

A Boycott That Worked

Compiled by Ted Olsen | posted 02/27/2004

Texas Girl Scout group breaks relationship with Planned Parenthood after cookie boycott

Who says prolife boycotts (or, to coin a word, a girlscott) don't work? This week, in response to a Girl Scout Cookie boycott organized by Pro-Life Waco, the [Bluebonnet Council of Girl Scouts](#) withdrew its cosponsorship of sex education programs with Planned Parenthood.

Council executive director Beth Vivio said the relationship was severed because it was perceived as an endorsement of abortion.

"Our policies basically state that we do not take a position on issues like abortion," she told the [Waco Tribune-Herald](#). "We feel these are private matters that need to be discussed or determined by each family."

[John Pisciotta](#), director of Pro-Life Waco and an associate professor of economics at Baylor University, is pleased, but is concerned with other areas of partnership between the council and Planned Parenthood.

Pisciotta is no wild-eyed fanatic, and, fortunately, the media hasn't been able to portray him as such. [The Ft. Worth Star-Telegram](#) quoted him saying, "I don't take pleasure in upsetting families and upsetting little girls. That is a downside of this. But it did get the conversation going."

Even more interesting a quote in an earlier *Tribune-Herald* story.

"I'm hearing that Girl Scout cookie sales may hit an all-time high," he said before the council made its decision to withdraw its sponsorship. "I'm happy about that. I hope they double it from last year. ... In our boycott, [the financial impact is nil](#). Our whole goal is education. We want everyone to know about this multifaceted entanglement between the Girl Scouts and Planned Parenthood. Many people are mad about this."

And now Planned Parenthood is mad. "I'm sick to think that an organization as illustrious as the Girl Scouts would make a decision based on one person's political agenda," said Pam Smallwood, executive director of [Planned Parenthood of Central Texas](#).

Planned Parenthood's education director, Pat Stone, had perhaps the most revealing comment. "This foisted an adult conversation on a bunch of little innocent girls," she told the *Star-Telegram*. "It's making them think of things they shouldn't have to worry about."

What was it again that the Girl Scouts had partnered with Planned Parenthood on in the first place? Oh yeah: *sex education*—which for Planned Parenthood includes discussion of abortion.

Speaking of "things they shouldn't have to worry about"

On a related scouting note, today and next Friday the [Supreme Court will discuss](#) whether to review *Boy Scouts of America v. Wyman*, and address the issue of whether states can deny the Boy Scouts access to facilities or other benefits simply because of its stance on homosexuality.

"This case is really the tip of the iceberg—a relentless attack on the Boy Scouts for the sin of teaching virtues to boys," lawyer George Davidson, who represents the Boy Scouts, is quoted as saying in a *Legal Times* article.

Indeed, Boy Scouts faced financial pressure from United Way branches in two states to repudiate its policy on homosexual behavior. The United Way of Ulster County, New York, said it would [pull its funds](#). The United Way of Central Ohio [adopted a policy](#) that will probably mean the end of funds next year.

Meanwhile, the Boy Scouts are accusing San Diego city officials of harassment. "Boy Scouts volunteers have been singled out for 'thousands of dollars of parking tickets' and videotaped by city rangers, and Scouts have been prevented from using adjacent parkland to eat lunch or work on projects," a spokeswoman told the [San Diego Union-Tribune](#). The Scouts are in the midst of a lawsuit against the city, which was launched when city officials caved to the ACLU and canceled its park lease to the Scouts.