, *i.e.*, your core constituency, fully appreciate and support your policy of distributing *The Boycott List* on a paid-subscription basis. You won’t do His littlest ones any good if you cease to exist. And *The List* is a bargain at ten times the price. Your policy is good; don’t change it for the casual observers.

Second, and more important, I read your article about the U.S. Catholic Bishops’ statement on pro-abortion politicians as an indictment of the leadership of the Catholic Church in this country, at least on this issue. I am a life-long Catholic, a graduate of the University of Notre Dame Law School, a communion minister at my parish, and so forth. Suffice it to say that I call myself a Catholic, notwithstanding my imperfect following of all of the Church’s teachings.

Your article was right on target. I believe that the Bishops’ statement was a cop-out. While it is my understanding that the Catechism of the Catholic Church does in fact teach that the individual is responsible for determining whether he has disqualified himself from receiving the Eucharist, nowhere does it preclude the local priest or bishop from recognizing the obvious self-excommunication that comes with the public embrace of abortion. The question is this: When a self-proclaimed “Catholic” publicly supports or advocates the destruction of innocent human life, how can a Bishop “legitimately” make a “judgment” that this person has not excommunicated himself from the

Church? And when this non-Catholic appears in the Communion line, how can a priest “legitimately” make a “judgment” to look the other way and act as if he has no responsibility for such a grave sin?

I hope the fact that Mr. Scott is not himself Catholic will not cause him to soft-pedal this issue for fear of alienating those of us who call themselves Catholic. Tell it like it is. Whether out of expedience, political correctness, or fear, it seems that the leadership of the Catholic Church in America has wholly failed to lead. And we really could have used some leadership at this critical moment in our nation’s history.

Keep the Faith, stay the course, and don’t worry about stepping on toes. Those who know the truth when they hear it will not be offended by it. God bless you.

There is no need to worry, Mr. Kothman. The personality of LDI’s president and “soft-pedal” are about as far apart as the North and South Poles. He probably could not soft-pedal even if he were *required* to do so.

The leader of Lake County Right to Life in Ohio sent a special message to LDI’s President:

Keep up your fine work. I appreciate your analytical mind and the way you express your thoughts in writing. It’s a real gift...Please know I am personally grateful for your faithfulness to this important work.

— Dawn E. Slike

Jacquelyn L. Ragsdale used the e-mail service at work, the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education, to send a simple message. “You and your organization are disgusting!” she wrote. Okay, so not everyone in the world loves us, but we think Ragsdale would be more productive if she were to spend her time in the office actually working.

Jennifer Gibbs had a few run-on sentences for us:

Please educate yourselves in a non biased [sic] way in an effort to ensure the needed gynecological attention for women who may not be able to afford it themselves can still be provide to [sic] them. Planned Parenthood is often used for the purposes of low cost [sic] or no cost [sic] testing, medical attention, annual exams, and birthcontrol [sic] to underprivilaged [sic] women and girls. Unless you have a better idea as to how our stuggling [sic] economy can afford a nation of teenage or drug addicted mothers we need people [sic] like Planned Parenthood. Any one [sic] of you in line to adopt crack babies? We need not act based on the way we think things *should* be but rather start with dealing with the way things *are*. *Let’s conquer that first and start at home!!!*

Gibbs had more to say:

The entire level of ignorance in the number and frequency of the other very essential services offered by Planned Parenthood in relation to the dramatic social

dysfunction clearly shows a lack of education and an unwillingness to obtain information that will better our society as opposed to gratifying personal opinions and agendas. Truly valid information comes from both sides of the spectrum and is excepted [sic] with an open mind. This should never be an issue of control but rather one of understanding and openness to the widely varied needs, experiences, and beliefs, of the vast number of individuals always mindful of the impact and trickle down set of consequences that come with each decision. There seems to be too much good coming from Planned Parenthood for the suggestion and petion [sic] of it’s closing to be considered credible.

Tonya Mullen had an idea she wanted to share:

As you know, Newman’s Own is on *The Boycott List*. McDonald’s uses Newman’s Own salad dressings. My hope is that we can put the pressure on Newman’s Own to stop funding PP [Planned Parenthood] or explain the situation to McDonald’s and ask them to select another supplier for their salad dressings.

I’m willing to help but would like to have the strength of your whole organization behind it as well. Let me know what we can do. Thanks!

It would be wrong for us to suggest a boycott of McDonald’s Corporation because it is doing business with Newman’s Own. However, it cannot hurt to *urge* the company to end its business relationship with Newman’s Own. Write to: Mr. Charles H. Bell, President & Chief Executive Officer, McDonald’s Corporation, One McDonald’s Plaza, 211 McDonald Dr., Oak Brook, IL 60523.

Nicole Tucker wrote to chastise LDI for viewing birth control and abortion as “totally unrelated”:

I have recently ordered two copies of your *Boycott List*. I received them and am very glad your organization exists. I will not be sending you further money for one reason.

You list birth control as a category and what companies to boycott. This signals to me that your organization sees birth control and abortion as totally unrelated. This in [sic] one of the major problems with the pro-life movement. Many forms of “the pill” are abortifacient. Meaning if the a [sic] fertilized egg happens to get through it will be aborted, and not allowed to implant. It is a second line of defense. Your *List* should not list this as a category, but should educate about this. Artificial contraception is evil and leads to a mind set that is more amenable to abortion. I am disappointed.

Ms. Tucker is clearly unaware of the many things we have written about birth control over the years. LDI has taken a very strong stand against it. Birth control is included as a *Boycott List* category because we

want people to know which corporations are involved in the business. It is also interesting to see which other subsidiaries are owned by birth control manufacturers. For example, Johnson & Johnson sells baby products *and* birth control. In addition, we are very careful about our choice of rhetoric. We routinely avoid use of the word “contraception” because much of it does not actually prevent conception.

We received a somewhat unsettling message regarding the boycott against Office Depot from a person who has been an LDI ally for quite some time:

I had noted on your *Boycott List* that Office Depot was listed and I actually called Office Depot and a Mary Wong...who's in charge of dispersal of funds, flatly denies any donations going to Planned Parenthood and she wanted to know what kind of information you guys had that actually showed that they were giving money to Planned Parenthood. She's been actually involved in their dispersal for four years and has worked for Office Depot for eleven years and she says the only donation that was ever given to Planned Parenthood by their...company was back in 2002 for an amount of 20 dollars and I have a hard time believing you guys would actually have a boycott based on 20 dollars. And I told them that you guys do your homework quite well, so I would like an answer from you guys...And if you can give me some kind of information that would substantiate your claim that Office Depot is indeed funding Planned Parenthood, I would very much appreciate it because I need to know whether or not I want to proceed with the boycott or not...And I want to tell you that she seemed pretty worried and she seemed pretty upset that you guys would put them on *The Boycott List* because they said that they're very careful not to do that....

— Phil Magnan

There is clearly a misunderstanding regarding the standards and practices LDI utilizes to administer the Corporate Funding Project. Not only would we place a corporation on *The Boycott List* if it gave \$20 to Planned Parenthood, we would do the same if it gave one penny to the pro-abortion group. This is the primary reason why we no longer track the amount of money corporations give to Planned Parenthood. Every individual was deciding for himself or herself if the amount of the grant to the abortion-committing group was “enough” to warrant their participation in the Project, which only served to undermine our efforts. The issue is not just the money; it is also the endorsement given to Planned Parenthood by corporations that fund the beast.

Our most significant concern with Mr. Magnan's letter was the part which reads, “if you can give me some kind of information that would substantiate your

claim that Office Depot is indeed funding Planned Parenthood, I would very much appreciate it because I need to know whether or not I want to proceed with the boycott or not.” The following text appears under the “General Information” section of *The Boycott List*:

We cannot honor requests for evidence that listed corporations have donated to Planned Parenthood as it involves many documents, telephone calls, letters and other research. You may be assured that all corporations listed herein belong on this *List* based on our long employed, clearly explained and uniformly applied standards and that excuses offered by corporations are unacceptable.

Yet Mr. Magnan demanded that LDI provide evidence that he would personally find satisfactory. And he clearly suggested that a \$20 donation to Planned Parenthood would be insufficient to warrant a boycott.

### STUDY LINKS T.V. AND TEEN SEX

According to a new study, young people who watch a lot of sexual content on television are nearly twice as likely to start having intercourse during the subsequent year as those with little exposure to televised sex. High exposure to sexual content among 12 to 17 year olds also was linked with a lower but still substantially increased risk of starting non-intercourse behavior, including passionate kissing and oral sex, the researchers found.

Programs that refer to sex but do not actually depict it had the same negative effect. “Exposure to TV that included only talk about sex was associated with the same risks as exposure to TV that depicted sexual behavior,” said Rand Corporation behavioral scientist Rebecca Collins. From innuendoes to depictions of intercourse, sex is pervasive on television. It is present in about two-thirds of all shows other than news and sports and teenagers watch an average of three hours of television daily. Television “may create the illusion that sex is more central to daily life than it truly is and may promote sexual initiation as a result,” the researchers said.

“When they're watching it for three hours a day, it really does become their social world. Those characters are people they identify with and pay attention to,” Collins said. Furthermore, television sex rarely deals with negative aspects that most teens are not prepared to deal with, including untimely pregnancy, acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS), and other sexually transmitted diseases. This “sends kids the message that everybody's having sex and nobody's thinking about responsibility and nothing bad ever happens,” she said.

The researchers identified 23 popular shows that on average featured a great deal of sexual content. Programs the researchers considered high in sexual content included "That '70s Show," "Friends" and "Sex and the City." Study participants were asked how often they watch those 23 shows and whether they engaged in various sexual activities. Results were compared from the two surveys.

The number of teens who reported having had intercourse climbed from 18 to 36 percent. The number who had sexual experiences other than intercourse increased from 62 to 75 percent. Factors that made having intercourse more likely included being older, having older friends, and getting poor grades. But even considering these factors, television remained a strong influence in determining the degree to which young people would be sexually active.

Many people start having sex during their teen years and previous data show that 46 percent of high school students say they have had intercourse. But many say they wish they had waited longer to have sex. Study results, which were no surprise to pro-life and abstinence education advocates, were published in September's issue of *Pediatrics*.

#### **BUFFETT'S MONEY AND GATES' FOLLY**

The family foundation created by Warren E. and the late Susan Buffett will soon become one of the 20 wealthiest philanthropies in the United States. Susan Buffett left the Buffett Foundation the bulk of her stock holdings, which is valued at approximately \$2.4 billion.

As of 2003, the Buffett Foundation, which is based in Omaha, Nebraska, had \$7.2 million in assets. The bequest from Susan Buffett is expected to be received by the Foundation within the next two years. In addition, three other foundations, established by the children of Warren and Susan Buffett, will each receive nearly \$50 million of stock.

Warren Buffett, chief executive officer of Berkshire Hathaway, is serving as executor of his late wife's estate. He has publicly said that the Buffett Foundation will also receive his stock holdings upon his death. Those holdings are currently worth around \$40 billion.

If the value of the stock were simply to remain constant after Warren Buffett's death, the Buffett Foundation would easily surpass today's largest philanthropy, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, which currently has an estimated \$27 billion in assets. Using constant dollars, the Buffett Foundation would be worth nearly

\$50 billion. However, it is likely that the stock of both Berkshire Hathaway and Microsoft would be worth *much* more by the time it is transferred to their respective foundations.

Warren Buffett has made it clear that even after his death the foundation will primarily fund pro-abortion, birth control and population control groups. In 2003, the Foundation made grants of \$2.1 million to PPF, \$1.5 million to NARAL Pro-Choice America, and \$960,353 to the Population Council. Buffett's daughter, who serves on the Foundation's board of directors, told *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* that population control and "abortion rights" will remain a top priority even after her father's death.

Meanwhile, Bill Gates has contributed \$400,000 to the campaign backing a California ballot measure that would make billions of dollars available for embryonic stem cell experimentation and cloning projects. Gates is just one of the billionaires to contribute to Proposition 71, which will be decided by California voters in November. If passed, the state would be required to borrow \$3 billion to fund the controversial experimentation over the next ten years. Cloning projects solely for research would be funded, but programs to create babies would be barred.

Billionaire eBay founder Omar Omidyar and his wife have contributed \$1 million in support of Proposition 71, as has billionaire savings and loan executives Marion and Herbert Sandler. Venture capitalists, Hollywood celebrities and the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation have also made big contributions to the campaign.

At this writing, the campaign to pass Proposition 71 has amassed more than \$12 million. The campaign to defeat it has garnered a *total* of less than \$20,000. It is believed that the death of actor Christopher Reeve, who had stridently campaigned in favor of embryonic stem cell experimentation, will spur even more people to support the ballot measure.

#### **MAGAZINE POLLS YOUTH ON ABORTION**

In its September 2004 edition, *Teen People* published the results of an online poll about abortion. Participants were asked to read a statement in support of and one against abortion. Poll results were printed in the "Your Life: Debate Club" section of the magazine.

The preface to the pro and con statements made the stakes clear. "President George W. Bush is pro-life. Senator John Kerry is pro-choice. The outcome of the presidential election could have huge consequences for abortion rights. Where do you stand on the controversial issue?"

Writing in favor of abortion was 20 year old Sarah Saheb from Kirksville, Missouri. Authoring an opposing view was 14 year old Morgan Davis of Spotsylvania, Virginia. “To have an abortion is a woman’s choice—not the government’s,” Saheb wrote. Davis wrote that, “Abortion rights deter women from addressing the consequences of sex.”

Which position was victorious? The pro-life side won with 57 percent of the vote.

*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.

© 2004 Life Decisions International.