

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

November 2008

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On October 29, 2008, we received an e-mail message from a twelve-year-old girl who lives in Baltimore, MD. She had just seen the aborted baby videos and photos on our website. She wrote to say: “Before, all I knew [about abortion] was that the baby was taken away. But now that I fully understand abortion, it hurts me deeply .... I don’t understand how people could do such a thing.”

In her ignorance and her innocence, this twelve-year-old reminds me of many sincere Christians who are only marginally better informed than she was before she saw our photos. Their confusion derives from the fact that their pastors have generally abandoned them on this issue. Clergy are largely avoiding abortion and the few who will address it are loath to show their congregations what abortion is and does. Some actually hinder the efforts of pro-lifers who attempt to reveal what their pastors are suppressing. The church, as a consequence, is left vulnerable to disastrous mistakes when confronted by crisis pregnancies and/or the predations of scheming, pro-abortion politicians who will lie, cheat and steal to get our vote. When pastors cloud the issue of abortion, and worse, legitimize the candidacies of evil charlatans, Barack Obama wins the White House.

Typical of many church leaders’ shameful attempts to obscure the facts is a September 24, 2008 letter from Linda Richardson, the Director of the Office of Family Life/Respect Life, in the Archdiocese of Trenton, NJ. She was writing to demand that a pro-life activist not bring abortion photos to a “Forty Days for Life” demonstration:

I believe that the Holy Spirit is much in evidence when our good people participate in prayer and reflection and give witness to our core belief regarding the protection of life.

However, I respectfully ask that you rescind your guideline that says people can bring graphic signs to this demonstration. Our diocesan policy has always been, and continues to be, that we do not use these images as part of our witness. In a way, graphic images are part of the violence against women and babies that is inflicted on our society. We are especially concerned about the effect of these signs on children who are exposed to them, and we have other powerful ways of making our beliefs known.

This sort of treachery is so pervasive that it has virtually become the policy of the Catholic Church regarding abortion pictures. It is nonsensical because we lose when we merely “give witness to our core belief” or make that “belief known” regarding abortion. It is vital that we, instead, “give witness” and “make known” the horror of abortion itself. The narcissistic contention that teaching what “we believe” is more important than teaching the inexpressibly shocking facts of abortion, is precisely why Catholics voted for Sen. Obama by huge majorities. But for Ms. Richardson to parrot the Planned Parenthood propaganda claims that *showing* these babies is more violent than *killing* them is beyond depraved. What *are* her “more powerful ways” of making our case? Ms. Richardson must be referring to the anemic, insipid, half-measures which have given us the worst public opinion polls in history, abortion laws which can’t stop a single abortion and the election of the most evil enemy of life to ever desecrate the American presidency.

Those “powerful ways” have turned out to be little more than a pathetic conceit. But Catholic leaders are not alone in making common cause with agents of evil.

Lisa Miller, writing on November 3 for Newsweek.com (“The Silence Issue”) remarks that:

[T]he silence of Saddleback Church pastor Rick Warren on the subject of abortion in this election has been notable. In 2004, Warren sent an e-mail around listing the five "non-negotiables" for any evangelical voter, and abortion was of course high on that list. This year, he has made no such pronouncement.

This relative silence on the part of religious conservatives, along with the well-documented broadening of the evangelical agenda to include issues like poverty and the environment, has led some to speculate that conservative Christians don't care about abortion the way they used to.

Despite Pastor Warren’s 2004 issuance of his “five non-negotiables,” the first being abortion and the second the killing of human embryos to harvest their stem cells, on November 9, CBSNews.com and the *Washington Post* reported a story titled “Obama Positioned to Reverse Bush Actions.” His first executive order will be to lift the ban on federal funding of international organizations which do abortion counseling and referrals and the second will end the prohibition against taxpayer financed embryo-killing. Pastor Warren was right about one thing: Sen. Obama also considers baby-killing to be non-negotiable.

Ms. Miller then notes that “According to a study by William D'Antonio at Georgetown University, 70% of American Catholics say they are willing to oppose their bishops on abortion.” Then just a few days before the election, pollster George Barna released a nationwide survey which found that voters who described themselves as “born-again” were evenly split between pro-life candidate John McCain and pro-abortion candidate Barack Obama (religionblog.dallasmorningnews.com, October 23, 2008, “McCain and Obama in ‘dead heat’ among born-again voters”). The numbers among Catholics were even worse.

Tim Rutten, *Los Angeles Times* columnist (latimes.com, October 20, 2008, “The end of the Catholic vote, Obama lead among Catholic voters may signal a profound shift”) reported that just prior to election day, Senator Obama had “a commanding 59% to 31% lead over McCain among Catholics nationwide.” Exit polling suggests that Sen. Obama actually carried the Catholic vote by a still enormous 54% to 45%, according to the *LA Times*, November 9, “Obama drew in religious voters.” Rutten adds that “national polls have reported for some time that ... [Catholics] believe that ... [abortion] ought to be legal in nearly identical percentages to the rest of America.” This, despite the fact that “at least 50 of the country’s 197 Catholic bishops recently have published articles or given interviews in which they argued that abortion, more than any other issue, ought to determine how members of their flock cast their votes.”

The *International Herald Tribune*, September 29, 2008, published an article headlined “Labor unions [with many Catholic members] stress economic issues in promoting Obama to members.” The article quotes a former Bush supporter who says “But this year the economy is very important. ... My wife is out of work. My son has a job with no medical. My 401(k) is going down.” His family and retirement plan are very real to him but unborn children and abortion are total abstractions, thanks to his church’s cover-up of abortion facts which are far too terrible to be conveyed by words alone.

Time.com, October 18, 2008, (“How Catholics are Judging Obama and the Democrats”) reported that “despite all the arguments about what it means to be pro-life and which party best represents Catholic social teaching ... the election is likely to come down to one issue for most Catholic voters: The economy.” In their July 14 issue, *Time* reported that Catholics were “almost twice as likely to name the economy, Iraq and terrorism as their top concerns over abortion and gay marriage....” This is convincing validation of *LA*

Times columnist Tim Rutten's reference to a recent study by Georgetown University's Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate, which found that "only 18% of Catholics 'strongly' agree with the statement 'in deciding what is morally acceptable, I look to the church teachings and statements by the pope and bishops to form my conscience.'"

We are long past the time in this country when most pastors, Catholic or Protestant, have the moral authority to merely command allegiance to doctrine. If Catholic clergy want the laity to accept the proposition that abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby, they have the burden to prove that fact to a skeptical audience whose objectivity has been shattered by the abortions Catholic women have had and the abortions Catholic men have forced. The numbers don't lie. Unsupported assertions of fact and bland expressions of opinion leave most parishioners mumbling, "You have your view and I have mine." This debate must be forced beyond opinion and focused on facts. But the facts are so horrifying that they cannot be explained by words alone. Only pictures will suffice -- the pictures are so horrifying that pastors are afraid to use them. Evangelical ministers argue erroneously that graphic images cannot be shown compassionately. Priests agree and cover up abortion pictures during homilies delivered beneath gory statues of our Savior being tortured to death.

Evangelicals may have been bad about covering up the horror of abortion but they have been worse about covering up the horror of Sen. Obama's position on the horror of abortion. Many brave Catholic pastors have anathematized Sen. Obama for his baby-killing policies but *The Orange County Register* ("Evangelicals embrace Obama") December 2, 2006, reported that Pastor Rick Warren described Sen. Obama as one of "two members of Congress he most respected." He added that Sen. Obama "always speak[s] with integrity ...." But the latter is simply not true. As an Illinois lawmaker, Sen. Obama repeatedly denied legal protection to babies born alive after their abortions failed to kill them but he persists in falsifying his record. *National Review*, September 15, 2008, reports in its "The Week" section:

During his days in the Illinois state legislature, Barack Obama opposed bills to provide legal protection to infants who survive botched abortions. When one such bill came to a vote, he worried that it would expose abortionists to legal liability [better that newborns die than that abortionists get sanctioned], though in recent years he claimed that he opposed the bill only because it failed to indicate that it left abortion itself unregulated [better that newborns die than that abortion itself be regulated]. If it had included the same abortion-protective language as federal legislation on the subject, Obama says, he would have supported it. But it has now become impossible to deny that the Illinois bill had identical language. Obama has fallen back on the claim that the law was unnecessary, since infants already had legal protection. That isn't true either: The state attorney general had said that he could do nothing to help some infants who survived abortions. Obama has called his critics, chiefly those at the National Right to Life Committee, liars, though he has yet to identify anything they have gotten wrong ....

Barack Obama likes to remind us that he is a Harvard Law School graduate and was editor-in-chief of the *Harvard Law Review*. He also likes to remind us that he was a law school professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago. How likely is it that he would have repeatedly misunderstood the legal implications of the infanticide legislation on which he was voting? Integrity?

On August 19, 2008, *National Review* editor Rich Lowery ("Barack Obama, Abortion Extremist") again accused the candidate of lying about his abortion record. In addition to describing Sen. Obama's repeated misrepresentations of his support for infanticide, Mr. Lowery points out that Sen. Obama told Pastor Warren, at Saddleback's Civil Forum for the candidates, that he favors "limits on late-term abortions, if there is an exception for the mother's health." What he didn't say, however, is that the U.S. Supreme Court case titled *Doe v. Bolton* mandated that a woman's health must be defined to include such factors as

“physical, emotional, psychological, [and] familial [considerations], and the woman’s age – [which are] relevant to the wellbeing of the patient.” Sen. Obama knows that this dishonest decision made the “health exception” an infinitely massive loophole which deceitfully prevents the banning of ANY abortion, at any stage of pregnancy. He sought to trick Pastor Warren and he knowingly misled the church.

He also told Pastor Warren that “I’m absolutely convinced that there is a moral and ethical element to this [abortion] issue,” but Sen. Obama carefully avoided any mention of the fact that “In 2007, Obama told the Planned Parenthood Action Fund that the Freedom of Choice Act would be the first piece of legislation he would sign as president. The act would not only codify [enact into federal statutory law] *Roe v. Wade* but wipe out all current federal, state and local restrictions on abortion ... including ... prohibiting federal funding of abortion” (*National Review*, “Abortion Extremist,” August 19, 2008). This is trademark Obama double-speak: He skillfully uses his opponents, eloquently feigning sympathy for concerns for which he secretly has nothing but contempt. He tells us what we want to hear but he gives the culture of death what it wants to achieve.

Columnist Patrick Buchanan, writing for RealClearPolitics.com (October 28, 2008, “Obama’s First 100 Days”), says a new President Obama, with a totally Democrat-controlled Congress (and with a possibility of a sixty vote, veto-proof majority in the Senate) will appoint “Two or three more liberal [pro-abortion] activists of the Ruth Bader Ginsberg-John Paul Stevens stripe” to the U.S. Supreme Court and that “U.S. district and appellate courts will be stacked with [pro-abortion] ‘progressives.’” He says that “Universal health insurance will be enacted, covering legal and illegal immigrants ....” What he doesn’t predict but will certainly come true is that universal abortion coverage will be mandated for every female of any age who wants (or is coerced into) an abortion for any reason or for no reason at all. The abortions we aren’t forced to pay for with our tax dollars, we will be forced to pay for with our insurance premiums.

Thank you Ms. Richardson. Thank you Pastor Warren. By God’s grace, we intend to involve ourselves much more directly in the work of educating the church to avoid more botched elections. We will get back to both of you shortly.

Lord bless,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregg Cunningham', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Gregg Cunningham  
Executive Director

P.S. On November 8, a twenty-year-old man from Morley, MI, who had just seen our abortion photos, wrote to say: “Until now, I was a complacent bystander. I would never let my wife have an abortion but I wasn’t letting the world know the truth of this awful practice. I am now....” The next day a fifty-year-old woman from Corinth, TX, told us: “I have been far too complacent about opposing abortion.” They both used nearly the same words to tell us that our abortion pictures had shoved them from passive to active opposition to abortion. They both almost certainly worship at churches whose pastors oppose abortion passively but refuse to shock their congregations into action. The pastors know the price for creating an appropriate sense of outrage in the hearts of believers is disunity in the fellowship. But that disunity is no longer going to be avoidable. If the Lord wills, we will soon be traveling to the largest churches in America to respectfully teach from the sidewalk what is being disastrously suppressed from the pulpit.