

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

November 2010

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

On October 9, 2010, we received a note from a pregnant nineteen-year-old Canadian girl. She considered aborting her pregnancy -- until she saw our abortion pictures. She wrote to tell us “I don’t know if I want to do it anymore.” Once she saw the horrible truth she became far more accountable for her decision. Accountability for wrongdoing rises in direct proportion to one’s awareness of the relative rightness or wrongness of the competing alternatives. Sadly, we live in a time when a high percentage of people are trying hard to avoid any accountability for the wrongs they do.

That is why last week, five brave Canadian university students were arrested for attempting to display our large CBR abortion photo signs in a heavily trafficked commons area on the campus of Carleton University. They offered themselves for arrest primarily to facilitate a legal challenge to Canada’s free speech laws, which are scarcely more free than those of some Third World police states.

A \$20 gift would cover the daily maintenance expenses for a billboard truck of the sort we drive near colleges whose students need education on abortion. Please consider donating on a monthly basis.

It was completely predictable that Carleton’s abortion advocates would reflexively demand that the horror of abortion be kept out of sight. They well understand that abortion pictures offer irrefutable evidence that abortion is an indefensible act of violence which kills a discernibly human baby – even very early in pregnancy. Among themselves, abortion defenders no longer debate the anti-abortion influence of these pictures. Strangely, however, many anti-abortion activists do. Here is why fretful abortion supporters are right to be afraid -- and dubious abortion opponents are wrong to be skeptical.

Something we have noted in the past on this subject merits repeating: On January 22, 2008, the *Los Angeles Times* published an opinion piece titled “Abortion’s battle of messages.” It was co-authored by Frances Kissling and Kate Michelman, two of the abortion industry’s best known and most strident proponents of “reproductive choice.” They admitted that “Advocates of choice have had a hard time dealing with the increased visibility of the fetus.” Ms. Michelman and Ms. Kissling added that “In recent years, the antiabortion movement [meaning CBR] successfully put the nitty-gritty details [meaning pictures] of abortion procedures on public display, increasing the belief that abortion is serious business and that some societal involvement is appropriate.”

Five years after CBR’s 1998 launch of our campus photo project, the world’s first large-scale pro-life outreach to college students, the *New York Times*, in their March 30, 2003 issue, reported a remarkable pro-life shift in student opinion on abortion. The article was headlined “Surprise Mom: I’m Anti-Abortion,” and it described “... a trend noted in polls: [T]hat teenagers and college-age Americans are more conservative about abortion rights than their counterparts were a generation ago.”

The numbers were striking and the article reported that the “... most commonly cited reason for the increasingly conservative views of young people is their receptiveness to the way anti-abortion campaigners have reframed the national debate on the contentious topic, shifting the emphasis from a woman’s rights to the rights of the fetus [emphasis added].” CBR’s abortion photos were the only

nationwide strategy which existed to focus students on the fetus during that period or since. Our pictures have now been seen by millions of students during hundreds of campus visits, with many schools receiving multiple visits over the years. The measurable change in student opinion has been extraordinary.

The president of the pro-life student organization at the University of California, Berkeley, for instance, said our CBR abortion photo project was "...the most high impact pro-life event our university has ever seen." The president of the pro-life student group at the University of New Hampshire said the pictures were "...the most effective pro-life project that any pro-life club can bring to their school." This is why abortion advocates refuse to debate us unless we agree to forego the use of pictures. It is why abortion advocates attempt to block the view of passersby almost everywhere we display abortion photos.

Most voters doubt that the human embryo and early fetus are developmentally entitled to rights of personhood. Nor do they believe that abortion is an evil of sufficient enormity to justify criminalizing the act, particularly during the first trimester (the phase of pregnancy during which 90% of abortions are committed). Many see it as the "lesser of two evils." And because our culture reveres "choice," the prevailing public sentiment is that nominal evils are private matters, best left to personal discretion. Society believes that government should restrict personal choice only when the behavior sought to be limited involves enormous evil. But because so many abortion opponents have conspired with so many abortion advocates to hide the horror of abortion, almost no one has any idea how evil abortion actually is.

A \$120 gift would cover the daily fuel expenses for the billboard trucks we drive to educate voters who have been lied to by teachers & reporters covering up the horror of abortion. We need help every month.

Typical of the pro-life impulse to sweep the inexpressible evil of abortion under the carpet are the *non sequiturs* of John Haas, the president of The National Catholic Bioethics Center (U.S.). The *Post* quoted Dr. Haas as arguing that displaying abortion photos is as unhelpful as posting imagery of terrorists beheading *Wall Street Journal* reporter Daniel Pearl. This is a sadly silly argument. No one needs to see Daniel Pearl's severed head to be persuaded that laws which prohibit the severing of journalists' heads are desirable -- but half of all Americans (and half of all professing Catholics) think severing a preborn child's head should be legal. Our experience with abortion photos suggests that most would change their minds if they were forced to look at a preborn child's severed head. Precious few of the 50% of Catholics who "oppose" abortion are doing anything about it -- and most who are think the thing to do is to cover it up.

He also says that abortion photos communicate disrespect for butchered babies. But these pictures save lives. A pregnant woman recently told us after seeing our pictures that "I ... supported abortion. I am ten weeks' pregnant. In the beginning I thought about getting an abortion but after seeing this I have changed my mind and I am now very much against abortion." She is answering Tony Kerr, advertising program chair at the Ontario College of Art and Design in Toronto, whom the *Post* quotes as asserting that "The display of graphic photos is likely not going to do anything of any lasting value" I would counter that the life of this woman's baby has inestimable "lasting value" and that we see pictures change minds in this way nearly every day.

Does Dr. Haas really believe that our duty to show respect for the dead transcends our duty to rescue the living? Many mothers tell us that nothing less shocking than these photos would have sufficed to dissuade them from killing their babies. His argument is with them, not with us. The idea that it is immoral to use pictures of injustice to conquer injustice would have sounded odd indeed to the many reformers who used shocking pictures successfully to influence public opinion concerning slavery, child labor, civil rights, the Holocaust, etc.

Many of Dr. Haas' conclusions seem to be based on misunderstandings of fact and none more so than his mistaken belief that abortion photos tend "... to become commonplace and not really have the shock value

you want” If Dr. Haas had our substantial professional experience with the public display of abortion photos, he would immediately see how wrong he is.

He is also wrong about the public consciousness being in danger of becoming saturated with these images. Had abortion images lost their emotional impact, the university community at Carleton would certainly not have panicked at the prospect of their display on this campus. They would have simply yawned.

An article in Canada’s *National Post* newspaper, July 30, 2010, makes this point under the headline “Is one woman’s 16-year protest a case of harassment or free speech?” The story describes the long prison terms served by pro-life activist Linda Gibbons who went repeatedly to an abortion clinic and “... held up a sign that showed a drawing of a baby that read: ‘Why Mom, when I have so much life to give?’” Her mere presence with a totally inoffensive drawing drove the clinic director crazy. “What people like her do is creepy,” says Celia Posyniak, an abortion clinic director in Calgary. “They don’t even have to say anything. It’s intimidating just to have someone standing there.” She adds, “I still remember the day they (the pro-life picketers) were kicked off our driveway. It was like a black cloud had lifted and I felt like a free person.”

Killing babies isn’t “creepy”? This director not only demands the right to kill babies but the right to do so without being made to feel guilty. “Why should they have to put up with that? And why should the staff have to put up with someone standing there mumbling at them?” said Ms. Posyniak. “Most people can’t imagine what that’s like. But I’ll tell you, it’s not a nice feeling.” God bless pro-life activists who evoke “not nice feelings” in the black hearts of these evil-doers! But in Canada, it’s the activists instead of the evil-doers who go to jail.

[A gift of \\$165 would buy one large hand-held sign of the size we display outside retail businesses which donate to Planned Parenthood. Please help us fight corporate support for abortion on a monthly basis.](#)

Don’t allow yourself to become puffed up with patriotic pride, however, over the mistaken belief that America is consistently better than Canada on freedom of speech. LifeSiteNews.com reported October 19, 2010 that the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit will allow pro-life activists to sue the Maryland State Police officers who arrested them for displaying CBR’s abortion photo signs along a public street. Many of the pro-life activists were teenagers, and the group included three young women reportedly “shackled, strip-searched and detained overnight.” That makes **Canada** seem more like Communist China!

And in fact, *The New York Times*, Sept. 9, 2010, reported a related story headlined “A Chinese advocate is freed, but stays under surveillance.” The article reports that lawyer Chen Guangcheng was released from four years of imprisonment for the crime of exposing the government’s use of forced abortion and sterilizations to enforce its one-child policy. After reportedly being periodically beaten in prison, Mr. Guangcheng was transferred to serve a tightly guarded sentence of house arrest so “...that he should not be able to cause embarrassment to China for his work” *The Christian Science Monitor*, on the same date, also reported a story on Mr. Guangcheng’s mistreatment but added that many other lawyers who had worked to expose China’s human rights abuses had lost their jobs, their licenses to practice law and been arrested or just disappeared. Those who are complicit in baby-killing often try hard to sweep the evidence under the carpet.

Such “sweeping” was prominently featured in an October 19, 2010, story in the *Los Angeles Times*, which reported that “L.A. County child abuse deaths rising.” The article says “More children have died in each of the last two years from abuse and neglect despite assurances that the problem was getting better.” The county’s Office of Independent Review “... found that the [children’s services] department inappropriately hid dozens of [abuse] cases from public view.” The department director repeatedly declined to be interviewed but reporters found evidence that her agency tried to save money by allowing endangered

children to remain in the custody of abusive parents because putting them in foster care was expensive. No wonder the department tried to cover up its responsibility for the murders of these children.

The same issue of the same newspaper reported another baby-killing cover-up story whose second headline read “Israel tries to head off shifting demographics.” It described Israeli attempts to negotiate Palestinian acceptance of Israel as an explicitly Jewish state and detailed proposed changes in Israeli immigration law intended to avoid Arab citizens of Israel ever becoming a voting majority. But the article carefully covered up the fact that Israel’s abortion rate (approximately 25,000 per year in a very small country) is a major reason the Israeli Arab population is growing so rapidly that Jews are in danger of becoming a minority in Israel. Lots of people are implicated in the deaths of babies but almost no one wants to talk about it, so reporters frequently help officials suppress the evidence.

A \$375 gift covers one hour of aerial billboards flying over the stadiums of the pro football teams which support Planned Parenthood (Dallas & Jacksonville). Monthly support makes complex projects possible.

Some in our government are just as dishonest as Israeli leaders when it comes to acknowledging responsibility for abortion. The Madison Center for Free Speech reported October 19, 2010 that pro-abortion Democrat Ohio Rep. Steve Driehaus has filed a complaint with the Ohio Elections Commission, alleging that the pro-life Susan B. Anthony List violated two Ohio laws against making false statements about candidates. Mr. Driehaus, who is about to be voted out of Congress, is complaining about pro-life attempts to erect billboards telling Ohio voters that he “voted in favor of taxpayer funded abortion.” In fact, Mr. Driehaus did vote for ObamaCare, and ObamaCare does use accounting tricks to hide the use of taxpayer dollars for abortion services. Now Mr. Driehaus is trying to cover up that fact to avoid voter accountability. We also drove our pro-life billboard trucks in Mr. Driehaus’ district to inform voters about this congressman and the ObamaCare vote and are increasingly glad we did.

We thank God for your willingness to help us push back against these powerful efforts to lie about abortion and make the issue go away. With the help of God and our faithful donors, this issue isn’t going to go away because we aren’t going to allow that. So as we near the end of the year, please pray about a special gift to help us keep abortion front and center despite our alarming revenue losses in this terrible economy.

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. October 18, 2010, a twenty-four-year-old woman (no hometown given) wrote to say: “I just had an abortion on 10/15/10. I didn't feel right about it. I gave into societal pressures due to being an unwed mother and college student. I wish I would've found this website before aborting my 9-week, 5-day fetus. I will live with regret for the rest of my life.” This tragedy would be repeated more often if CBR ever disappeared.