

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

December 2010

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

On November 15, 2010, we received a message from a seventeen-year-old girl from Seattle, WA, who said our abortion photos had influenced her thinking about abortion “to the fullest.” She said, “I was considering abortion because I wasn’t sure if I wanted to bring someone into this world knowing I couldn’t take care of it like I always wished [and] then feel guilty. Now I look at ... [the pictures] and I would rather go on trying my best to ... [parent] than to live in full guilt of this situation. I’m keeping my baby. Thank you.”

She changed her mind because she saw the majesty of prenatal development *and* the horror of abortion. She saw that abortion is an *extreme* solution to the problem of crisis pregnancy and that carrying to term may be difficult but compared to abortion, it is an act of *moderation*. Most Americans reject her conclusion because they don’t know what she now knows. The political consequences of this ignorance are catastrophic.

Politico.com, November 13, 2010, carried a devastating abortion story titled “Abortion: Wave-stopper for Dems?” The article says that “While almost nothing went right for Democratic candidates this fall, one issue turned out to be a winner in some of the closest Senate races in the nation: abortion.” How? “By branding Republican challengers as *outside the cultural mainstream* on the issue, Democrats managed to hold on to at least a slice of the political center by courting and winning over moderate women in a handful of key states [emphasis added].” Pro-abortion Politico.com gleefully chortled that “Highly touted Republican Senate candidates ... found themselves on the wrong end of the issue”

Pro-abortion campaign ads hammered pro-life U.S. Senate candidates for being “too extreme” and for working to “turn back the clock” on abortion. They condemned pro-lifers for opposing abortion “even in cases of rape and incest” and for wanting “... to make criminals out of women who have abortions and the doctors who perform them.” No significant pro-life organization has ever wanted to lock up women but that inconvenient fact never inhibits the persistent propaganda that we do. In that same spirit, a direct mail attack smeared another pro-life candidate as “radical, wrong, extreme, out of touch, sexist.”

Planned Parenthood was also crowing at the millstone abortion has become around the necks of so many pro-life candidates. “Candidates’ positions on choice do serve a signaling function, in terms of the kind of person they are and if they are standing up for women or not,” said Deirdre Schifeling, political director of the Planned Parenthood Action Fund.” Defeated pro-life candidates were understandably demoralized. One lamented the role abortion played in his loss and said, “I don’t know that there is any way to avoid it”

But there is “a way to avoid it.” The pro-life position has only become “the wrong end of the issue” because the pro-life movement has made the colossal blunder of allowing elections to become referenda on “the right to choose” instead of “the right to life.” When “choice” is the issue, we lose. It is sacrilege to blaspheme “choice” in a culture which worships unfettered liberty as fervently as Druids revere pagan deities. Images of preborn children, depicted before *and* after abortions, are the only effective means of proving that killing a baby is an extreme act and that saving a baby is an act of moderation. Candidates can’t show those pictures. We must do it for them. If we don’t, our political hopefuls will lose winnable elections and each defeat will help drive the next generation of candidates away from the issue, convinced

that any expression of pro-life political conviction is suicidal. Voters who have never seen an abortion will continue to believe that the pro-aborts are the ones “standing up for women.” The pro-aborts get this.

Politico.com ran a November 19, 2010 story headlined “Anti-abortion groups lobby for Pitts,” which describes the fight to control a House subcommittee which writes abortion policy. It quotes NARAL Pro-Choice America, which carefully avoids any mention of abortion and instead frames the debate as vaguely as possible, referring only to “women’s health issues, including the health reform law and family planning.” Planned Parenthood was only slightly more transparent, referring to “...anti-choice extremists [who] are using women’s health as a political pawn”

The abortion industry tries to make abortion invisible because they know it is so horrific that they must keep it an abstraction, concealed from public view or even hearing. They won’t even say the word. That is why they are terrified every time we use photos to make abortion real. That is why it is so bizarre that so many pro-life organizations help them get away with this deception by hiding the very pictures the pro-aborts are trying to suppress. Too many pro-life leaders are far too desperate to be liked. They know that no one likes abortion pictures. But old-school pro-lifers seem to be the only reformers in the world who are still disoriented on the value of shocking pictures -- and the abortion industry delights in this pro-life confusion.

LATimes.com, November 11, 2010, published an article titled: “Cigarette labels -- people are talking about proposed graphic warnings. Cigarette labels are about to get more graphic” The article reported: “Americans seem fascinated by the proposed package images of corpses and cancer patients ... [b]ut the FDA's labels aren't nearly as gory as what appears on these cigarette warning labels from other countries.”

Canada has used graphic photo warnings on cigarette packages for ten years and is now studying the redesign of their disturbing photos. Suite101.com on November 10, 2010 reported regarding the Canadian review process that “Although many health advocates state that cigarette package warning labels are effective, there is also question as to how long they remain effective.” Some Canadian authorities believe that shocking photos must periodically be replaced to preserve their power to disturb.

The ugly picture trend is catching on. Postmedia News reported a story on November 15, 2010 titled “Canadian cigarette warnings are no longer the envy of the world” which says that “Since 2001, 39 countries have followed Canada’s lead and many have surpassed it with bigger and more graphic warnings.” Confirming this trend, *The European Journal of Public Health* published an article October 5, 2010 under the title “Showing leads to doing: Graphic cigarette warning labels are an effective public health policy.”

The transportation industry website Truckinginfo.com ran a disturbing image story November 17, 2010 called “LaHood Launches ‘Faces of Distracted Driving’ Campaign.” The U.S. Department of Transportation is now using shocking images of horrific traffic accidents caused by drivers distracted by texting, etc. Additionally, the *Los Angeles Times*, October 16, 2010, featured a story headlined “Traveling exhibit displays Nazis’ ‘Deadly Medicine.’” It reports that visitors to the educational presentation “can watch video of doctors testing how long it takes mental patients to die after inhaling tailpipe exhaust.”

Why are disturbing pictures increasingly the quickest means by which to simplify, summarize and communicate a complex, off-putting message? How about the fact that society isn’t as engaged, scholarly and honest as it used to be. Starting with simple reading skills, the *Christian Science Monitor* reported an article on February 6, 2007 headlined “Coming U.S. challenge: A less literate workforce.” On October 26, 2009, The History News Network reported “The appalling decline of literacy among college students.”

Then *The Orange County Register*, November 16, 2010, published a story titled “College readiness doubted” that says “Less than a third of high school teachers believe their students are ready for college

when they graduate” The article also reports that 73% of Orange County, CA, high school graduates entering the California State University system “did not demonstrate readiness for college English” In fact, “28% of high school graduates said they had to take one or more remedial courses in college.” Did the rest of these academic semi-literates just wing it? But integrity may be a bigger problem than literacy.

The *Los Angeles Times*, November 14, 2010, ran a story called “Students come forward in college cheating scandal.” At the University of South Florida, 200 students (in a class of 600) cheated on a business course exam. In exchange for admitting their guilt and agreeing to take an “ethics seminar” they will be allowed to complete the course. What does an “ethics seminar” teach? Cheating is unethical? Students were arrested for attempting to interfere with our first Genocide Awareness Project display at the University of South Florida. Cheating is now epidemic and confirms findings by pollster George Barna, who said in 2002 that “Americans are most likely to base truth on feelings” and that only “a minority of Americans believes in the existence of absolute moral truth,” with “less than one out of three born-again Christians adopt[ing] the notion of absolute moral truth.” Shocking pictures can influence feelings when words just bounce off.

Forced pictures, however, can also reach people who are spiritually confused and we have plenty of those. Albert Mohler, the president of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, wrote an article at albertmohler.com in 2005 titled “The scandal of biblical illiteracy: It’s our problem.” He cites Gallup for the proposition that America has “become a nation of biblical illiterates.” He says “Fewer than half of all adults can name the four gospels. Many Christians cannot identify more than two or three of the disciples.” He quotes Barna findings that “60 percent of Americans can’t name even five of the Ten Commandments.”

This may be the most alarming trend of all. The *Los Angeles Times*, October 17, 2010, ran an op-ed piece titled “Losing faith.” The sub-headline said “Young people are rejecting organized religion they see as too politically conservative.” The authors cite survey data finding that “... a majority of the Millennial generation was liberal on most social issues and above all on homosexuality.” Their study concluded that “The fraction of twenty-somethings who said homosexual relations were ‘always’ or ‘almost always’ wrong plummeted from about 75% in 1990 to about 40% in 2008.”

But the authors add that “Ironically, in polling, Millennials are actually more uneasy about abortion than their parents.” This increasingly pro-life orientation of young people would only seem “ironic,” however, to researchers who are unaware of the fact that CBR has spent the last twenty years forcing abortion photos into the fields of view of literally millions of middle school, high school and college students. Our riveting pictures cut right through this rising tide of illiteracy, inattention and moral relativism.

The best evidence of the importance of abortion pictures may be a July 16, 2010 article appearing in *The New American Magazine*. It reported a recent George Barna survey in an article titled “Americans Remain Split on Abortion Issue.” The story says “According to Barna, compared to its data from the 1990s and early 2000s, ‘the new research suggests that Americans are more likely these days to take a “middle ground” or “not sure” position toward abortion.’” CBR’s experience teaches that the surest way to convince ambivalent observers that there is no logical “middle ground” on baby-killing is to show them baby-killing – the very tactic most pro-life organizations so strenuously and disastrously oppose.

Not only do growing numbers of people struggle to read and discern right from wrong (education-portal cites a July 24, 2007 study reporting that 50% of American adults can’t read a book written at an eighth-grade level) but many can’t even pay attention. London’s *Daily Mail*, MailOnline.co.uk, carried a November 17, 2010 analysis of our declining ability to focus titled “Internet generation don’t have attention span for jury duty, warns Lord Chief Justice.”

This may help explain a story in *The New York Times*, November 8, 2010, headlined “Terror Verdict Tests Obama’s Strategy on Trials.” It said “The jury did not explain its verdict, which seemed contradictory: It convicted Mr. Ghailani of conspiring to blow up the buildings, but acquitted him of conspiring to murder the people inside the buildings.” No wonder they didn’t want to explain a verdict which suggests that a lack of analytical ability may be compounding a lack of juror focus. And no wonder Marketwire reported a story September 17, 2009 headlined “Shrinking Attention Spans Are Damaging Communication Skills.”

Worse yet, *The Washington Times* published an October 27, 2010 AP story headlined “TV commercials shrink to match attention spans.” Fryesite.com posted on the same story on the same day and reported that “Almost two decades ago advertisers recognized that the average person mentally tuned out about halfway into one-minute commercial ad spaces. Since that time the thirty-second ad time has ruled the industry. But recently advertisers are beginning to think that thirty seconds may even be too long for the average viewer.” The post also notes that “Fifteen-second ads now make up more than 34% of the overall television advertising industry.” A picture is more quickly understood and longer remembered than any narrative.

In 1858, local newspapers estimated that the series of seven Lincoln-Douglass debates, centering chiefly on slavery, drew crowds of between 12,000 and 20,000 people, with historians remarking that whole families traveled up to 80 miles (generally by horse and sometimes through inclement weather over mud-clogged roads) to listen to these three-hour exchanges. At Ottawa, IL, a crowd of 12,000 endured “sweltering heat.” In Freeport, IL, another 12,000 “stood shoulder to shoulder” with a “cold rain falling.” 19th Century Americans paid attention.

But today? Not so much. On November 19, 2010, Politico.com reported a story headlined “Poll: Most don’t know GOP won.” The article said that despite massive news coverage of mid-term elections which produced the largest change in government in six decades, “Only 46 percent of respondents in a Pew Research poll ... knew that the GOP had taken over only the House ...” Only 38% knew who the new speaker, third in line to the presidency, would be. Huge numbers of Americans have simply tuned out.

That is why we are so thankful for your help in simplifying and forcing life-saving truth into the heads of the swelling legions of lost souls who have trouble reading, paying attention and telling right from wrong.

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. Extremity is a time-sensitive construct. In *A History of the American People*, Johnson, Harper Perennial (1999) the author notes that in the 18th and 19th Centuries, Massachusetts was known as an “extremist” state for the stridence of its opposition to slavery. From the perspective of history, their “extremism” no longer seems quite so “far outside the mainstream.” History is just as likely to vindicate “anti-choice extremists” when considered from the viewpoint of a more humane and enlightened epoch.