

With 60,000 students, The Ohio State University is huge; but huge is just the right size for the giant, gut-wrenching pictures which are the Genocide Awareness Project (GAP). So for five straight days the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR) recently deployed its photo murals to make abortion an unavoidable issue for way more Ohio State students than attend the university's vaunted football games!

The Ohio State Lantern, Monday, October 26, 1998 ran a lead editorial entitled, "Our View, BCS formula spurs debate for playoffs:"

Unthinkable. Impossible. Insulting. No, we're not ranting and raving about the Genocide Awareness Project We're in disbelief over the possibility Ohio State's football team could go undefeated, convincingly destroy all opponents, go wire-to-wire as No.1 in both major polls, and still miss out on the Jan. 4 national championship game.

It is a measure of CBR's impact on the university that even the editors of its football-obsessed student newspaper couldn't discuss their sacred season without mentioning GAP. This was only one example of abortion's dominance of news and commentary during the week of CBR's visit. **OUR PURPOSE AT OSU** Our objective in erecting this out-door anthropological exhibit was to encourage comparison of abortion photos with photos of more widely recognized forms of genocide and thereby dramatize the parallels. Abortion is not only the greatest injustice of our time, it is the least understood and most ignored. We want people to see abortion from the baby's perspective - not just the mother's. We want to force a serious debate on this mass murder which many will commit but few will discuss. Our target audience is students who demand "choice" but refuse to acknowledge what's being "chosen." Intellectual dishonesty has made abortion a topical taboo. "Reproductive freedom"

has become an "article of faith." To question is heresy which invites instant anathematization as an "anti-choice extremist." Peer pressure has rendered "pregnancy termination" a settled issue. But truth be known, the issue isn't nearly as "settled" as "The Pagan Left" would have "The Religious Right" believe. And we were about to prove it in a most "unsettling" way; by forcibly unmasking this "choice," whose name America dares not whisper. In fact, by the end of the week, nearly everyone at Ohio State would be talking about abortion - whether they wanted to or not. And lives would be saved because the discussion, though compelled, was occurring on *our* terms - no more pretending the baby isn't really a baby, no more denial that abortion is an act of violence. Here is an excerpt from a student E-mail that describes GAP's power to stop the fraud:

At the time when the GAP was on the Ohio State University campus (Columbus) this ... [student] was not physically showing any signs of pregnancy even though she was pregnant She had made up her mind to have an abortion the same week that GAP was visiting the campus. When the project was on the Oval, she had decided not to go near the display because she knew what it was about and she didn't want anything to distract her from going through with the abortion. She figured that if she stayed away from the display then it wouldn't affect her. Little did she know that the display would be moved all around campus. One day when she was leaving her job, what does she see RIGHT SMACK IN FRONT OF THE BUILDING SHE WORKS IN It was none other than the GAP display. She decided to take a look at the pictures and talk with the volunteers. That day she decided not to have an abortion. Thank the Lord.

Saving this baby and the many others about whom we will never hear, required perseverance in the face of enormous

hostility. The following vignettes illustrate just how hostile Ohio State's culture has become where abortion truth is concerned.

CULTURAL HOSTILITY The campus newspaper (*The Lantern*) routinely publishes prominent ads for the Northwest Women's Center, advertising "Early Term Abortions" which promise to be "Caring" and "Confidential." The proprietors assert that "We Believe The Choice Is Yours." The tragedy of genocide is that everyone gets a "choice" but the victim. But as if to fulfill Biblical prophecy (Isaiah 5:20), while this ad was calling "evil" "good," another section of the paper was calling "good" "evil." *Lantern* columnist Robert Nekervis penned the following drivel on Friday, October 23, 1998:

Millions have bought the myth that ... [Mother Teresa] was a benevolent humanitarian. In reality, the neurotic little woman from Yugoslavia ... was a hideous monster. She was an unprincipled thief who contributed to the world's suffering in the name of her delusional mysticism. In short, she was a disgusting human and the world is a better place with her absence.

What, according to Mr. Nekervis, were some of Mother Teresa's more "monstrous" offenses? Well, he says she eased the suffering of poor sick people by accepting financial contributions from savings and loan magnate Charles Keating, a man who was convicted of financial misconduct. But when storied evangelist Dwight L. Moody was criticized for accepting contributions from mobster Al Capone, he defended his decision by saying "I just decided that Satan had had that money long enough!" Mr. Nekervis is also scandalized that Mother Teresa opposed artificial birth control and encouraged the sick to look for meaning in their suffering. How about those for "crimes against

humanity?" Mr. Nekervis doesn't seem to realize that our marvelous Mother Teresa didn't invent Catholicism, she merely lived it. But it gets even weirder. A far-left Ohio State fringe group which misleadingly styles itself The Feminist Majority (whose tiny group protested our presence) recently won the Intercollegiate Studies Institute's "Campus Outrage Award" for "extreme acts of political correctness and outrageous attempts at thought control." When a political cartoonist for the student newspaper satirized the women's studies program, members of this feminist organization protested by attempting to burn their bras on the porch outside his door. But unlike the foundation garments torched by feminists of yore, modern Maidenforms are manufactured from flame retardant fabric. The term "*bra-scorching* feminists" may lack the punch of their mother's more fearsome "*bra-burning*" nom de guerre but *The Washington Times National Weekly Edition*, April 19-25, 1999, reported that one of the cartoonist's supporters did get punched in the face "after a confrontation with the Feminist Majority's president" In addition to 15,000 copies of the offending edition of the newspaper being stolen and presumably destroyed by unknown enemies of both the brassiere and The First Amendment, the student cartoonist was (*surprise!*) fired. **UNIVERSITY OPPOSITION** In their defense, these impressionable ladies were merely following the example of Ohio State's administration. During our pre-visit negotiations with university administrators, the school's Office of General Counsel made the peculiar legal argument that CBR could not express its point of view on this *public* campus without first being *invited* to do so by the university community. Steven J. McDonald, Associate Legal Counsel for Ohio State said in a letter to CBR, dated October 12, 1998: "To the extent that our campus is a 'forum' at all, it is a forum only for that which we and the members of our community wish to say, hear, and study, not for that which others may believe

we should hear." "Others?" Attorney McDonald obviously thinks Ohio State is his private club instead of everyone's public university. But we obviated the necessity of proving him wrong in court when we secured the "invitation" of five student organizations (End Time Ministries, The Navigators, Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, New Life Christian Students and The College Republican Club). These invitations were secured and our visit coordinated by the tremendously effective work of Mark Harrington, the director of our Mid-west offices in Columbus, Ohio.

On Tuesday, October 20, 1998, *The Lantern* quoted Eric Busch, assistant vice president of Student Affairs, expressing a different attitude toward CBR (at least for public consumption):

'OSU allowed ... [CBR] to come to campus because it does not discriminate but the university stands as non-partisan.' [CBR note: "Allowed" us? They couldn't stop us! This disingenuous claim of accommodation is belied by the fact that the administration initially attempted to ban GAP by invoking a long ignored university prohibition against the display of large signs. We responded with a threat to place our GAP panels on the sides of rental trucks and drive them all over campus, all day long. We also promised a law suit. They quickly backed down. But the administration reportedly pressured the advisor of the only student group then sponsoring us to withdraw its invitation.] 'This university stands for free speech but is not endorsing these troubling images,' Busch said.

Thank heaven Mr. Busch can still be "troubled" by images of this sort (though he seemed far more "troubled" that the pictures were being displayed than that the babies were being killed). But Mr. McDonald's urge to stifle dissent betrays a thinly disguised hostility toward freedom of

expression (of non-liberal ideas) that runs deep in academe. *The Lantern*, Monday, October 19, for instance, rightly decried the heckling of way-right knuckleheads who disrupted the Wyoming funeral of murdered homosexual student Matthew Shepard. But then the editors' totalitarian inclinations got the best of them. The paper argued that the occurrence ". . . was one of those incidents in which many Americans secretly wish there were a clause in the Bill of Rights that revoked the right of protest to people who are such idiots." Sadly, large numbers of collegians (and their censorious mentors) think anyone who disputes conventional leftist "wisdom" is "an idiot" who thereby forfeits all rights, constitutional or otherwise. In an atmosphere poisoned by the infantile notion that "personal feelings" trump "constitutional rights," objective dialogue becomes nearly impossible. And hysterical fear of open discussion is nowhere more evident than among shock troops of pro-abortion hard-core. **PRO-ABORT OPPOSITION** In a letter dated October 12, 1998, Aly Terrell, State Organizer, NARRAL Ohio (National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League) declined an invitation to participate in a campus abortion debate with the following retort: "I am writing to inform you that I am not willing to participate in a debate with Gregg Cunningham. The extremist and violent nature of the rhetoric used by Mr. Cunningham and the organization he represents is inappropriate and offensive." She said "rhetoric" but she meant pictures. Ms. Terrell apparently doesn't think it is "extreme," "violent," "inappropriate," or "offensive" to torture babies to death, just to display pictures of babies who have been tortured to death. In this latter respect she sounds eerily like the majority of "pro-life" leaders. (Most contemporary pro-life leaders are "pro-life moderates" who condemn the use of abortion pictures - even in crisis pregnancy counseling - because they don't know how to use them and/or, they fear the persecution invited by

their effective use). Pro-aborts have for years made abortion debates impossible by simply refusing to participate. But the advent of GAP *guarantees* that there will be a debate - *and* that it will be well informed. There is no longer anything Ms. Terrell or her fellow travelers can do to stop it. Although the response of most Ohio State students was both civil and cerebral, a belligerent minority tried unsuccessfully to disrupt our presentation at every turn. It soon became clear that abortion advocates still don't understand the implications of "police scanner" journalism. Pro-abort violence will *never* drive us from *any* campus (we inform the administration that pro-abort assaults may actually *lengthen* our stay) but conflict draws the press like flies (especially where cops are involved) and the more fiercely the pro-aborts oppose our presence, the more attention they inadvertently focus on our message. We could not have had so many excellent discussions with so many students had the antics of these pro-aborts not helped us draw large crowds every day. GAP is like a leg-hold trap; the harder you struggle, the deeper the steel jaws sink their teeth. If the pro-aborts ever demand compensation for their raucous attacks, we will cheerfully pay.

At Ohio State, our would-be tormentors consisted chiefly of non-students, self-styled lesbians and loony-left day-trippers who car-pooled in from another campus (planet?). This was a group which obviously had little experience defending their muddled beliefs. The academic community is so liberal and so isolated, that their biases had probably never been seriously challenged. At any rate, they showed a great deal more passion than mastery of fact or argument. So like children, they threw tantrums. *The Ohio State Lantern*, Friday, October 23, 1998, carried a story describing their agitation: Headline; "Student arrested in failed attack on abortion display."

University police arrested an unidentified female student Thursday for criminal mischief after she allegedly charged the Genocide Awareness Project display with a knife, apparently trying to slash the controversial images. Although a campus police dispatcher confirmed the arrest, she did not provide details of the incident.

* * *

Cunningham said that a group of about 40 people approached the display and divided into several groups. While one group distracted the only police officer on duty, the second group charged another side of the display, he said.

* * *

The unidentified woman moved through the crowd and pulled out a knife, attempting to cut one of the display signs, Cunningham said. 'It took 20-30 minutes for campus police to regain control. Eight to 10 officers tried to restore order.' Once the incident began, the first officer quickly called for back-up, he said. 'The police acted swiftly and did a good job,' Cunningham said. The entire incident was caught on video tape and still photos were taken. 'We got everyone involved on tape,' Cunningham said, adding that he will send members of the Center back to Ohio to file charges. 'We will make an example out of lawbreakers.' When asked if the Center was worried about security if no police were present, Cunningham said the Center prefers that the police handle the situation, but they have their own security measures when necessary. Cunningham would not elaborate on those measures. Although much commotion happened during the afternoon, the Center still had its open debate at 8 p.m. The

debate attracted over 70 people and the audience was forced to move from Hitchcock Hall to a larger classroom in Boltz Hall. Unlike the incident hours before, the debate between Cunningham and audience members was calm. Two videos were shown. The first showed pictures of an embryo from the seventh week until the tenth week. The second video graphically pictured aborted fetuses. Comments during the debate questioned the legitimacy of the Genocide Awareness Project *and allowed for intelligent conversation* [emphasis added].

It should come as no surprise that those who advocate violence as a means by which to dispose of inconvenient pregnancy, might also use it against inconvenient truth-tellers. A follow-up story declared CBR's refusal to tolerate this sort of thuggery. *The Lantern*, Thursday, October 29, 1998, published the following account:

The organizers of the Genocide Awareness Project plan to file charges against an alleged vandalism attempt last Thursday of its controversial posters comparing abortion to lynchings and the Holocaust. 'People who decide to be violent need to be held accountable,' said David William Lee, director of operations at the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform, the group that organized the project. University Police said about 30 people rushed through the yellow tape that surrounded the display. [CBR note: The university initially and naively refused our request for steel crowd-control barricades and several police officers. This decision was eventually reversed when it became obvious that the absence of fencing and adequate police presence was encouraging predictable violence by angry pro-aborts. WE NEVER ENCOUNTER SIGNIFICANT VIOLENCE WHERE WE ARE GRANTED STEEL BARRICADES AND ENOUGH UNIFORMED POLICE TO DETER MISCONDUCT.] Police

have a photograph of a woman who allegedly tried to vandalize the display, OSU Police Chief Ron Michalec said. The woman, identified only as Lisa, was grabbed by OSU officer Bruce Anderson as she ran away from the display. Anderson noticed an individual who was pointing at her and yelling, 'She's got a knife,' police said. A small Swiss Army knife was found folded in her pocket... Anderson also restrained Patricia A. Sikora, 21, from Polk, Ohio, after seeing her hit the display with her fists.

* * *

'I pounded on the display,' Sikora said, 'it was my way of expressing my rage.'

We will press charges against both students but as an excerpt from the following E-mail (to CBR from Melody Shaw, a Dayton Right to Life volunteer) explains, we treat even petulant students with patience. "... [A]fter listening to you speak with the 'pro-choice clown' at OSU who was yelling in your face ... I ... saw how great and compassionate your heart is [see accompanying photo]." **PRO-ABORT COVER-UP** When the neo-fascists failed to destroy the evidence, they took up the cause of "pro-life moderates" and tried to cover the evidence up. *The Ohio State Lantern*, Monday, October 26, 1998, explained:

[Headline:] Dozens of protesters block abortion display. Added police presence felt at non-violent scene on south Oval. The most organized protest against the anti-abortion Genocide Awareness Project on Ohio State's campus occurred Friday on the south Oval. The project consists of posters juxtaposing graphic images of the Holocaust, racial violence and aborted fetuses. The protesters, who carried signs and numbered about 35, formed a line with their

bodies *in an attempt to block as much of the display from view as possible* about 11:15 a.m.

[emphasis added - CBR note: The best test of GAP's effectiveness is that panicked pro-aborts also tried to cover the display with their coats at Penn State and tried to knock it down (by hand and by crashing a car into the exhibit) at the University of Kansas. When is the last time pro-aborts physically attacked a pro-life literature table in some student union? They ignore our presence when our medium (anemic brochures) encourages passers-by to ignore our message (abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby). They go mental when our medium (giant abortion pictures) makes it *impossible* to ignore that message. If the pro-aborts have figured out what saves babies, why don't we get it?] Various members of the group led protest chants with a bullhorn until noon, when someone from the crowd announced that they would have to quit using the bullhorn because it was disrupting classes being held in nearby buildings. The group continued chanting until about 12:30 p.m., when a break was taken and the bulk of the protesters left. [CBR note: As usual, it was pro-abort students and not pro-lifers who disrupted classes and turned violent.] The number of police assigned to monitor the project increased after an incident Thursday in which a group of protesters charged the display. One of the protesters - a woman suspected of planning to slash the display with a knife - was arrested. OSU police Capt. John Petry, who was in charge at the scene, would not comment on the numbers of police present or their tactics and contingency plans. But an informal count showed at least eight police officers present, up one from the day before.

* * *

Though the project is an anti-abortion display, it drew a wide variety of protesters, for a wide variety of reasons. According to Michelle Montagno, a senior at OSU and a member of Feminist Majority [a.k.a. the "bra-scorchers"], the protesters present on Friday drew their numbers from Anti-Racist Action, Students for Choice, the Association of Women Students, Hillel, and others, as well as individuals. A significant portion of the protesters were there to protest what they called a misuse of racist images in the project's posters. 'We know and they know that the people who are high up in the pro-life movement are not people of color.' said Zakiyyah Sabir, a protester, referring to the blacks who were part of the [GAP] project. 'They're white Christian males and they are pulling the puppet strings for these people.' At least some of the blacks on the ... [CBR] side of the police barricade ... disagreed. 'I came here because I thought that this was one of the greatest opportunities to expose the truth, or to give women a real choice, to see what really happens in abortion. Nobody pays me to do this, nobody exploits me, nobody uses me in any form,' said Emma Sanders, founder of Black Americans for Life. In addition to accusations of racism, protesters also alleged that the project secretly served as a mouth-piece of the 'religious right,' or at the very least, mixed religion in where it didn't belong. 'We've watched their funding, we've tracked who gets these people to speak,' said Jerry Bellow, a protester and member of Anti-Racist Action. 'These people are entirely a project that was brought together by coalition of hard-right, fundamentalist groups. Right to Life, Christian Coalition, Operation Rescue, all came together to bring [this] out. This is just another campaign of this large, interlocking network of religious fanatics bent on remaking America in the image of their very narrow ideology.'

Our sponsorship by four, small student ministry groups and

the beleaguered, campus Republican Club hardly qualify as Mrs. Rodham Clinton's "vast right-wing conspiracy." How ironic that a racist group, laughably calling itself "Anti-Racist Action," lamely tries to change the subject by shouting crude racial slurs at African American pro-life activists whom they patronize as "having been manipulated by white people." A black faculty member parroted this same mean-spirited bigotry as he scurried past the exhibit, lacking the integrity to even discuss the issue with black members of our staff. The difference between education and indoctrination is that the former invites healthy heterodoxy but the latter demands rigid orthodoxy. Venerating multiculturalism while punishing philosophical pluralism is cynical, hypocritical and unworthy of a great university.

In any event, students were left to wonder how it could be "racist" for CBR's black and Jewish staff to compare violence against the unborn with violence against their own black and Jewish peoples? Then "The Heathen Left" invoked the ultimate boogiemanager, by attempting to link us to "The Religious Right." Never mind that The National Right to Life Committee is staffed by well-intentioned "pro-life moderates" who disfavor projects of this sort. Never mind that we have never even met the leadership of the Christian Coalition (whose influence is waning with IRS denial of tax-exempt status). And never mind that Operation Rescue (though we love the spirit of Rescue and Rescuers) has never been involved in *any* GAP presentation. "Watched our funding" indeed. If the mainstream organizations of the "Religious Right" ever offered more than token opposition to social evil, we would faint dead away. But the facts hardly matter to pro-aborts desperate to dance away from the real issue.

ABORTION IS GENOCIDE

Thanks to GAP, however, avoiding that issue is now harder

than ignoring a train wreck in your bathroom. *The Columbus Dispatch*, in its Tuesday, October 20, 1998, confirms this thesis with a story headlined: "Anti-abortion display meant to shock" with a subhead reading "Genocide awareness group puts banners on OSU campus."

With a pre-calculus midterm on her mind, Heather Crawford wasn't receptive to shock-value visual images displayed at Ohio State University yesterday.

* * *

'I don't really agree with the tactic of using the KKK and the Holocaust. I don't see how it impacts abortion,' said Crawford, a freshman from Findlay, Ohio. 'The display isn't expected to change the views of anyone whose mind has been made up,' Cunningham said, 'but to encourage the undecided to consider the position that abortion represents a devaluation of life.'

* * *

The display gets the point across, said Jessica Evans, 18, who is anti-abortion. The freshman from Yorkville, Ohio, looked away when she saw the photos. The banners gave Scott Gallagher reason to briefly re-examine his stance on the volatile issue. 'It's disgusting; it's upsetting.'

* * *

Representatives from the Hillel Foundation oppose the use of Holocaust imagery in the contest of abortion protest. 'Using the image of the Holocaust and victims of the Holocaust is offensive to the Jewish people and to survivors,' Hillel Executive Director Joseph Kohane said. 'Using one people's disaster, one of the most painful in history, for political ends betrays the lack of belief that their own cause

can carry them.'

Perhaps Mr. Kohane doesn't know that Martin Luther King also invoked the imagery of the Jewish Holocaust because in the darkest days of the struggle for civil rights, he too "lacked a belief that his own cause could carry him." It would have been narcissistic for victims of the Jewish "disaster" to which Mr. Kohane refers to deny Dr. King's comparison and selfishly appropriate this imagery for the exclusive benefit of their "one people." It would be just as narcissistic to deny the right of pro-life advocates to draw the same comparison.

Holocaust remembrance activists use these pictures to ensure that no one will forget the evil of Jewish suffering; we use them to ensure that no one will forget that abortion suffering is just as evil. They urge universal acceptance of responsibility for achieving "the political end" that a Holocaust can "never again" victimize their people. CBR agrees that everyone should protect; but we also believe that everyone should be protected. Paradoxically, survivors of one genocide are helping perpetrate another, both here and abroad. Jewish Rabbi Jacob Neusner asserts just this comparison of Holocaust genocide with abortion genocide. He is a professor of religion at the University of South Florida, Tampa and Bard College, New York. While GAP was on display at Ohio State, he published an article containing the following excerpts in the October 26, 1998, issue of *Christianity Today*:

... [H]ow is mass abortion in the State of Israel such as is practiced by the secular (but not the religious) portion of the Israeli population not comparable to mass murder of Jewish Children in German Europe?

* * *

As the numbers mount up, when do considerations of volume enter in and validate calling the annihilation of millions of lives "a Holocaust?" I think they do. Here is a Holocaust today. Every Jewish child born in the State of Israel is a survivor of the Holocaust sustained by Israeli law.

* * *

The difference is, Germany has acknowledged its shame. But for the annual annihilation of tens of thousands of Jewish children, the State of Israel acknowledges nothing.

Nor does the United States of America. That was clear from the comments of some (but not all) of the students quoted in *The Lantern*, Tuesday, October 20, 1998:

[Headline] Graphic images spark abortion debate [Sidebar headlined] Contention, discourse follow abortion display at other schools Vivid signs comparing abortion to the Holocaust and the lynching of blacks caused heated discussions Monday between passers-by and members of the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform on the Oval. 'Abortion is genocide,' said Gregg Cunningham, director 'We want to get these images into students' heads now so that the images will come to their minds later.'

* * *

Allie Berson from the Holocaust Awareness Council at the Hillel Foundation was also on the Oval passing out protest flyers and talking with students. 'I find it extremely offensive that (the Genocide Awareness Project) is using atrocities from the Holocaust for political debate against abortion,' said Berson, a junior majoring in interior merchandising. 'There has to be a better way for them to get their point across,' Berson said. The Holocaust Awareness Council was just

one organization that opposed the display. Elyse Latella, who protested with other members of the Feminist Majority Alliance, dressed in black and held a sign which read 'Satanists for Life.' 'The signs were a radical way of mocking the Genocide Awareness Project,' said Latella, a senior majoring in women's studies. 'Our organization takes a pro-choice stance and is specifically geared toward this group because their tactics correlating abortion and genocide are wrong,' Latella said.

Last Wednesday, the Center [CBR] facilitated a program at the Hale Black Cultural Center to explain to [black] student leaders that these images aren't meant to be racist, [Joseph Gilkes, president of End Time Ministries, a sponsoring organization] ... said. [CBR note: We took this invaluable opportunity to show pre-natal development and abortion videos which will be remembered long after our words are forgotten.] But that still did not convince all members that the project's imagery is acceptable. 'I think that this project is more of a shock treatment and sensationalism because abortion affects everyone, not just African-American,' said Lawrence Williamson, director of the Hale Center. 'I am not in favor of what they are trying to achieve with their shock treatment.' Jeff Capell, president of the OSU College Republicans, said this is an excellent event to start a campus debate about abortion. 'It's really no worse than what you find in a history book or a network prime time TV show,' Capell said. 'An honest picture of a brutal event is going to be graphic and if you want to be honest about it, you can't sugar coat,' he said. [CBR note: Because Jeff's College Republican club was one of those co-sponsoring groups, he E-mailed us to say that a small faction of his membership tried to impeach him as a result of CBR's visit to OSU. He adds, however, that 'we easily beat them back' Jeff is our kind of guy and someone from whom you will no doubt

be hearing more.] 'I passed a woman who was actually weeping. I felt like doing it too,' said Lillie Jenkins Carter, a doctoral student majoring in communications. 'The pictures are startlingly graphic.'

Perhaps Lawrence Williamson would have been one of those civil rights moderates who condemned Dr. King's "shock treatment" and "sensationalism." He sounds like a "pro-life moderate" but we suspect he's just a pro-abortion. It is sometimes hard to tell the one from the other. Thankfully, many of the black students he advises thought for themselves and rejected his point of view. Ally Berson of the Genocide Awareness Council may be "extremely offended" and wonder if there can't be "a better way for us to get our point across" but we use pictures for the same reason she does. She uses them to condemn one form of genocide and we use them to condemn all forms. So Ms. Berson isn't really rejecting our methodology, she is rejecting our message. She denies the validity of the comparison between abortion and the Holocaust. She is wrong. Lawrence L. Langer writes the following Holocaust observations in *The Atlantic Monthly* magazine, November, 1998:

Recently I watched the testimony of a survivor of the Kovno ghetto, in Lithuania. He spoke of the so-called Kinderaktion, in which the Germans rounded up all the children (and many of the elderly) and took them to the nearby Ninth Fort - a killing site outside Kovno - for execution. The witness was present in the room when an SS man entered and demanded from a mother the one-year-old infant she was holding in her arms. She refused to surrender it, so he seized the baby by its ankles and tore the body in two before the mother's eyes.

How is this atrocity morally distinguishable from Martin

Haskell's description of the "dilation and extraction" abortion procedure in which he essentially "seizes the baby by its ankles" as he prepares to crush its skull ("Dilation and Extraction for Late Second Trimester Abortion," Martin Haskell, MD, Presentation, National Abortion Federation Risk Management Seminar, September 13, 1992)?

Or consider parallels to Warren Hern's "dilatation and evacuation" abortion which also "tears the body" into parts. On page 142 of his book, *Abortion Practice*, Warren Hern, MD, Alpenglo Graphics, 1990, he explains "As the calvaria [skull] is grasped, a sensation that it is collapsing is almost always accompanied by the extrusion of white cerebral material [brain] from the external os [cervical opening of the uterus]." At page 143, he recommends the "Hanson maneuver" with which he presses his hand against the mother's lower abdomen to locate the baby's head, which he then forces " ... down to the lower uterine segment" where it can be " ... grasped more easily." At page 153, Hern cautions that "Grasping and collapsing the calvaria [skull] are often difficult. "Stripping the calvaria of soft tissue [tearing off the baby's face and scalp] is sometimes the first step in successful delivery of this part, followed by dislocation of parietal bones [crushing the baby's skull]." On page 156 he instructs that "The operator uses a forceps with a small blade and powerful grip, such as the small Sopher or small Hern; an 8-inch curved Mayo scissors is used to dissect fetal tissue a little at a time [tear off bits of hands, arms, feet, legs, etc., small piece by small piece]." The comparison between abortion and the Holocaust is further strengthened by the section of Langer's *Atlantic Monthly* article which documents an even more horrific scene (were that possible). This incident is recounted by a witness who observed the following in Poland, in the woods of Kazimierz Biskupi:

[The Gestapo] ordered the assembled Jews to strip - first those who were standing near the large pit. Then they ordered the naked people to go down into both pits and jump into the larger pit. I could not describe the wailing and the crying Some mothers jumped in holding their children, some were throwing their children in [T]wo Gestapo men began to pour some liquid, like water on the Jews Apparently, because of the slaking of the lime, people in the pit were boiling alive. The cries were so terrible that we who were sitting by the piles of clothing began to tear pieces off the stuff to stop our ears.

This sickening tale is hauntingly reminiscent of the amnio infusion (saline installation) abortions commonly performed on second trimester babies in the 1970s and 1980s and still legal today. The child is killed by chemical burns which leave victims looking as though they have been "boiled alive." The poison is so toxic that its incautious administration could (and sometimes does) kill the mother. The baby simultaneously swallows and inhales the scalding solution. It destroys the mucus membranes of the respiratory and digestive systems. This agonizing death finally culminates with widespread vasodilatation, edema, congestion, hemorrhage and shock ("Fetal Pathology and Mechanism of Death in Saline Abortion, Galen et al., *Amer. Jour. of OB & GYN* , vol. 120, pp. 347-355, 1974). How "terrible" would be the baby's "cries" if they could be heard? Of final comparative interest is Langer's mention of the medical experiments performed on victims of the Holocaust:

A doctor at Mauthausen, in training to serve at the front as a physician with an SS unit, liked to amputate the arms or legs of Jews to see how long it would take them to bleed to death. After all, this would be useful medical information

On May 23, 1999, *The Los Angeles Times* reported a story entitled "Ethics Panel Supports Human Embryo Study."

A presidentially appointed ethics panel has decided to recommend that the federal government begin funding some research on human embryos, saying the moral cost of destroying embryos in research is outweighed by the social good that could come from the work.

Ms. Berson no doubt rejects these indisputable comparisons because she is contemptuous of the personhood of the human embryo and fetus. PERSONHOOD IS WHAT GENOCIDE IS ALWAYS ABOUT. This is the same contempt with which SS men would have dismissed her personhood, had she been savaged by Nazi "choice" in some squalid death camps.

Personhood is always about raw power; those who have it can define personhood in terms which exclude burdensome beings who don't. But without a hint of ironic awareness, Ms. Berson showcases one kind of genocide while demanding the cover-up of another. And she is hardly alone in her self-centered, moral muddle.

COLUMNS AND LETTERS

Student columnist John Roszkowski rambled incoherently through a pro-abortion opinion piece which appeared in the October 28th, *Lantern*, under the title "Individual choice is the bottom line.". In the middle of his diatribe, Mr. Roszkowski lapses into a short-lived, lucid interval: All that aside, my hat is off to the Genocide Awareness Project. I don't agree with its platform, and I think its demonstration was lurid and tacky. But sometimes lurid and tacky wakes people up, even if its substance is debatable (kind of like my column, heh-heh). They got folks all fired up

on both sides of the issue, and got them to think instead of mouthing the same old, tired dogma. In fact, a few of the people working there that I talked to had arguments with pretty solid reasoning. But before all this praise goes to their heads, I'd like to say one last thing. The G.A.P. is a group of sick, misguided bastards.

GAP had an equally profound effect on an equally extreme pro-abortion, named Jessica Weeks. She spews the usual feminist dogma in her October 26th, *Lantern* column:

After restraining myself from assaulting the G.A.P. representative who was blithering on about sin, I made it to my home unscathed except for that queasy feeling you tend to get when you see pictures of decapitated eighth-month fetuses. I concluded that although the admittedly interesting G.A.P. had every right to be there, it had done little but crystallize my pro-choice position and alienate me from the pro-lifers who had presented the material.

Here again is the all-too-common inclination toward violence, displayed by pro-aborts who are confronted with evidence they can't lie their way around. Her reference to "blithering about sin" could refer to a remark by Rev. Clenard Childress, who responded to a student who was defending abortion rights as "moral diversity." Pastor Childress quipped, "Oh, so that's what you call sin!" At least Ms. Weeks' "queasy feeling" suggests the remnants of a functioning conscience, though the rest of her column revealed predictable indifference to distinctions between traditional (quaint?) concepts of right and wrong. Lissa Huddleston, a senior horticulture major, though, got it right. Writing in the *Lantern* Readers' Forum, on the same day, she noted in part:

Yes, it's true, the pictures are shocking, they are grotesque,

and yes, they do offend us. I really didn't want to see them, and when I did, I thought I would throw up or scream; and believe me I cried. The point is, we all acknowledge that the Holocaust was wrong. And yet we close our eyes in denial when we are confronted with mass killings happening in our day and time, and involving us. Here, on this campus, we are now challenged to see the destruction and acknowledge that this, too, is wrong; and of course that's hard.

Space constraints prevent a more complete inclusion of the articles and letters which appeared in the campus and city papers but each can be reviewed in full on the Internet at <http://www.thelantern.com> and <http://www.dispatch.com>. From our personal journals, however, we share the following anecdotes. **PERSONAL NOTES** A black student asked for help persuading her absent but abortion-minded, pregnant classmate to cancel an appointment to kill her baby. My wife Lois showed her a pro-life video and gave her counseling tips and a referral to a local CPC which she could help her friend.

Pro-abortion protesters carried blasphemous signs reading, among other things, "Satanists For Life: Save Your Babies For Satan," "Kill A Fetus For Jesus," "Eat A Fetus For Jesus," "Don't Abort! Your Fetus May Be The Anti-Christ." Two male journalism students who had spent a long time staring at the GAP signs, came out of the crowd and peppered me with questions which they read from a notepad. One eventually said "I hate to admit this, but you guys are changing our minds about this [abortion]." A male student dressed as the "Joker" began the week displaying vulgar signs and shouting senseless profanity. In one of the more amazing transformations we have ever seen, by mid-week he had abandoned his costume and involved himself in sensible discussions with our staff. Both he and his

roommate admitted the project had forced them to accept the relationship between abortion and other forms of genocide. A group of very obviously drugged lesbians mocked and desecrated a copy of the Bible and simulated lewd acts in an attempt to scandalize our staff. Sadly, we're used to this. We've seen it all before. Todd Beauchamp was approached by an angry Christian student who gestured toward the GAP display and declared that "Jesus wouldn't do this." Todd pointed out that Jesus already had. Our Lord confronted the culture with horrifying visual images as he intentionally made his way through the large crowds (including families of women and children) between Pilate's palace and Golgotha, beaten so "appallingly" that the 52nd Chapter of Isaiah (verse 14) says he was no longer recognizable as a man. His purpose was to expose the terrible consequences of evil. The student went away apparently speechless. In several discussions with students involved with the OSU Campus Crusade for Christ ministry (Campus Crusade at Penn State was a major sponsor of GAP), it became clear that our request for their sponsorship had created divisions between the leadership, which was too risk-averse to sign on and students, who after observing the impact of the project were puzzled by the reluctance of their leaders. We are saddened to see this crippling spirit of fear in both Catholic and Protestant campus ministry leaders almost everywhere we go. A pro-life professor (we won't mention the person's name, discipline or even gender, because they might not be tenured) came by the exhibit every day and took materials to integrate into their curriculum. In fact, because the doctrine of academic freedom is selectively applied, even this brief reference could touch off a witch-hunt to ferret-out our faculty member and punish their heresy (remember the fate of the student newspaper columnist?). Many students also took materials for use in the classroom and to give their professors. On the

day we set up the display between the schools of nursing and medicine, a male nursing student told Rev. Clenard Childress that the GAP signs helped him realize that he could no longer be "pro-choice." I asked a very, very angry female medical student why, if she were really "pro-life," she would not want passers-by to see what they might be choosing?. She huffed that "now you are offending me" and stormed away. Her Jewish classmate had already informed us that she (the classmate) was going to medical school specifically to become an abortionist. Attempts to get her beyond a recitation of pro-abortion slogans and into a discussion of the medical facts proved predictably futile. At about that same time an assumedly pro-life professor of medicine came by and said he had seen abortions and the real thing was even worse than any picture could convey. A Christian medical student expressed concern that the Christian Medical and Dental Society had not sponsored GAP. His classmate agreed. So did we. When David Lee spotted a nurse examining the signs he asked her what she thought. She said "it's very effective, it changed my mind." Cheree Bartlette was accosted by a female nursing student who accused us of using propaganda and scare tactics reminiscent of Hitler. She refused to elaborate. Cheree said she would be glad to use propaganda or anything else that saved lives. (Not all propaganda is, of course, false).

A medical student walked by with two classmates and exclaimed "this is very powerful!"

Many people could be observed peering out of doorways and windows to see the display, even during set-up.

Lois made some progress with an anti-vivisectionist who was drawn to one of our animal cruelty versus abortion signs.

Paul Kulas spent considerable time with the vice president of the Pro-Choice Club. She claimed to be a Catholic but was not well informed about abortion and was highly selective about the church teachings she embraced. The conversation was frustrating but he felt by the end it had been time well spent.

A female student rushed out of the question and answer period during my "debate" with the university community and shouted "even if he makes abortion seem unthinkable, it will always be a women's right!" How's that for logic?

Two black and one Middle-Eastern student came up to view the display because they said it was the "buzz" in the student union building.

A passer-by expressed the opinion that there was no moral difference between a man and an ant. When one of our volunteers voiced dismay that this man, as a student, was being taught that kind of thing, he said "no, I'm an instructor."

After a long conversation, James Paul finally got one of the homosexual protesters to admit that he really didn't know whether abortion was right or wrong. That's got to count as progress.

A lesbian advised me that our discussions had been "deeply disturbing" to her and that the whole week had been a "nightmare." Now, that's real progress.

A reporter for the student newspaper told us "off the record" that GAP had had a "huge impact."

Scott Klusendorf, formerly with our staff, spent a day with us

at OSU and in one of innumerable debates, engaged a female student who said the fetus wasn't human because it lacked requisite "human experience." Scott asked her whether a newborn baby lacked humanity because it had no more "human experience" than a fetus? She finally left in frustration but not before a crowd of onlookers noted the many lapses in her logic.

A professor of medicine walked over from the medical school, still in his white lab coat, and after carefully examining each GAP sign, he surprised us by offering a large financial donation.

A male student admitted to David Lee and Lois that his girlfriend was struggling with the memory of having aborted another man's child. They were able to give him post-abortion literature and counseling referrals for his girlfriend and to convince him of the importance of abstinence as well as the spiritual basis for post-abortion healing and the practice of sexual restraint.

Despite the fact that none of our signs or literature express any spiritual content and our answers to questions are invariably secular unless students plainly invite a spiritual discussion, the pro-aborts displayed immense hostility toward Christianity and seemed to believe that associating us with the church would discredit our message. When a self-described anarchist from Antioch College began to lose a theological debate with David Lee and Jim Spencer, her pro-abortion friend quickly dragged her away from the exchange. This "flight response" was a reaction we would see time and again when students began to lose arguments. But whether students left on their own or were pulled away, they all took with them vivid recollections of the pictures. Another student from Antioch left a crowd of pro-aborts

trying to block GAP signs from the view of passers-by and began a conversation with me during which I was able to persuade him that we sincerely shared many of his other concerns. I talked him into approaching David Lee and after a time, he apologized to both of us for speaking harshly. Thereafter he left and never rejoined the pro-abortion demonstration. I am not sure we changed his mind about abortion but he clearly rethought his impression of our project and our motives in organizing it. **"PRO-LIFE MODERATES" COVER-UP TRUTH ABOUT**

ABORTION Finally, there appeared a "pro-life" letter so dumb, I'm ashamed to admit that its author and I shared a common major; political science. As an act of Christian charity, I will not further embarrass this young man by mentioning his name but I will quote his letter in full, because he speaks for most of our misguided movement. His missive was published by *The Lantern*, Friday, October 23, 1998, in the Reader's Forum:

A great atrocity has occurred in the pro-life movement, and it is displayed prominently for all to see. Yes, I'm referring to the graphic photographs of aborted fetus [sic] in the middle of our Oval. Yes, I am a supporter of the pro-life movement, for intellectual and philosophical reasons. As a pro-lifer, I would like to be the first to condemn what I feel is a blatant lack of couth, diplomacy and a campaign that I feel is truly counterproductive towards the pro-life view. The logic for this display of graphic photos is to compare different forms of genocide in history then equate them with abortion. I agree with this perspective, and I do believe that abortion is a murderous act. However, if there's one thing that my history classes have taught me, it's that issues don't get solved over night, and pushing too hard on one side only leads to counter productivity. As Abraham Lincoln was frequent [sic] at saying, 'You can win more flies with honey then [sic] you

can with gull [sic].' In layman's terms this means when you try to cram your viewpoint down peoples' throats, they simply get defensive. This is counter productive, in that defensive people don't listen to other viewpoints, don't understand other viewpoints, and ultimately launch their own extreme campaigns. In conclusion, I urge that if the Genocide Awareness Project truly cares about the pro-life movement, they will stop this travesty and work to further the movement, not make pro-lifers look like extremist wackos who kill abortion doctors for a living.

Phew. He is pro-life and agrees with our genocide comparison but thinks that if we make it by using the only convincing medium (pictures) available to us, the tactic will fail because it is "uncouth," lacking in "diplomacy" and is not "sweet" enough. This he believes amounts to "pushing" so "hard" that viewers will become too "defensive" to be converted and we will only end up looking like assassins. Phew again. There is nothing "couth" about torturing babies to death so there is no "couth" way to teach about the practice. "Diplomacy" is sensitivity to the wishes of others and it is useful only up to the point that those others wish (demand?) that you stop troubling them with life saving truth. As for "sweetness," see "couth" above. Question: Will the baby known to have been saved by GAP at OSU think we "pushed too hard" if his mother tells him or her why they are still alive? And regarding the concern that we look like assassins when we expose injustice, racists routinely attempted to discredit Martin Luther King by associating his peaceful protest with the violence of the Black Panthers. Pro-aborts do the same thing to us. That's called changing the subject and "pro-life moderates" let pro-aborts get away with it all the time. If only this student "pro-life moderate" were alone in his confusion. **IGNORANCE AND DENIAL** America is able to tolerate and even commit *first*

trimester abortion (the period of pregnancy during which 90% of "terminations" are committed) by denying who this baby is and what abortion does to him. Most people vaguely understand but don't *fully* appreciate the wonder of prenatal development or the wickedness of abortion - and they want to keep it that way. How better to keep your options open than to keep your mind closed. But this pretense becomes nearly impossible while staring at pictures of aborted babies.

Recall the E-mail describing the pregnant Ohio State student who attempted to avoid our GAP exhibit. She believed that she could maintain the fiction that abortion is morally acceptable - if she could just avoid the pictures. She could deflect the truth as long as it was kept abstract by the fuzziness of mere words. She knew that she was not among the few who can be turned against abortion through the use of rhetoric and like most Americans, she knew just enough to know she didn't want to know more. She felt so threatened by these images that she went out of her way to keep them out of her head. She intuited that it takes only a glance for visual truth to crash through psychic defenses. That is precisely why the abortion industry has always been terrified of pictures. The lies of abortion apologists are instantly refuted by pictures; at least for viewers with a functioning conscience.

We know this because the campaign to enact legislative prohibitions against "partial-birth" abortion has forced the press to publish and broadcast gruesome pictures. Public support for *late*-term abortion has plummeted accordingly. But support for *first* trimester abortion persists at high levels in every poll. Because the nation is still ill-informed about early abortion, it is much easier for Americans to trivialize the embryo and early fetus as inconsequential "blobs of tissue."

The term "partial birth" abortion now evokes vivid images of grisly horror but public perception of "first trimester" abortion remains willfully murky and therefore, morally ambiguous.

Even physicians rely on denial to justify the "termination" of early pregnancy. The first trimester abortionist views his victim only remotely, as a grainy image on an ultrasound monitor (which medical texts have long warned him to turn away from the baby's mother, "Warns of Negative Psychological Impact of Sonography in Abortion," Dorfman, *Ob. Gyn. News*, Feb. 15-18, 1986). He is further detached by the vacuum pump which mechanically shreds the baby (whose dismemberment he would have had to accomplish manually in an earlier time) and whisks its remains discretely out of view. The soul-numbing job of reassembling the corpses is left to subordinates.

The remoteness of executioner from victim will be increased further still (along with ease of denial) when abortionists merely write abortifacient prescriptions, filled by amoral pharmacists, for lethal pills to be ingested by aborting mothers, in the privacy of their own homes. The babies will be younger, smaller and some will argue, possessed of even less compelling claims to rights of personhood. And their tiny bodies will splash into their mothers' toilets, far from the offices of their abortionists, to be flushed into sewers running red with the blood of our children. And as if to prove this point, a recent survey predicted an increase in the numbers of physicians who will begin performing abortions when they can do so by chemical means (*Will 1999 Be The Year For Mifepristone (RU-486)? And, An Update On Women's Other Options For Very Early Abortion*, The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, September 16, 1998, <http://www.kff.org>).

Chemical abortion will also increase denial among "patients."

An article entitled "Reactions to Medical Abortion Among Providers of Surgical Abortion: An Early Snapshot," *Family Planning Perspectives*, January/February, 1999, reports the following:

Some providers have discovered, in the course of counseling medical abortion patients, that some women do not consider the procedure a "real" abortion. At a national meeting on medical abortion, counselors from clinics already providing such procedures told of women who call clinics saying: 'I ... don't believe in abortion. But I can't be pregnant. Can you give me that pill that will make me stop being pregnant?'

* * *

Abortion providers now have a methodology [chemical abortion] about which there is much patient misinformation, and which - given that it seems to induce a miscarriage - can allow some women the illusion that an abortion has not taken place at all.

Chemical abortion "patients" may see "their" procedure as morally superior to vacuum aspiration abortion in part because it is committed earlier, on younger, smaller (less developed) babies and in part because the method of killing is less direct. This is exactly the erroneous moral distinction most Americans make between vacuum aspiration and "partial birth" abortions (vacuum occurring in the first trimester versus "partial birth" in the second and third, with vacuum being a method of killing that is more direct than chemical but less direct than "partial birth"). Denial is a willful ignorance of the facts which makes it possible to rationalize the unthinkable as appropriate, necessary or even indispensable. *As the baby and its fate become more abstract, we must work harder to make both more concrete.*

UNBORN AND NEWBORN Denial is now so pervasive and persuasive that it is even used to rationalize literal child-sacrifice. *Newsweek* magazine, April 19, 1999 in its coverage of the discovery of the bodies of three children, sacrificed in the Andes to "mountain gods," by Incas who drugged and buried them alive, quotes Mario Lazarovich, director of cultural heritage in the province of Salta, concerning the children's deaths: "They exude an air of tranquillity Their death was not violent, and this allows us to see the ritual from an Inca point of view: this was not a time of terror and horror but of peace and worship." No right. No wrong. Just cultural relativism. We are losing so badly on abortion that devotee's of darkness aren't merely rationalizing past infanticide, they are emboldened to urge it *here and now*. Princeton University has named infanticide advocate Peter Singer to a tenured chair at its Center for Human Values. Forget the *unborn* child, Singer doesn't believe that a *newborn* child merits rights of personhood until 28 days after birth. During the first month outside the womb, Singer says parents should have the right to "choose" to kill a baby if it is "disabled." Disability, of course, means different things to different people. Children born female are killed as "disabled" in many cultures. In his book *Practical Ethics*, Peter Singer, Cambridge University Press, 1993, professor Singer asserts that "Killing a disabled infant is not morally equivalent to killing a person. "Very often it is not wrong at all." He adds, "When the death of a disabled infant will lead to the birth of another infant with better prospects of a happy life, the total amount of happiness will be greater if the disabled infant is killed." Mr. Lazarovich romanticizes child killing as an act of "peace and worship" while Dr. Singer purrs that it produces "happiness." These sentiments are manifestly perverse. If we can no longer protect the born, what hope can we have for the unborn? Evil of this magnitude must be resisted with more than tactful platitudes

and abstract expressions of easily ignored disapproval. We've got to get in people's faces; respectfully but with audacity appropriate to the calamity which has befallen us. **TACTICAL PROS AND CONS** Pro-life tactics which break the law (Rescue, etc.) are of dubious merit because they teach no facts about the baby or abortion, they are costly (arrests, etc.) and the press heightens the impression that they are "extreme." (It is encouraging that Rescuers are now using pictures.) We will never be blessed with news coverage as objective as that of the civil disobedience conducted by civil rights activists, which was reported as "heroic." On the other hand, pro-life tactics which are typified by the broadcast of timid TV commercials won't be received at "extreme" but they are very costly, teach no facts and the opinions they express are so vague that it's hard to grasp that they are even pro-life. These ads may save some lives, but they assume too much prior knowledge and they underestimate cultural resistance to truth. Another popular pro-life tactic involves billboards which offer pregnancy tests. They attract callers who don't realize the number displayed is pro-life but many will never end up in the CPC's offering the tests, because the great majority of these women don't want help getting *through* a crisis pregnancy, they want help getting *out* of one. The pregnancy test project has definite value where it gets abortion vulnerable women into a CPC equipped to dissuade them from killing their babies. But unfortunately, another weak link in this progression is that the majority of participating CPC's use video (tapes, live ultra sound, etc.) only to teach about the baby, if at all. The vast majority refuse to use any graphic images to teach about abortion. This is tragic because, as we have noted *ad nauseum*, abortion is an evil which is trivialized when we attempt to describe it with words alone. Life Chain, the placement of miniature crosses on lawns, picketing, marching, etc. have long been staples of pro-life activism

and are neither costly nor perceived as "extreme" by most observers. But these projects frequently fail to change behaviors because they merely state conclusions (and often state them too abstractly) instead of teaching the facts which *compel* those conclusions. Then there is GAP. It is far less costly than TV ad campaigns or criminal misconduct. It teaches pivotal facts instead of merely stating (or worse, vaguely suggesting) unpopular conclusions. It doesn't rely on the willingness of a reluctant public to consider our message - we go to them instead of vainly hoping they will come to us. It also reaches large numbers of people in a very short time. It is nearly impossible to ignore. It is and always will be perceived as "extreme" by those who confuse the medium with the message. Our *message* is extreme ("abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby"). Our medium (abortion pictures) is extremely effective at communicating this extreme message. Any other medium would be less extreme but less effective. Any other medium would dumb-down the message. This perception of methodological extremity is unavoidable if we tell the whole truth about abortion and that perception is a reasonable price to pay for unmasking that truth.

In other words, the pro-life movement is like the protagonist in actor Bill Murray's movie "Groundhog Day;" seemingly doomed to relive the same day over and over again. It's not 1975 anymore, and we don't have to be trapped into reliving the same projects in perpetuity.

Thank heaven we have finally broken out of our "Groundhog Day" cycle by acquiring high grade, shocking pictures of aborted embryos and early fetuses and thank heaven that we have learned how to use them. Their display incontestably teaches everything a person needs to understand to conclude that abortion is indefensible. If that's

not enough to change someone's mind, their problem is spiritual rather than educational, in which case we can only urge and pray for their salvation.

GAP has begun to change public perception of early-term abortion in much the same way the "partial birth" debate has turned America against late-term abortion (Credit The National Right to Life Committee primarily for effective work on this front). GAP dims the once bright line dividing early and late termination of pregnancy.

Early abortion *pictures* are far more troubling to the culture than late-term photos because the latter depict *someone else's* abortion (the "rare" one which even many pro-aborts self-righteously condemn). But early photos depict *your* abortion; the "common" one you struggle to convince yourself was a "necessary evil," or at worst, the "lesser of two evils." And they make your abortion (or the one to which you support a right of access) look indefensibly more evil than you ever dared imagine. These pictures enable us to stop merely arguing conclusions about abortion and start proving the facts which compel those conclusions.

WHY WE'RE LOSING

But incredibly, the "pro-life" movement largely refuses to use abortion images of any kind, so it matters little that the pictures save lives, motivate repentance and inspire involvement. How do they defend this suppression of evidence?

Most pro-life "activists" are involved in crisis pregnancy service delivery. Many are themselves post-abortive and unresolved issues related to their own experience cause them to recoil from disturbing images. For many others, a pregnant woman is more real than her unborn child, so

pursuit of her spiritual or emotional well-being is accorded a higher priority than saving her baby's life. Still other crisis pregnancy service personnel simply fail to understand the value of abortion pictures or have never been trained to use them appropriately. CBR is heavily involved in this important area through the work of Lois Cunningham, a public health nurse and experienced crisis pregnancy medical clinic director, who is currently our Director of Crisis Pregnancy Outreach. But the crisis pregnancy approach is *reactive*, dealing with a problem one crisis at a time, after it's already upon us. We also need *proactive* projects like GAP which get out ahead of the problem and intercept it before it gathers unstoppable momentum.

The dirty little secret of the pro-life movement is that most of our organizations care more what the public thinks of *them* than what the public thinks of *abortion*. And the pro-aborts, who are as frightened of pictures as pro-lifers are of criticism, have figured this out. They gleefully paralyze easily intimidated "pro-lifers" with accusations of "insensitivity," or even "violence," when we dare to make abortion real. CBR scoffs at this silliness but the mere threat of such allegations causes the "compassion" wing of the pro-life movement to run screaming from the room. They are simply unwilling to pay the high public-relations costs imposed on groups which fully expose the horror of abortion.

Is it really "compassion," however, to care more about the feelings of the born than the lives of the unborn? Was Martin Luther King less effective because he provoked the anger of bad people who hated his goals and good people who hated his tactics? Dr. King advanced the cause of civil rights precisely because he wasn't trying to win a popularity contest; he was forcing a reluctant nation to face social injustice. His method was to incite racists who were

brutalizing African Americans in private, to do it in public, where their savagery could be documented with pictures he could then use to outrage people of conscience. He knew this process would be effective but costly and he was one of the few activists who had the integrity and the courage to pay the price. Had leadership of the civil rights movement been abdicated to "civil rights moderates" who shrank from confrontation, it would still be 1963 for black America. Another group of social reformers who paid a terrible price to achieve their ends were the journalists who opposed the Vietnam War. *Time Magazine*, November 23, 1998, describes their sacrifice:

By ... [1975], the public and most of the American press, including *Time*, had turned against the war. That was due in no small measure to the words *and pictures* from the correspondents sent to Vietnam to cover the conflict For their trouble, many were killed or wounded, and most were criticized as biased at best and unpatriotic at worst. [Emphasis added.]

The pictures were worth innumerable words. Focusing the attention of a disinterested culture on irrefutable *visual* evidence of social injustice invariably causes social unrest (i.e., anti-war riots) but it also speeds social reform. Pictures of Los Angeles motorist Rodney King's beating by the LAPD advanced the campaign against police brutality beyond any result which could have been achieved by words alone. Yet even before the ensuing riots, the press was vilified by some for broadcasting these shocking images too often and by others for broadcasting them at all. The high cost of exposing injustice motivates many to suppress evidence of injustice which the public is eager to ignore. Are pro-lifers willing to pay the high cost of victory? The pro-aborts are. Warren Hern is one of the most savage late-term

abortionists on the planet. Here is what he says about the price he and his killer colleagues are willing to pay:

At the rally, the antiabortion fanatics showed up shouting my name and calling me a murderer. They had numerous signs showing my name and various descriptions of me, none of them flattering. As I began to speak, they began to shout. I spoke above them I felt defiant ... [CBR note; shouting by pro-lifers is a stupid tactic]. Our only option for taking the high moral ground was to place our own lives and bodies on the line. We must risk our lives for our cause by continuing to provide safe abortion services in the face of the threats and attempts to intimidate. Only our own moral courage in doing what we see as right and ethical could be an effective counterpoise to the religious fervor of the antiabortionists ["Life On The Front Lines," Warren Hern, *Women's Health Issues*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 137-138, Fall 1993].

Hern and his kid-killing kindred are willing to be criticized, reviled and even murdered to advance their cause. Pro-lifers are afraid to even be criticized. The people who are killing babies are more committed than the people trying to save them. This may be one of the reasons the pro-life movement is ignored by most Americans and not taken seriously by the bulk of the rest. We don't have the moral authority to command attention and respect because we're trying to win on the cheap. We respect, appreciate and wish to work with any pro-life organizations which condemn violence. But many pro-life groups are reluctant to associate themselves with anyone who rocks the boat - and they're convinced that pictures will surely capsize the pro-life dingy. Most of these organizations are so timid that they consciously cover-up the horror of abortion for fear of offending. They are the contemporary counterparts of the "civil rights moderates" whose passion for appeasement sabotaged Dr. King from

one side while violent groups like the Black Panthers (corresponding to today's anti-abortion assassins and bombers) sabotaged him from the other. They, of course, deny cowardice and argue that "expose" just doesn't work. But *Au contraire. We win when we fight abortion as a concrete act of violence and we lose when we merely dispute it as an abstract right of choice.* We also lose when we allow most Americans to cling to a mythical "middle ground" on abortion. James Morrow, writing in the May 17, 1999, issue of *U.S. News & World Report* describes this imaginary neutrality:

... James Gilmore carved out a middle-ground position that helped him get elected as governor of Virginia. He said he was opposed to abortion but accepted *Roe v. Wade* - the Supreme Court's 1973 decision upholding a woman's constitutional right to an abortion - as the law of the land Indeed, many GOP candidates since have followed his lead.

Morrow cites George W. Bush and Elizabeth Dole in this regard with the former assuring pro-lifers that he supports a ban on abortion while promising pro-aborts that he will do nothing to pass one ("since the country isn't ready"). Mrs. Dole says she shares Mr. Bush's abhorrence of abortion but urges the GOP to stop even discussing it (because it diverts attention from more "relevant" issues). She adds that "good and honorable people disagree" over the issue. But how could a "good and honorable" person support abortion unless they didn't know it tortures babies to death? In which case, they need to be educated. Might it not be reasonable to expect political leaders to play a leading role in the teaching? And if abortion supporters do understand what they're supporting, by what civilized standard could they be either "good" or "honorable?"

What if Presidents John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson had believed that African Americans were entitled to equal justice but decided to betray the cause of civil rights because the country "wasn't ready?" Notwithstanding the bloody riots which confirmed how "unready" the country really was, would presidential hypocrisy on racism have been "good and honorable?" Then how can it be "good and honorable" on abortion? *Getting* a reluctant country "ready" to do justice is the very essence of leadership. Meekly acquiescing in a status quo which both GOP candidates admit to be unjust is the very essence of betrayal. A group which likes to think of itself as the most influential pro-life organization in the country has actually endorsed George W. Bush's "position" as acceptable. This is leadership?

This sort of political double-talk seems to work because voters also want it both ways on abortion. If we can't push the electorate out of the "middle" and force people to take a stand, then we don't stand a chance of turning this thing around. "Pro-life moderates" base their opposition to pictures on their belief that many "neutrals" who view shocking photos are so angered that they become pro-aborts. Ridiculous.

WHAT WE MUST DO TO WIN

Many Americans who say they are in the "middle" on abortion simply don't know the facts. If the sight of those facts, as horrifying as they are, motivates them to declare themselves pro-aborts, then they were pro-aborts all along. For those on whom the pictures have no effect at all, the question is begged: What practical difference is there between a "neutral" who straddles the fence and someone who calls themselves "pro-choice?" Anyone who has no position on baby-killing is supporting the *status quo*; legalized baby-killing. Therefore, how could the

circumstances of the pro-life movement be worsened even if every self-proclaimed "neutral" were hypothetically pushed into the pro-abortion camp?

But we know experientially that large numbers of "neutrals" and even pro-aborters *are* converted to our side when we change their understanding of the facts - which is usually only achievable when the new information is presented irrefutably.

Therefore, pushing some "non-committeds" into the pro-abortion camp would be a small price to pay for the creation of the political majority required to out-law abortion. It should also be borne in mind that many "neutrals" who are angered when first confronted by pictures of aborted babies ultimately embrace the pro-life point of view. We see this delayed reaction (we call it the "sink-in" factor) all the time.

Beyond ridiculous is the "pro-life moderate" suggestion that pregnant women who see pictures of aborted babies may, as a result, actually be *more* likely to kill their children. No one decides to end a pregnancy because they were shown an abortion and liked what they saw. *Many* people, however, kill their baby because they *weren't* shown an abortion whose display would have made it impossible to continue deluding themselves about the viciousness of the procedure. Almost everywhere we go, post-abortive women *and* men confide to us that they might have made a different "choice" had they been shown an abortion *before* they "chose" it, instead of after.

And as for the loopy argument that pictures drive away pregnant women who might have been converted by a "gentler" approach, any mother who can look at what abortion will do to her baby and "choose" it anyway, is a

mother who has placed herself beyond the reach of any approach, "gentle" or otherwise.

"Pro-life" defenders of this "abortion cover-up" also argue that there are many possible approaches to pro-life activism and each should be respected for its own life saving value. That most non-violent pro-life projects have life-saving potential may be true but it is also beside the point. Not all programmatic alternatives are equally effective. And the choice of *less* effective options permits the slaughter of babies whose lives could have been saved had *more* effective alternatives been employed. Not to mention that advocates of "cover-up" are arguing in defense of ignorance. Most Americans really *don't* understand the magnitude of the evil abortion represents. We see this constantly in the looks of stunned disbelief on the faces of the tens of thousands of people who stumble past our exhibit - in community after community. We need to show a greater sense of urgency about saving babies. Our choice of tactics shouldn't be based on our needs but on the needs of the children. But laying aside every tactical and strategic consideration, the pro-life movement has a spiritual obligation to be a witness against this evil by proclaiming the terrible truth as vividly as humanly possible. Ephesians 5:11 commands us to "expose" the "deeds of darkness;" not to cover them up. Abortion is inexpressibly evil. There are no words adequate to describe it. If you haven't seen it, you can't possibly comprehend it. The pro-life movement's reluctance to use graphic pictures guarantees that we will never make our case to a majority of the population. We can't win with words alone. The culture is simply too hostile to our point of view. **HUMANE TREATMENT OF ANIMALS/**

ANIMALISTIC TREATMENT OF HUMANS It is hostile because it's killing 4,500 babies a day in this country, with about 15,000 per year being slaughtered so far along in pregnancy that they could survive outside the womb on the

day of their abortions. This is a culture which does not want to be reminded of what it knows or informed about what it doesn't. Who cares anyway? But abuse an animal and the anthropomorphic outrage becomes almost pathological.

Associated Press, December 31, 1998: [Headline] State mourns loss of wild horses, rallies with rewards The local [Nevada] townsfolk are counting on a reward fund - \$35,000 and growing - to help nab the killers of 34 wild horses

* * *

It has rocked the region and attracted interest overseas. 'We're handling it just as we would a murder,' Storey County Sheriff's Sgt. Bill Petty said. 'We said from the beginning we wanted to treat it like there were humans lying out there,' he said as he mapped locations and helped conduct autopsies on the string of horse carcasses this week.

* * *

Many of the wounded suffered for days before dying.

* * *

Media outlets in London, Germany and Japan have been following the story.

* * *

'We're getting donations from all over the country,' said Bobbi Royle of Wild Horse Spirit

A leading psychologist in the area said the shootings suggest a 'sadistic personality.' 'This is someone who takes pleasure in the pain of other creatures,' said Ole Theinhaus,

chairman of the Psychology Department at the University of Nevada-Reno. 'To think of 30 horses killed this way, to keep killing while the horses are suffering, you lose the ability to connect with a person who can do that,' he said. Associated Press, February 1, 1999: [Headline] Marines maintain innocence in shooting of wild horses Two marines charged in the shooting of wild horses in Nevada say they are innocent and at least one is frightened by the public outrage directed their way, a defense lawyer said Monday.

* * *

'I was here on a murder case a couple of years ago and security was nothing like this,' said Jerry Polaha, a Reno-based lawyer for ... [one of the Marines].

* * *

Sheriff's deputies closed off a square block around the courthouse ... as a security precaution during Monday's arraignment.

* * *

'I got on the Internet and, wow, you should see what is on there. It's scary,' Polaha said.

* * *

Four deputies and an armed chief bailiff who goes by the name Bearclaw provided security on Monday. They escorted the suspects out of the courthouse, Bearclaw with a shotgun in his hand.

Talk about beating a dead horse. Law enforcement now treats animal-killing as murder and child-killing as "choice."

And the public reaction? Sick. But the painful, lingering, death, of a human baby, who briefly survives a botched abortion, is hushed up with a news blackout and there are little more than sighs from the few who learn of the atrocity. The story rated only mention in passing by *The Cincinnati Post* and was virtually ignored by the national press. There was international coverage of the horse-killing but *World* magazine, a small-circulation, national Christian news journal, was nearly alone in reporting a May 1, 1999, story headlined "Killing a baby called Hope."

It's not news when the life of a late-term unborn child is snuffed out at the hands of Martin Haskell, the abortionist who pioneered the partial-birth abortion procedure. But it is news when there's a survivor [CBR note; tell that to the secular press]. Last week pro-lifers called attention to the case of a 22-week-old child born alive in a Cincinnati hospital - a day after Dr. Haskell began his multi-part, three-day abortion technique [on the child's mother].

The story goes on to describe the refusal of Bethesda North Hospital emergency room physicians to place the struggling baby girl on a respirator. Nor would they permit the nursing staff to provide care. Dr. Gene Rudd of the Christian Medical and Dental Society issued a statement of outrage:

Babies at this same age - 22 weeks - can and have survived outside the womb. The difference that apparently led doctors to let Baby Hope' die is that she was the product of a failed partial-birth abortion This clearly crosses the line into infanticide

How she must have suffered as she slowly suffocated. Would "horse-killer" psychologist Dr. Ole Theinhaus think Martin Haskell a "sadistic personality?" Would he "lose the

ability to connect" with the doctors who ordered that she die an agonizing death? Would Dr. Theinhaus speculate that these doctors also "found pleasure in the pain of other creatures?"

This same sordid scenario plays itself out again and again around the world. Columnist John Leo reports in *US News & World Report*, June 14, 1999, that Canadians are just as committed to covering-up embarrassing truth as Americans.

... [L]ast month the Calgary Regional Health Authority used the law [the Alberta Human Rights, Citizenship and Multiculturalism Act] to get a temporary injunction against publication of further stories by the Alberta Report on "partial birth" abortions. Quoting unnamed nurses and hospital documents, the magazine stated that some of the babies in such operations at Foothills Hospital were born alive and deliberately allowed to starve to death.

American journalists can't rely on the Canadian police state's Ministry of Censorship to suppress awkward truth, so they censor themselves. There's an old saying that if a foreign power were killing our children by force of arms, we would consider it an "act of war;" but when we do it to ourselves, it becomes "freedom of choice." Lest anyone mistakenly imagine the foregoing horse tale is an anomaly, consider that *The Los Angeles Times* ran a June 12, 1999, story entitled "Gruesome Deaths of Deer Prompt Protest of Fence." The report detailed a clash involving a homeowner who erected a wrought-iron fence, topped with spikes, on which deer are impaling themselves as they attempt to jump into a garden:

One deer was so deeply impaled on the fence May 26 that an animal control officer had to shoot it and carve it from the

spikes.

* * *

... [M]ore than 50 area residents attended a candlelight protest vigil along the fence Residents say they will present a petition with more than 150 signatures to the Sierra Madre City Council next week, demanding that the fence be made safe.

* * *

Some canyon folk have taken to patrolling the area nightly with flashlights to scare deer off from attempting dangerous leaps over the fence. Other neighbors say they will hacksaw the spikes off even if it means going to jail.

To the eternal shame of the Christian Church, it is now axiomatic that Americans are *way* more exercised about the slaughter of animals than Christians are about the slaughter of babies. **PLEASE DON'T STOP US** This is why we GAP. We are going to make certain that *no one* can cover up *or* ignore the horror of abortion any longer. And no one is going to stop us; not the press; not the public; not the "pro-life moderates;" not even the government (at least not in the US, yet). In truth, we can only be stopped by you - and only if you refuse to support this project. Please don't make yourself part of the abortion cover-up. Send us money and lots of it and by God's grace we'll save babies and lots of them.