



The Caleb Report

September-October 2007

Life Decisions International

vol. xv • no. 5

VATICAN REAFFIRMS AND CLARIFIES STANDARDS OF CARE Medical Personnel Obligated To Provide Nutrition And Hydration

On August 1, 2007, the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF) of the Roman Catholic Church issued a document addressing the administration of nutrition and hydration by artificial means. The document was released in response to questions posed by Bishop William S. Skylstad, president of the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB), in a letter dated July 11, 2005—four months *after* the brutal death of Terri Schindler Schiavo.



Paul III

Founded in 1542 by Pope Paul III, CDF was originally called the Sacred Congregation of the Universal Inquisition as its duty was to defend the Church from heresy. It is the oldest of the nine congregations that assist the pope in the administration of the church. The name was changed to the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office by Pope Pius X in 1908. It received the current name in 1965 under Pope Paul VI.

The new CDF document responds to only two questions. The first concerns patients said to be in a “vegetative state”:

Is the administration of food and water (whether by natural or artificial means) to a patient in a “vegetative state” morally obligatory except when they cannot be assimilated by the patient’s body or cannot be administered to the patient without causing significant physical discomfort?

The answer was unambiguous:

Yes. The administration of food and water even by artificial means is, in principle, an ordinary and proportionate means of preserving life. It is therefore obligatory to the extent to which, and for as long as, it is shown to accomplish its proper finality, which is the hydration and nourishment of the patient. In this way suffering and death by starvation and dehydration are prevented.

The second question regards the administration of nutrition and hydration when doctors believe the patient will never regain consciousness:

When nutrition and hydration are being supplied by artificial means to a patient in a “permanent vegetative state,” may they be discontinued when competent physicians judge with moral certainty that the patient will never recover consciousness?

The answer to this question was equally unambiguous:

No. A patient in a “permanent vegetative state” is a person with fundamental human dignity and must, therefore, receive ordinary and proportionate care which includes, in principle, the administration of water and food even by artificial means.



Pius XII

Issued with the document was a set of “Commentary,” which provides the rationale for the answers to the questions. One section addresses a November 24, 1957 speech by Pope Pius XII at a conference on anesthesiology. CDF said the speech is often cited by those wishing to justify withholding nutrition and hydration from “vegetative” patients:

In this address, the Pope restated two general ethical principles. On the one hand, natural reason and Christian morality teach that, in the case of a grave illness, the patient and those caring for him or her have the right and the duty to provide the care necessary to preserve health and life. On the other hand, this duty in general includes only the use of those means which, considering all the circumstances, are ordinary, that is to say, which do not impose an extraordinary burden on the patient or on others. A more severe obligation would be too burdensome for the majority of persons and would make it too difficult to attain more important goods. Life, health and all temporal activities are subordinate to spiritual ends. Naturally, one is not forbidden to do more than is strictly obligatory to preserve life and health, on condition that one does not neglect more important duties.

One should note, first of all, that the answers given by Pius XII referred to the use and interruption of techniques of resuscitation. However, the case in question has nothing to do with such techniques. Patients in a “vegetative state” breathe spontaneously, digest food naturally, carry on other metabolic functions, and are in a stable situation. But they are not able to feed themselves. If they are not provided artificially with food and liquids, they will die, and the cause of their death will be neither an illness nor the “vegetative state” itself, but solely starvation and dehydration. At the same time, the artificial administration of water and food generally does not impose a heavy burden either on the patient or on his or her relatives. It does not involve excessive expense; it is within the capacity of an average health-care system, does not of itself require hospitalization, and is proportionate to accomplishing its purpose, which is to keep the patient from dying of starvation and dehydration. It is not, nor is it meant to be, a treatment that cures the patient, but is rather ordinary care aimed at the preservation of life.

CDF tackled a hypothetical situation. What if a patient in a “vegetative state” were to stay that way for a long period of time? May family members or doctors with-

hold nutrition and hydration in such a case? No. CDF compared such situations to the “burden” of caring for a quadriplegic or a person with a serious mental illness or advanced Alzheimer’s disease:

Such persons need continuous assistance for months or even for years. But the principle formulated by Pius XII cannot, for obvious reasons, be interpreted as meaning that in such cases those patients, whose ordinary care imposes a real burden on their families, may licitly be left to take care of themselves and thus abandoned to die. This is not the sense in which Pius XII spoke of extraordinary means.

“Everything leads to the conclusion that the first part of the principle enunciated by Pius XII should be applied to patients in a ‘vegetative state,’” the document stated. In the case of serious illness “there is the right and the duty to provide the care necessary for preserving health and life.”

CDF outlined the many documents and statements made by the Catholic Church over the years that support the answers provided in the new document. The “Declaration on Euthanasia,” published by CDF in May 1980, addressed the difference between proportionate and disproportionate means, as well as that between therapeutic treatment and normal care:

“When inevitable death is imminent in spite of the means used, it is permitted in conscience to take the decision to refuse forms of treatment that would only secure a precarious and burdensome prolongation of life, so long as the normal care due to the sick person in similar cases is not interrupted”...Still less can one interrupt the ordinary means of care for patients who are not facing an imminent death, as is generally the case of those in a “vegetative state”; for these people, it would be precisely the interruption of the ordinary means of care which would be the cause of their death.

The Pontifical Council *Cor Unum* published “Some Ethical Questions Relating to the Gravely Ill and the Dying” in June 1981. “There remains the strict obligation to administer at all costs those means which are called ‘minimal,’” the document stated, defining “minimal” as things that are “normally and in usual conditions...aimed at maintaining life (nutrition, injections, etc.)” It was concluded that the cessation of such minimal measures “would mean in effect willing the end of the patient’s life.”

In 1995 the Pontifical Council for Pastoral Assistance to Health Care Workers published the “Charter for Health Care Workers,” which clearly states that the administration of nutrition and hydration is “part of the normal treatment always due to the patient when this is not burdensome for him or her; their undue interruption can have the meaning of real and true euthanasia.” This applies even when the nutrition and/or hydration are administered through “artificial” means.

Not surprisingly, Pope John Paul II often spoke about patient care. During a November 1985 speech at an international conference on different types of human pre-leukemia, he said no person may relinquish “the commitment to valid treatment for sustaining life, nor assistance with the normal means of preserving life,” which he said certainly includes the administration of nutrition and hydration. The Pope also said that denying such care in order to shorten life “in order to spare the patient or his family from suffering” is unacceptable.

In a speech to a group of American bishops in October 1998, John Paul II said nutrition and hydration are to be considered normal care and ordinary means for the preservation of life. He said it is unacceptable to interrupt or withhold them if from that decision the death of the patient will follow as this would constitute euthanasia by omission.



John Paul II

Speaking at a conference titled “Life-Sustaining Treatments and the Vegetative State: Scientific Progress and Ethical Dilemmas” in March 2004, John Paul II said the administration of nutrition and hydration, even when done by artificial means, is in principle an ordinary and proportionate means of preserving life for patients in a so-called “vegetative state.” As he put it, “It is therefore obligatory, to the extent to which, and for as long as, it is shown to accomplish its proper finality, which is the hydration and nourishment of the patient.” He also said this means of sustaining life is to be provided to those in a “permanent vegetative state.”

John Paul II made four key points during the March 2004 speech:

1. “The term *permanent vegetative state* has been coined to indicate the condition of those patients whose ‘vegetative state’ continues for over a year. Actually, there is no different diagnosis that corresponds to such a definition, but only a conventional prognostic judgment, relative to the fact that the recovery of patients, statistically speaking, is ever more difficult as the condition of vegetative state is prolonged in time”...
2. In response to those who doubt the “human quality” of patients in a “permanent vegetative state”, it is necessary to reaffirm that “the intrinsic value and personal dignity of every human being do not change, no matter what the concrete circumstances of his or her life. *A man, even if seriously ill or disabled in the exercise of his highest functions, is and always will be a man, and he will never become a ‘vegetable’ or an ‘animal’*”...
3. “The sick person in a vegetative state, awaiting recovery or a natural end, still has the right to basic health care (nutrition, hydration, cleanliness, warmth, etc.), and to the prevention of complications related to his confinement to bed. He also has the right to appropriate rehabilitative care and to be monitored for clinical signs of possible recovery. I

should like particularly to underline how the administration of water and food, even when provided by artificial means, always represents a *natural means* of preserving life, not a *medical act*. Its use, furthermore, should be considered, in principle, *ordinary and proportionate*, and as such morally obligatory, to the extent to which, and for as long as, it is shown to accomplish its proper finality, which in the present case consists in providing nourishment to the patient and alleviation of his suffering”....

4. The preceding documents were taken up and interpreted in this way: “The obligation to provide the ‘normal care due to the sick in such cases’ (Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, ‘Declaration on Euthanasia’...) includes, in fact, the use of nutrition and hydration (cf. Pontifical Council *Cor Unum*, ‘Some Ethical Questions Relating to the Gravely Ill and the Dying’...; Pontifical Council for Pastoral Assistance to Health Care Workers, ‘Charter for Health Care Workers’ ...). The evaluation of probabilities, founded on waning hopes for recovery when the vegetative state is prolonged beyond a year, cannot ethically justify the cessation or interruption of *minimal care* for the patient, including nutrition and hydration. Death by starvation or dehydration is, in fact, the only possible outcome as a result of their withdrawal. In this sense it ends up becoming, if done knowingly and willingly, true and proper euthanasia by omission”....



Skylstad

The Commentary notes that the responses to Bishop Skylstad’s questions coincide with previously released documents and statements made on the subject by several popes. It concludes by emphasizing the general ethical criterion which states that the administration of nutrition and hydration, even by artificial means, “always represents a *natural means* for preserving life, and is not a *therapeutic treatment*. Its use should therefore be considered *ordinary and proportionate*, even when the ‘vegetative state’ is prolonged.” The document was approved by Pope Benedict XVI.

LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr., applauded the Vatican for its statement. “It is rather surprising to me that the American bishops would be unclear about the position of the Catholic Church on this matter given the numerous statements made in the past,” he said. “While it should not have been necessary, I am thrilled that the Vatican has reiterated that position.”

In March 2005, Scott released a public statement that called the death of Terri Schindler Schiavo “a tragedy of our own making.” He said the Pro-Life Movement failed to educate the general public and pastors failed to educate the church about such issues and work to pass legislation to avoid it:

We surely knew this was coming, but everyone has been so busy putting out fires on other issues that our eyes were blinded to the smoldering embers. After all, this case has been ongoing for many years. Still, everyone “dropped the ball” in a big way. When are we as a movement going to get ahead of these issues instead of reacting after-the-fact?

...

Unless we can make the case that nutrition and hydration are basic necessities and not “medical treatment,” this battle is lost before it has really been fully engaged. With doctors and lawyers and reporters and commentators responsible for spreading false information, the Pro-Life Movement needs to find a way to reach Middle America.

We call on Congress and state lawmakers to pass legislation making it illegal to withhold nutrition or hydration from any person unless it is determined to be an overwhelming and insurmountable physical burden or if nutrition and hydration cannot be assimilated by the body. It seems that allowing any person—or anyone acting on behalf of another person—to withdraw nutrition/hydration is tantamount to condoning killing and suicide. It strikes me as odd that if one of the people protesting outside the hospice had decided to go on a hunger strike, he or she would have been taken to the hospital, probably after collapsing, and given nutrition/hydration without consent.

Many lawmakers will consider this proposal “dead on arrival” because at the moment most people believe they should be able to refuse nutrition and hydration. But the Pro-Life Movement and the church need to undertake a massive education campaign on this issue and it must commence immediately.

Why is it that a diagnosis of “persistent vegetative state” has become a license to kill? No one should be put to death just because he or she is determined to be in such a condition. Why is the means by which a person receives nutrition and hydration a factor in whether or not someone may refuse them?

If a fully conscious and healthy person wanted to be starved to death, what would be wrong with it? Why must he or she be in a “vegetative state” before we will let the person starve to death? It seems to me that the condition of a person should be immaterial. No one has a “right” to suicide, especially with the help or consent of the state.

James Borkowski, a member of LDI’s Board of Directors and a resident of British Columbia, Canada, closely followed the Terri Schindler Schiavo case. “Certainly removing nutrition and hydration from the ‘extraordinary means’ list is critical. What could be less extraordinary than food and water?” he asked.

“Declaring that someone is in a ‘persistent vegetative state’ or referring to a human being as ‘a vegetable’ inherently dehumanizes and we should find an alternative way to describe people in such conditions,” Scott said. “No human being is a vegetable. Vegetables grow in the ground. Vegetables are carrots, peas, corn and so forth. Human beings are much, much more.”



Levada

Today, CDF is charged with promoting and defending the doctrine on the faith and morals. Currently headed by Prefect Cardinal William Joseph Levada, it has 23 members (cardinals, archbishops and bishops). Congregation work is divided into four sections: doctrinal, disciplinary, matrimonial, and one for priests.

NEWSPAPER GETS IT *VERY* WRONG

No one was suspicious when Scott Barancik, a staff writer for the *St. Petersburg Times*, contacted LDI about

the Corporate Funding Project, specifically as it relates to boycott target OSI RESTAURANT PARTNERS INC., which is based in nearby Tampa. After all, LDI receives inquiries about the highly successful project every day.

Barancik wanted information, which was readily provided via fax, e-mail and several phone calls. Unfortunately, however, Barancik is apparently one of those reporters who place no value on truth; he just wants to attack a pro-life organization that is having an impact.



“The threat, laid out in a certified letter to the chief executive officer of Tampa’s OSI Restaurant Partners, was explicit,” read Barancik’s introduction to the article. What’s this? LDI made an “explicit threat” against OSI? There must be some sort of crime involved here.

Just what was this *explicit threat*? “Stop making charitable donations to Planned Parenthood...or else face an embarrassing boycott of Outback Steakhouse, Carrabba’s Italian Grill and other OSI chains,” Barancik wrote. Ah, but as used in the actual article, the so-called explicit threat (highlighted below) was not in quotation marks:

The threat, laid out in a certified letter to the chief executive officer of Tampa’s OSI Restaurant Partners, was explicit: *Stop making charitable donations to Planned Parenthood...or else face an embarrassing boycott of Outback Steakhouse, Carrabba’s Italian Grill and other OSI chains.*

The statement was not in quotation marks for good reason. LDI has never made a statement that is even remotely close to the one Barancik dreamed up. Yet the implication is that the words Barancik used are indicative of the tone of LDI’s letter. This is bad enough, but there is *much* more.

In the letter, LDI referred to Planned Parenthood as “the world’s leading pro-abortion behemoth.” Barancik, 43, editorialized that the statement is “a stretch.” (The statement is provably true. One need only do some research, or simply ask LDI to back it up.) Barancik continued:

Life Decisions, a Washington, D.C., advocacy group, based its boycott threat on a small contribution made by a lone OSI restaurant on the West Coast in 2005. Perhaps that’s why OSI chief executive Bill Allen, who oversees more than 1,400 locations worldwide and whose staff declined interview requests, did not respond to the letter.

He’s in good company. Though Life Decisions says more than 150 regional or national companies have agreed to its demands over the years, a number of corporate giants—including Walmart, Nike, GlaxoSmithKline, Wachovia, Time Warner, the Dallas Cowboys and Walt Disney—have resisted. But the public-relations risk associated with boycotts, and the pitfalls of corporate philanthropy, are real.

The article included a reference to the expertise of LDI President Douglas R. Scott, Jr. in organizing boycotts

and the success in convincing AT&T to end support of Planned Parenthood more than 15 years ago. Barancik also noted that AT&T’s decision had been discussed by Jerome L. Himmelstein in his book, *Looking Good and Doing Good: Corporate Philanthropy and Corporate Power*. “AT&T’s foundation had been funding Planned Parenthood for 25 years but agreed to stop in order to avoid further controversy,” Barancik reported. But he contacted the author for comment:

Big mistake, Himmelstein said in an interview. Companies that stuck to their convictions back then saw the protests quickly subside. But abortion foes and supporters alike responded virulently to AT&T and Target, both of which did an about-face months later. “If you do it for Life Decisions, why not for every other Doug Scott in the world that wants to puff himself up and say, ‘We’re going to boycott you,’” he said.



Himmelstein

But this is not what Himmelstein had written in his book. “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,” he wrote. In another paragraph of the book Himmelstein noted that, “Controversy endangers corporate interests; there are less contentious ways of doing good...”

A professor of sociology at Amherst College, the liberal Himmelstein ended the chapter with a quotation from an unidentified director of a corporate foundation:

“We had purposely avoided support to organizations that fall into the general heading ‘controversial.’ Planned Parenthood is one. We don’t see anything to be gained by that. How I feel personally is one thing, and I support it personally; but I don’t feel, nor does our management feel, that it’s in the company’s interest to become embroiled in the support of an organization that has virtually nothing to do with the core business purpose of the company.”

The most amazing part of Barancik’s article is that it was written without interviewing anyone from LDI. Of course, had he done so, there may have been some sort or ethical responsibility to include some truth.

Needless-to-say, Barancik’s article generated some e-mails to LDI. The first was from Harvey A. Ford of the law firm Ford & Ford:

Today I read in the St Pete Times that you have threatened a boycott of Outback Restaurants. Thank you for bringing that to my attention. I have only been to an Outback and its related restaurants a couple of times in the past, but I will assuredly now become a very regular customer and will take my clients and friends there and encourage all of them to also go there on their own and to tell their friends. I will not be telling them why I go there other than it is a good restaurant. I don’t want to be guilty of the same economic terrorism that you employ. I will be checking your website regarding other “boycotted” businesses and will

be patronizing them as well. Thank you for the good recommendations (Marriott, Sears, Wells Fargo, Rotary Int'l, etc). Keep up the work. And I imagine that someone has already reviewed the source of your funding, which itself is probably the target of a boycott. Ain't life grand?

Ford sent the same message to the *St. Petersburg Times*, which was printed in the "Letters" section.

LDI responded to Ford by saying such a message may make him feel good but it really accomplishes nothing. He followed with more sarcastic words that were intended to discourage and harass:

Oh my, "it accomplishes nothing"? I feel so deflated. By the way, my wife and I enjoyed our \$49 meal at Carrabas [sic] on Sat [sic] night. It was packed, with lots of people waiting. Then, I went home and paid my Wells Fargo mortgage payment (some Sat night eh?) and we made plans to stay at a Marriott in Manhattan in a few weeks to visit our kids. Thanks again for the suggestions.

Another person who sent a letter to the *St. Petersburg Times* was Judy Ellis:

In a country where we celebrate differences and our right to believe as we choose, it is outrageous that Mr. Scott should resort to financial terrorism to shove his agenda down the corporate throat. Mr. Scott is free to believe what he wants about abortion, but imposing his personal view of the world on viable businesses smacks of the Taliban. And he needs to know this: Boycotts work both ways. How about a boycott of any place that yields to Mr. Scott's threats? Personally, I intend to double my business in places that resist Mr. Scott's strong-arm techniques.

Wanting to be sure someone at LDI read the letter she sent to the newspaper, Ellis sent us an e-mail:

I strongly recommend you check the letters to the Money section of the *St. Petersburg Times* yesterday (Sunday). Four people responded to the article about your financial terrorism and oddly enough, not a single one of them agreed with you.

You are, incidentally, the American Taliban. Congratulations!

LDI thanked Ellis for the tip and asked if she had the website address where the letters printed in the newspaper could be viewed. Ellis used the opportunity to send a mean-spirited reply and she tried to make us believe she is well-read and has a large vocabulary. Of course, Ellis assumed we were not nearly as educated. In other words, Ellis is one of the intellectually elite that Planned Parenthood founder and eugenics advocate Margaret Higgins Sanger embraced—to the detriment of the lowlifes that were the masses:

You're such a smart fellow, you can find them yourself, I'm sure. Of course, if you had half a brain, you'd be reading intelligent literature like Harris and Hitchens and Dawkins and not that book of fairy tales. Have you ever had an independent thought about all this nonsense, all of which is traceable back to Osiris, same old stories, same old myths, new names? The original Noah's ark story predates the bible by more than a thousand years. For heaven's sake, figure it out!!!

And while you're contemplating your navel (omphaloskepsis—look it up), leave the rest of us alone. I am making a special trip to Outback next week and so are my friends.

Listen: You can't make us believe the way you do, understand? Some of us have brains of our own!! You believe what you want, we'll do the same—but committing financial terrorism, Taliban style, is not the way to go.

LDI apologized and told Ellis she could have made her point without resorting to nasty sarcasm. She responded:

You worry about sarcasm. I worry about terrorism. Which one of us has a nastier habit? At least I don't threaten people to get my point across—why do you feel the need to do so?

I am a very kind person; I give free legal advice and assistance to the elderly, the sick and the dying. I don't need a god/crutch to tell me to be a good person. I'm just sick of you and your ilk...up to HERE!

Ellis sent yet another e-mail when she did not receive a quick reply from LDI:


Aha! Chicken! We can always count on you guys cutting and running—you're such a bunch of moral cowards!...You don't have the strength of your own convictions! You know what's wrong with this world? Religion.

If LDI had known Ellis was pro-abortion and a bigot, our response would have been completely different.

A letter printed in the *St. Petersburg Times* from Planned Parenthood apologist Elvina L. Bergmann, 30, was headed, "Scare tactics deserve sanctions":

Life Decisions International, a Washington, D.C., advocacy group, is a despotic group. Why do we tolerate Life Decisions [sic] tactics in the United States?

Planned Parenthood is an organization that provides care and services. Quality care and information and education are provided to all who go there. It's intolerable that Life Decisions can function without sanctions and no punitive measures. Why allow this 500-pound gorilla to utilize its scare tactics to hinder support for organizations that help so many?

 Another person to write a letter in response to the article was Abigail Ann Martin. Her letter was headed, "Blackmail tactic of 'good cause':"

The word "ethics" can mean many things to people, apparently. Life Decisions, the organization that is vindictively aggressive against abortion, seems to feel itself secure in its interpretation. And of the virtue of using any means to advance its cause.

It uses the threat of boycott against large corporations who give charitable contributions to Planned Parenthood. To many of us, this has an ugly name: blackmail. Life Decisions does not stop with threats. Slander is in its weaponry, also. It stridently refers to Planned Parenthood as "the world's leading pro-abortion behemoth." (Never mind that Planned Parenthood's activities encompass all aspects of women's health, including advice, counseling and information regarding abortion.)

Though Life Decisions claims that over 150 "regional or national companies have agreed to its demands over the years," it has

not managed to cow some “corporate giants.” One must salute Wal-Mart, Nike, GlaxoSmithKline, Wachovia, Time Warner, the Dallas Cowboys and Walt Disney. But the shabby fact remains that any organization purporting to be in a “good cause” can stoop to scare tactics and threats to achieve its ends.

We have free speech in our country, and that is right. What is not right is use of it to limit the freedom of others.

If Martin’s name seems familiar it may be because she has been an outspoken atheist for many years. In 2004, she wrote a letter that was printed in *The Humanist*, a publication of the Humanist Society:

Another source of wonder to me is how the expression “human rights” is interpreted. I am a materialist, an atheist. Therefore I do not believe that I—or anyone else—is born equipped with a “right” to this or that. For from whom—or what—do these rights come? Who or what bestows “rights?”

All that I have said does not preclude humanitarianism, pity, love, and so on. We are all faulty human beings, and it is only decent that we do what we can for each other. It is only healthy (from a scientific point of view) that we work to make our society as good and as harmonious as possible. A conviction of this has evolved over many a weary age—it is not instilled in us by an unknown entity out in infinity.

In a letter printed in *The Nation*, Martin defended Sam Harris, author of *Letter to a Christian Nation*:

Harris is showing everyone the irrationality of supernatural belief and the harm it engenders. He explains how belief in a “God” has caused—and is causing—much suffering...I submit that the fanaticism fueled by religious belief is different from the enthusiasm for good causes. The latter is focused on victims and is not concerned with trying to please a stern (unseen) deity. It is not geared to a quivering subservience to a higher power. It is trying to rectify human ills and should not be compared to the “deranged” followers of any god. Harris’s writing is thoughtful and entertaining. And it is necessary, given the world’s ugly enmities and bewildering violence.

Most interesting of all is an unrelated letter published in the *St. Petersburg Times* in 2001, in which Martin said “we should endure preaching we hate, art we consider trashy, literature we think tasteless because by so enduring, we ensure that our ideas will be allowed expression.”

While a response to the attacks by Barancik, Ford, Ellis, Bergmann, and Martin (hereafter collectively referred to as “the gang of five”) is probably unnecessary, especially for the readers of *The Caleb Report*, there are some statements we just cannot let go without making a remark or two:

- If LDI had placed OSI Restaurant Partners on *The Boycott List* without first writing to the company there would have been no “threat.” This is how most groups implement a boycott. Would the gang of five have preferred that LDI not contact OSI before making it a boycott target? Would this have been a better and open way to handle the matter?

- Do labor unions use a “strike threat” if they do not get what they want from corporations? In the case of Planned Parenthood, do those who oppose LDI’s boycott view a “strike threat” in the same immoral and reprehensible light as a “boycott threat”? Should labor unions just go on strike and not discuss the issues with business until later? Do strikes also constitute “economic” or “financial terrorism?”
- Did Barancik criticize the “boycott threat” made by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) against television networks for failing to increase racial diversity in programming to levels demanded by the group? Did the gang of five speak out against this economic terrorism?
- Did Barancik criticize homosexual activists when they called for a boycott of Colorado because the state’s voters decided against granting them protected class status? There was no “threat” (warning); the activists just called for the boycott—period. Did the gang of five speak out against this blackmail?
- When Ellis writes about “that book of fairy tales,” she is referring to *The Holy Bible*. When Martin writes about the “irrationality of supernatural belief,” she is referring to God. It is sad that these two women think it is acceptable to belittle the beliefs of others and ridicule those who do not think as they do. Frankly, we at LDI do not believe in atheists. Agnostics might exist; we are just not sure.
- As for comparing LDI to the Taliban, well, it is ironic that some people who claim to be so learned can show such a lack of education and understanding about what the Taliban really believes and does. (At least they are not calling us Nazis this time!) Furthermore, it is amazing how a zealous point of view can overshadow reason and civil discourse. LDI does want to make everyone believe as we do. We rely on education and other tools that have been widely used and accepted for centuries. People may believe as they wish, just as long as they do not kill anyone (including preborn human beings).
- Martin accused LDI of being “vindictively aggressive against abortion.” Rhetorical nonsense. She said LDI uses “scare tactics.” More rhetorical nonsense. Martin also said LDI would use “any means” to advance our cause. Now this is the epitome of nonsense!
- LDI “stridently refers to Planned Parenthood as ‘the world’s leading pro-abortion behemoth.’ (Never mind that Planned Parenthood’s activities encompass all aspects of women’s health, including advice, counseling and information regarding abortion.)” Martin wrote. Even if the manner in which she described Planned Parenthood were true, the abortion-committing group could simultaneously “the world’s leading pro-abortion behemoth.” All she had done here is redirect the

attention of the reader. She did not dispute the statement made by LDI.

- The most telling statement made by Martin is her claim that LDI has slandered Planned Parenthood when we referred to the world's leading pro-abortion behemoth as, well, "the world's leading pro-abortion behemoth"! Is Martin suggesting that if Planned Parenthood was proven to be the "world's leading pro-abortion behemoth" it would be a negative thing? Would it be something that would actually constitute slander if inaccurately applied to a group? Does not that imply that there is something wrong with abortion? Would not Martin consider it a badge of honor to be called "the world's leading pro-abortion behemoth?"

It is plain to see that the gang of five is upset because LDI has successfully employed the very same strategy that the kinds of groups they support have used for many years. Why do we have no doubt that if this "financial terrorism" and "blackmail" was being organized for a cause they endorse, every one of them would enthusiastically participate? Did not Ellis suggest boycotting corporations that choose not to give to Planned Parenthood? Is not that extortion? After all, LDI does not demand money from anyone. Hypocrisy can be an ugly and self-biting thing.

"THE VIEW" CAN'T SMILE WITH MANILOW

Singer/songwriter Barry Manilow is so liberal that he refused to appear on ABC's "The View" unless producers agreed to bar co-host Elisabeth Hasselbeck from participating in the interview. At least this is the story Manilow is telling.



Manilow/Hasselbeck

A rabid supporter of liberal Democrats for many years, Manilow has already contributed the maximum allowed by law (\$2,300 per candidate) to the presidential campaigns of Senators Hillary Clinton, D-N.Y., Barack Hussein Obama, D-Ill., and Joseph R. Biden. He has also donated money to the campaign of former Senator John R. Edwards, D-N.C.

Manilow has said *his* decision to cancel the appearance on "The View" is based on a philosophical clash with the conservative and pro-life Hasselbeck. "I strongly disagree with her views. I think she's dangerous and offensive. I will not be on the same stage as her."

"I had made a request that I be interviewed by (co-hosts) Joy (Behar), Barbara (Walters) or Whoopi (Goldberg), but not Elisabeth Hasselbeck," Manilow said in a statement published on his website. "Unfortunately, the show was not willing to accommodate this simple request so I bowed out. It's really too bad be-

cause I've always been a big supporter of the show, but I cannot compromise my beliefs."

While Manilow claims *he* decided to "bow out," sources associated with "The View" said it was actually the show's producers who cancelled the appearance because of Manilow's "completely disrespectful" demands. Oddly, Manilow was a guest on the program twice in 2006 while Hasselbeck was co-hosting. "Access Hollywood" reported that Manilow is just trying to make a ruckus to "create a buzz" over the release of his new album. If this is the case, Manilow needs a new publicist; one who will not alienate millions of people.

The controversy was discussed during on "The View":

Goldberg: "Barbara [Walters] and Bill [Geddie] made a decision that has stood from the beginning of 'The View'; if you don't sit with one, you sit with none." <enthusiastic audience applause>

Behar: "We practice free speech here."

Goldberg: "That's right. That's right."

Walters and Goldberg are known for their support of legal abortion. To their credit, the pair put free speech and diversity of thought ahead of their personal beliefs.

QUOTABLE QUOTE

"While Christianity appears to be dying a natural death throughout Western Europe, it is proving to be amazingly resilient here in the United States. It should come as no surprise, however, that Americans, the richest and most powerful people on Earth, the most aggressive and self-assured, should also be the ones most susceptible to religious sentiment."

— Stephen E. Silver, "The East, The West, and Religion"

PUTTING THE FRIGHT INTO HALLOWEEN



It began in 1950 when school children in Philadelphia, Penn, went door-to-door at Halloween collecting money in decorated milk cartons. They raised \$17 and started a project that has since raised more than \$188 million, more than 63 percent of which has come from the United States. Millions of children in Canada, Ireland, Mexico, and Hong Kong now participate in "Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF" and related Halloween fund-raising programs.

The program goes "far beyond Trick-or-Treating in scary costumes with the familiar orange collection boxes in hand," UNICEF claims:

Children and young people take part in various fun and educational events that help them gain a better understanding of child rights and the challenges facing children around the world—including poverty, killer diseases and armed conflict. They help stage events to raise funds and increase awareness about these issues, and in doing so learn that they can help change the world.

In the United States, children are urged to hold additional fund-raising events at school. They are asked to get teachers, administrators and parents involved to help make such events successful. UNICEF provides a list of fund-raising programs that have proved successful in schools over the years. It also provides material for teachers who wish to promote UNICEF in the classroom and parents who wish to do the same at home. UNICEF publishes the names of schools and groups that raise at least \$500 on its website.

In Canada, the campaign is recognized by the federal government through the permanent declaration of October 31 as National UNICEF Day. UNICEF Canada has altered its Trick-or-Treat campaign. It now takes place throughout October and no longer involves door-to-door collections on Halloween. One program UNICEF Canada is promoting is the "Dare-to-Wear Costume Challenge," which is called "an exciting way to get into the spirit of Halloween and help turn costume fun into education funds!" UNICEF described the program:

The challenge is simple: it's a fundraising dare. You set the target amount of funds to be raised and when that target is met, you'll Dare-to-Wear a Halloween costume at work, to class, to a game or to a special Halloween event. Challenge your colleagues, classmates, teammates or maybe a rival business and encourage them to donate to UNICEF...

Why not make it interesting? Ask your boss, team captain, professor, community leader or even your CEO to be a part of the Costume Challenge—if your fundraising goal is met, they'll be the one to Dare-to-Wear!

Children in the United States wanting to participate in the "Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF" program are asked to go to a Hallmark Gold Crown or Pier 1 Imports store to pick up a collection box. CVS Pharmacy had been a box pick up location but the company ended its relationship with UNICEF after receiving complaints.

ACTION: Ask Hallmark and Pier 1 Imports to stop distributing "Trick-or-Treat for UNICEF" collection boxes. *Contact:* Pier 1 Imports Inc., 100 Pier 1 Pl., Fort Worth, TX 76102, phone: (817) 252-8000; Hallmark Cards Inc., 2501 McGee St., Kansas City, MO 64108, phone: 800-425-5627 or (816) 274-5111

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*—Los Angeles Mayor **Antonio Villaraigosa, D**; *October*—**Jack Kevorkian**; *November*—**Simon Cowell**, chief executive of International Save the Children Alliance; *December*—pro-abortion Australian correspondents **Kerry-Anne Walsh**, **Michelle Singer**, and **Barrie Cassidy**; *January*—**Scott Barancik**, pro-abortion staff writer for the *St. Petersburg Times*; and *February*—singer **Barry Manilow**.

WHEN YOU FEEL OVERWHELMED

A professor stood before his philosophy class with several items in front of him. When class began, he picked up a large, empty mayonnaise jar and proceeded to fill it with golf balls. He asked the students if the jar was full; they agreed it was.

The professor picked up a box of pebbles and poured them into the jar. He shook the jar lightly and the pebbles rolled into the open areas between the golf balls. He then asked the students again if the jar was full; they agreed it was.

The professor picked up a box of sand and poured it into the jar. Of course, the sand filled up everything else. He asked once more if the jar was full and the students responded with a unanimous "yes."

The professor then picked up two cups of coffee from under the table and poured the entire contents into the jar, effectively filling the empty space between the sand. Yet again the students agreed the jar was full.

"Now," said the professor, "I want you to recognize that this jar represents your life. The golf balls are the important things—God, your family, your children, your health, your friends, your freedom—things that if everything else was lost and only they remained, your life would still be full."

"The pebbles are the other things that matter like your job, your house, and your car. The sand is everything else—the small stuff. If you put the sand into the jar first there is no room for the pebbles or the golf balls. The same goes for life. If you spend all your time and energy on the small stuff, you will never have room for the things that are important to you. Pay attention to the things that are critical to your happiness. Play with your children. Take time to get medical checkups. Take your spouse to dinner. Help the less fortunate. Pray and thank God for your many blessings. There will always be time to clean the house and fix the disposal. Take care of the golf balls first—the things that really matter. Set your priorities. The rest is just sand."

One of the students raised her hand and inquired what the coffee represented. The professor smiled. "I'm glad you asked," he said. "It just goes to show you that no matter how full your life may seem, there's always room for a couple of cups of coffee with a friend."

The Caleb Report, an official periodical of Life Decisions International (LDI), is published six times per year. Opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of every LDI Partner or members of its Board of Directors/Advisors or staff. This publication may be copied so long as the appropriate citation(s) are included. It may be quoted so long as proper acknowledgment(s) are provided. Write: P.O. Box 75161, Washington, DC 20013-0161. Phone: (540) 631-0380. All past editions of *The Caleb Report* are available on our website (www.fightpp.org).

© 2007 Life Decisions International