

*The Los Angeles Times*, December 8, 2001, featured a front page article whose headline read “Flood of Sept. 11 Aid Swamps Charities.” Inside the paper, the article continued under the headlines “Giving: Aid Exceeds Expectations” and “Giving: Donations Pour In.” Though we don’t begrudge the victims of terror the help they need and deserve, it now seems likely that more Americans were killed by abortionists on September 11 (about 4,300) than were killed by terrorists (about 3,000).

Unlike the Red Cross, however, pro-life organizations aren’t being “swamped” by a “flood” of donations. Assuming 3,000 deaths among the 50,000 people who worked at the World Trade Center, about one in seventeen was killed. One in three unborn babies is killed by abortion *every day*. *On September 11, it would have been six times safer to have been a worker in the Twin Towers than it is to be a baby in its mother’s womb.*

But pro-life donations aren’t “pouring” in; trickling would be more like it. Many pro-lifers seem to be giving to victims of terrorism, or they tell us that the economic downturn will prevent them from giving at all.

Why do “pro-life” Christians write checks to the United Way, which is awash in money, but ignore pro-life organizations, which are struggling to raise funds? Is it because the press made the victims of September 11th so painfully real? After all, we were shown their photos. Their grieving relatives were interviewed. Their backgrounds were profiled. The press also made real the horror of the victim’s deaths. We were tortured by the sight of airliners crashing into skyscrapers. We were sickened by pictures of people jumping from the upper floors. We gasped as the buildings collapsed into rubble. The images were published and

broadcast until they became unbearable. Thus was forged a national consensus that, somehow, each of us must fight terrorism, personally, regardless of the cost.

No such consensus exists concerning abortion -- even in the church. The victims of abortion are anonymous. The horror of abortion is invisible. Of course American's aren't haunted by abortion. How could they be?

But we intend to change all that. We will do for the public's perception of abortion what the press has done for people's understanding of terror. Abortion pictures have been banned from television, newspapers and magazines but we have truck photos and hand-held sign photos and we are using them to make abortion as unavoidable as the press has made terror. But we can't achieve this vital goal by ourselves. We need help from those of you who may not be doing enough and more help from those of you who may be doing a lot.

As we continue our Genocide Awareness Project on college campuses, our work with crisis pregnancy centers and our video production endeavors, we would also like you to know something about our truck project. We call it the Reproductive "Choice" Campaign (RCC).

## MAKING ABORTION IMPOSSIBLE TO IGNORE OR TRIVIALIZE

*The Orange County Register*, July 25, 2001, carried a story called "Abortion Foes Drive Point Home" with a subhead which read "Trucks Emblazoned With Graphic Images Of Fetuses Shock Some Commuters." The article was about our Center For Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR) and it began with the following description of our RCC trucks:

Heads swiveled and jaws dropped open as the trucks rumbled past. People gestured and necks craned. At one point, a van hit the brakes to avoid a collision with rubbernecks.

Some motorists waved to show their support. At least two made obscene gestures. Others called the number displayed after reaching their destination.

'It's a very effective marketing campaign," one caller said. Another asked where to send a donation, adding, 'I think what you're doing is great.'

But others exploded in anger, some complaining that the signs might give their children 'bloody nightmares.'

'What [expletive] ... is the matter with you people?' one caller said. 'Is that what people should be looking at first thing in the morning?'

'I found it personally offensive,' said a third. 'I think your cause is worthy, but I think those trucks are disgusting. I also think it's a driving hazard.'

Cunningham said he isn't afraid of making people angry.

People *do* get angry when we show the truth about abortion because they don't want to be bothered. We are losing this fight precisely because enough people aren't bothered enough by abortion. Abortion is not exacting enough of an emotional toll on American society. The culture is in massive denial about what abortion is and does. Social reformers have always had to force-feed facts into the heads of people who resist evidence of their own complicity in injustice. The Reproductive "Choice" Campaign will be used to disturb the nation until the stress becomes unendurable. Because the

news media, entertainment media, education establishment, clergy, etc. are suppressing the truth about abortion, we have decided to bypass these gatekeepers and take our message directly to our target audience. The May 28, 2001 issue of *U.S. News & World Report* featured a cover story about that audience. It was entitled "Traffic." The article reported that:

Since 1982, while the U.S population has grown nearly 20 percent, the time Americans spend in traffic has jumped an amazing 236 percent. In major American cities, the length of the combined morning-evening rush hour has doubled, from under three hours in 1982 to almost six hours today.

The freeway is the last place where viewers can neither turn the page nor change the channel. It is a multibillion dollar transportation complex which we have turned into a forum for education. We have been presented with a vast captive audience and we will take full advantage of the fact that most commuters will give our signs at least one curious glance. Once these pictures are in people's heads, they will never get them out. Every time viewers thereafter hear the word abortion, a disturbing picture will go off in their brains. Those with a functioning conscience will eventually change their points of view.

Since June of this year, CBR's RCC trucks have traveled more than 40,000 miles. Staff members Mark Harrington, Fletcher Armstrong, Russ Neil and Gene "Bubba" Garret helped roll the trucks from coast to coast (with help from indispensable volunteers such as Bill Calvin) while in Southern California, the project was conducted by staffers Paul Kulas, Michael Spielman, Greg Davis, Barbara Smith, Sean O'Donohue, Kathy Ellison, and Maryann Matthews (with help from indispensable volunteers such as Rev. Mark

Weaver, Dennis Asbury, Judy Lange, Dan Hume, Naomi Ness, John & Patsy Dubreil, Ray and Christine Lowe and Dan Casey). According to statistics provided by an advertising industry association, some 400,000 motorists a day are seeing our trucks. It is no longer easy for commuters to pretend that abortion is morally inconsequential.

This project has received enormous newspaper and television news coverage (see some of it on our Website at [www.abortionNO.org](http://www.abortionNO.org)). The newspapers, however, refused to publish pictures of our signs. TV news anchors warned viewers that the images were so disturbing that they "couldn't be shown." Most stations blurred them out. When something is so horrifying that it must be censored, perhaps it should be stopped.

Our adversaries are speaking out about this campaign and as you might imagine, they are not pleased. What follows are some breathtakingly dumb remarks from some of the most prominent abortionists in the country. One of the most reliable measures of any organization's effectiveness is the reaction its tactics elicit from those who wish it ill. By that standard, RCC can only be termed a resounding success.

#### ABORTIONISTS SAYING WONDERFULLY TERRIBLE THINGS ABOUT CBR

*The Washington Times*, August 23, 2001, published a feature entitled "A Vehicle For Change:"

'The [RCC] campaign brings the focus back to the more *extreme* side of the anti-choice movement,' said Stephanie Mueller, spokeswoman for the National Abortion Federation. 'Not only do most people who see this campaign feel alienated by it, but even those who are opposed to a

woman's right to choose do not support this type of tactic.' [Emphasis added].

We cheerfully admit to being “extremists.” We have to be -- we are fighting extreme evil. For viewers to feel “alienated” is a good thing if it leads to remorse. Ms. Mueller unwittingly makes our point: People don't feel nearly bad enough about abortion. We very much want to make them feel worse and our trucks work well in that regard. And yes, many “pro-lifers” oppose our tactics but many civil rights “activists” opposed the tactics of Martin Luther King.

*The Oracle* (Univ. South Florida) September 5, 2001, in an article headlined "Fetus Truck Tour Rolls Into Tampa" reports:

On the other side of the abortion debate is the pro-choice group the National Organization For Women [NOW]. Helen Greigo, executive director for NOW in the State of California, said she has seen the impact of the truck campaign in her state. 'I think the imagery has shock value' she said. (The Center For Bio-Ethical Reform) is a *very dangerous* faction in our opinion. [Emphasis added].

When our most powerful enemies say we're not just “dangerous” but “*very dangerous*,” we must be on to something.

When our most powerful enemies say we're not just “dangerous” but “*very dangerous*,” we must be on to something.

INTIMIDATING BUT UNSTOPPABLE

*The San Francisco Chronicle*, November 24, 2001, in an article entitled “Abortion Foes Plan A Convoy, Pictures Of

Fetuses Displayed On Trucks,” reported that abortionists want very much to stop our trucks but they can’t figure out how to do it:

Bay Area abortion rights groups are aware the trucks are coming -- Cunningham sent them a hand-delivered letter -- but acknowledge there is little they can do to stop the display.

Although there is some debate over whether the photographs violate obscenity standards and therefore threaten the ‘public peace,’ most free speech attorneys believe the grotesque images are protected by the First Amendment.

Pro-choice activists are preparing for a spate of outrage in a region where the abortion debate has been relatively muted.

\* \* \*

‘Its clear they are trying to use shock tactics and scare people and frankly I think they have picked the wrong area, said Jana Cunningham, public affairs director for Planned Parenthood Golden Gate and no relation to Gregg Cunningham. ‘I know that when these people show up, we’ll get more donations.’

\* \* \*

Beth Parker, a San Francisco attorney who does work for Planned Parenthood, said one potential argument against the trucks might include protecting children from obscene images but she acknowledged most political speech is protected. ‘The way people have typically gone after these issues had been from a safety or traffic stand point,’ Parker said. ‘Are they so large that they make it difficult to navigate?’

Are they parking in the wrong areas? But it's quite difficult to go based just on the photographs.'

\* \* \*

Belle Taylor-McGee, executive director of the California Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League, said her group plans to ignore the truck campaign but questioned the group's tactics in the wake of the September 11 attacks.

She said she felt the hand-delivered letter warning them of the coming campaign was akin to intimidation and she thinks the group misleads the public by using the word 'choice' when it wants to ban all abortions. 'This is in poor taste and I think the timing is not good to try and frighten people and advertise distorted images when people are already feeling distressed' Taylor-McGee said of the trucks. 'We are not going to be intimidated by their tactics.'

We think it is at least "poor taste" to torture babies to death. We can't, however, imagine a better time to scare abortionists and are they ever "running scared." What they most fear is the truth. As to Ms. Taylor-McGee's decision to "ignore" us, it obviates the necessity for us to expend resources overcoming their opposition. If, on the other hand, they oppose us, doing so will focus more attention on our cause. Nice dilemma, eh?

## ANGRY ABORTIONISTS

Debbie Blair, of Planned Parenthood, Lexington, KY told Channel 36 News in October "I find ... [CBR's] flagrant, vulgar pictures offensive."

Channel 7, the ABC television news affiliate in Orange County, CA interviewed Jon Dunn, president of Planned

Parenthood of Orange County and San Bernardino County, CA in July. "I think it's awful that they are parading them [aborted baby pictures] around on the sides of trucks," he lamented.

NOW maintains a Legal Defense Education Fund which publishes *Women's E-News*. This online journal declared our truck project the "Outrage Of The Week" for September 21, 2001. The real "outrage" is public indifference to dead babies, not that the public is being inconvenienced by pictures of dead babies.

*The Palm Beach Post*, September 10, 2001, in an article headlined "Shock Trucks," reports the dismay these pictures produce on the other side:

'Our right to choose is again under attack by this quote public information campaign unquote' says Lillian Tamayo, Palm Beach and Treasure Coast Planned Parenthood president and CEO.

\* \* \*

'The use of graphic, gory photos,' she adds, 'is appalling to me. I speak Spanish and English and sometimes I don't have words to express my sense of outrage.'

Planned Parenthood speechless? Ms. Tamayo is right about one thing. The "right to choose" is under attack as never before.

Television news on Channel 25 in Palm Beach, Florida also interviewed Ms. Tamayo in September and without missing a beat, she continued her tirade:

But I don't believe Americans will be fooled by it to be honest

with you. It is an attack on women's reproductive health and a woman's right to choose. Women don't make these decisions without considerable exploration in their hearts. And to portray it as something flippant like this is just unfair and fundamentally hateful of women.

"Portraying it as something flippant?" First of all, there is nothing polemical in these pictures. Just the facts in photo form. Secondly, pro-aborts always argue the non sequitor that a bad thing can be made less bad if you "agonize" about it before you do it. Thirdly, this "hateful of women" nonsense is just more "identity politics." "If you oppose my political agenda, you attack my person." This is crybaby stuff, but it does intimidate our mostly craven conservative brethren (who act more like weak sistren). And finally, what *really* angers Ms. Tomayo is that our photos have reframed the abortion debate by exposing "choice" as homicide. As she shouts "It's my body," Ms. Tomayo can no longer hide the presence of a second body – the one that has been dismembered, disemboweled and decapitated.

## DISTURBING

*The Michigan Daily* (The University of Michigan), October 26, 2001, reported a story entitled "Trucks Bring Anti-Abortion Display Back To Ann Arbor."

'The nation is in a delicate position right now,' said LSA sophomore Clair Morrissey of Students For Choice. 'We feel it is grossly inappropriate and uncalled for. It is incredibly harmful to the state of mind of women on campus. 'It won't change the mind of someone wanting to have an abortion, it only hurts women who have.'

Actually, it does both. But since the Centers For Disease

Control say that 45% of women who abort have already had one or more previous abortions, post-abortive women are the women most likely to abort. This group is at such high risk for abortion that we certainly don't want them to "feel good" about the "procedure."

*The Oracle* (Univ. South Florida) September 5, 2001, in an article headlined "Fetus Truck Tour Rolls Into Tampa" reports:

Sara Clark, a student at USF who is involved with the campus chapter of NOW said ... "It is incredibly disturbing...."

Good.

#### TRUCKS SCARY BUT INEFFECTIVE?

Abortionists keep telling us that the trucks are ineffective but if they really believed that, why would they tell us that and why would they keep saying the pictures are "scary?" *The Detroit Free Press*, October 20, 2001, published a story headlined "Abortion Foes Plan Campaign" with a subhead which read "Planned Parenthood Calls The Caravan's Start Poorly Timed."

We're all in a different sphere right now than we were a year ago. People are frightened and scared. Now is not the time' said Robin Menin, president of Planned Parenthood, Mid-Michigan Alliance.

\* \* \*

Planned Parenthood's Menin said the campaign is not likely to be effective in the short – or long term and may be counterproductive. 'These are people who are pushing a

religious view of the rights of women. We feel terrorized' she said. 'We think of them as the domestic Taliban.'

Then when *would* be the time? Planned Parenthood didn't stop killing babies on September 11<sup>th</sup>. They gave abortions away free in bizarre "door-buster" specials. So why should we stop saving them?

And if abortion is no big deal, why would the trucks upset anyone? Even those who are "frightened and scared" should just shrug us off if our tactics are as unconvincing as our detractors suggest. Concerning the Taliban, we thought they are the ones who selfishly kill innocent people – with neither mercy nor remorse. Isn't that what abortionists do? Isn't it the U.S. military that is trying to save the innocent victims of the Taliban? Isn't that what CBR is also trying to do for the babies? I don't think "Taliban" means what this lady thinks it means.

Cybercast News.com (CNSNews.com), August 6, 2001, carried a story they called "Truckin' Against Abortion." Here comes that "scary" theme again:

A Michigan chapter of Planned Parenthood, located within CBR's September target zone, sees the Reproductive Choice Campaign rooted in scare tactics. 'Their goal, obviously, is to scare women; scare particularly, I'm sure, young women and give them an impression of what abortion's about,' said Margy Long, director of development for Planned Parenthood, Mid-Michigan Alliance.

'I think it's unfortunate,' Long said, 'that anybody wants to use scare tactics and what I think is exploitation to try to prove their particular political point of view.'

\* \* \*

'I don't think that any woman who's contemplating what to do about an unintended pregnancy doesn't know that there is a developing fetus in her uterus. So, it's not something that women don't already know about,' Long said. '[However,] we have to remember that this is a developing pregnancy and it is not the same thing as a child,' she said.

Now here we have world-class double-speak. If women already know their “fetus” is merely a “developing pregnancy,” (which Ms. Long says is “not the same as a child,”) why would they be “scared” to have us show them a picture of it after an abortion? Can this lady be listening to what she is saying?

Planned Parenthood can't have it both ways. If abortion is a good thing, how can it be “exploitative” to show pictures of it? What is it we are “exploiting?” People's sense of guilt and shame? We certainly hope so.

*World Net Daily*, August 3, 2001, reported a story entitled "Controversial Billboard Trucks Roll On."

[S]aid Glenn Mones, spokesperson for Planned Parenthood Federation of America ... 'The bottom line is that most Americans believe that the government shouldn't interfere with the private medical decisions of women, and this [the CBR, RCC truck project] isn't about to change that.'

Perhaps Mr. Mones is concerned that people who see our trucks will no longer think of abortions as “the private medical decisions of women.” Maybe they will begin to think of abortions as acts of violence which kill babies.

In a story called "Pro-Life Caravan Targets Florida," *The*

*Miami Herald* reports in its September 5<sup>th</sup> edition that:

‘Their [CBR's] ignorance is profound,’ said Patricia Baird Windle, a retired Central Florida abortion clinic owner and author of a book on abortion rights. ‘Sometimes the pictures will upset youngsters but grown women will say “Oh isn’t that disgusting” and they’ll go on their way,’ Windle said.

Ms. Baird Windle is wrong. Countless "grown women" have told us that these pictures have changed their minds about killing their children. We cite many examples below and could cite many more.

*The Contra Costa Times*, November 27, 2001, carried a story which began “Anti-Abortion Display Hits The Road.”

Calling the trucks a ‘sensationalist demonstration,’ a Planned Parenthood official said accurate information on birth control -- not gore -- will help reduce the number of abortions.

‘Let’s face it -- the real purpose of this kind of demonstration is to stir up emotions,’ said Mitzi Sales, vice president for external affairs at Planned Parenthood’s regional headquarters in Concord [CA].

Ms. Sales is only half wrong. We *are* trying to stir up emotions -- such as regret -- among those guilty of complicity or complacency in the deaths of babies.

## THE TRUE MEASURE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Not everyone, of course, thinks the trucks are ineffective. An educator recently sent us an E-mail expressing the opposite point of view concerning the likely impact of the photos on her students. She said:

I teach 8th grade English at a public school and want you to know that the majority of my students see nothing wrong with abortion. I have long believed that if they actually saw the results of "choice" that most would be sickened and would change their minds. I cannot show this kind of photo at school, but the kids of today need to see just what abortion does do to a baby. Thank you for doing what I legally cannot do.

Our pictures are also effective with college age students. *The Detroit Free Press*, July 26, 2001, ran a piece about CBR under the headline "Billboards On Trucks Carry Graphic Photos:"

The mobile billboard project is the second national campaign by the Center to bring graphic images of abortion to audiences that haven't sought them. The first is a college campus display called the Genocide Awareness Project [GAP], which has visited universities nationwide and in Canada. It was displayed at the University of Michigan and Eastern Michigan University last fall and prompted angry opposition at both campuses. Andrew Shirvell, a U-M senior and president of Students for Life, said the project gave a tremendous boost to his organization, however. 'It raised the issue to a level it has never been before.'

The reason for this "boost" can be seen in an article appearing in *YahooNews*, Thursday, September 6, 2001. It quoted a South Florida motorist who spoke while looking at our trucks:

'These pictures are horrible. But you know what, it makes you think twice about actually ...[having an abortion]. It really does,' bystander Margo DeJesus said.

On Friday, November 16, 2001, we received yet another encouraging E-mail from a pregnant college student. She had just seen on our Website the same aborted embryo and early fetus pictures we display on the trucks. Some of these photos had initially been E-mailed to her by a friend (apparently aware of her dilemma) who had come to our site via Yahoo:

I am a 22 years [sic] old Spanish girl. I got pregnant by my ex. He wants me to get an abortion and he says that he is not going to be responsible for my child. I was thinking on it because I am in college and I don't have anything done yet. But I was looking at this [sic] pictures and this is horrible. I don't know how people can easily kill like this. I'm going to keep my baby.

Literally a moment ago, I received two similar E-mails, the first from a young woman who had also just seen our abortion photos. She said the pictures "opened my eyes as to what truly happens during an abortion -- which [sic] I had known this ten years ago." We are left to wonder whether she is referring to an abortion she thinks she would not have elected had she been showed the truth back then. The second note came from a woman who said "It is impossible to walk away from seeing these pictures without being seriously effected [sic]."

Through our Website, we have received countless messages confirming the transforming impact of aborted baby pictures. Here are just a few:

-- I was thinking of [having an] abortion because may [sic] children are gonna be less than 2 years apart but after reading everything and looking at the pictures I can't do it.

-- Your photos changed me from pro-choice to pro-life. More has got to be done to educate the public on the true horrors of abortion. Please continue to spread your word any way you can. This is truly a cause that cannot be ignored. I think it should be mandatory for every woman who is to undergo this surgery to see photos like these so they too would understand exactly what is taking place.

-- Today, as I returned from lunch, we were behind two of your trucks that were followed by a police car. I was amazed. I had seen abortion pictures online before but seeing them in public is stunning. I visited your Website and read much of the literature offered there. I am glad that your organization supports crisis pregnancy centers and other loving alternatives to abortion. Love does conquer all .... These depictions are horrific and offensive, but they do have a value by grabbing our attention .... I have always been a vocal opponent to abortion and thought I was doing my part by voicing my opinion and discussing it with my family and others. But seeing your trucks, and visiting your Website, made me question if I am really doing my part. I am newly resolved to provide financial and prayer support to the local crisis pregnancy center to partially fulfill my responsibility towards 'the least of these.'

-- I was driving to work this morning at 8am on the 405 freeway Northbound alongside of the convoy .... I read the trucks and I noticed the law enforcement type car following behind. I noted the Website, and looked it up when I got to work. I read the article and got chills. I think it is a very graphic and straightforward way to get the point across but you are absolutely right about what abortion is and what it does. It was a very sobering visual affront, but people need to know. I have had an abortion and I can tell you this ... I could feel the life being pulled out of my womb and almost

as though my fetus was screaming .... I think your campaign will help many women choose NOT to have an abortion.

## PHOTO FRAUD

Neo-Nazi skinheads respond to photo evidence of the Holocaust by asserting that the pictures are fake. Abortionists sometimes do the same thing with abortion photos. If our pictures are accurate, they know they have no moral argument with which to defend abortion. The following E-mail quote from a frustrated young woman is typical: "Your photos are complete and utter fabrication, a fetus at 8 weeks has no fingers, [expletive], how dense do you think people are?" First of all, at eight weeks the baby is an embryo, not a fetus, but more to the point, this lady is apparently unaware that every embryology text teaches the following: The digital rays which become fingers begin to form in the embryonic hand disk five weeks after fertilization and deepen into ridges and grooves during the sixth week. Webbed fingers then emerge and begin to separate through the seventh week. Fully individual digits have formed by eight weeks. People who are pro-abortion want greatly to believe that the baby doesn't look like a baby. Our pictures prove otherwise.

Ignorance and denial are to be expected from a misinformed public, but when professional baby killers make shocking misstatements of fact concerning abortion, it is difficult to believe that they don't really know the truth.

*The Oakland [Michigan] Press*, October 23, 2001, printed a story called "Abortion Foes To Take Message On The Road."

Judy Karandjeff, a spokeswoman for Planned Parenthood Associated of Michigan, said she does not believe the

group's campaign is effective because most people have already made up their minds, either for or against abortion.

\* \* \*

'We are concerned about the tactics they use and the visuals they use, which are inaccurate,' [Judy] Karandjeff said. 'They would not be representative of the majority of abortions that take place in this country.'

Ms. Karandjeff is wrong. 90% of abortions occur in the first trimester of pregnancy and *all* of our truck photos depict first trimester babies.

*World Net Daily*, August 3, 2001, reported a story entitled "Controversial Billboard Trucks Roll On."

Jon Dunn, president of Planned Parenthood of Orange and San Bernardino Counties, told *The Orange County Register* the mobile billboards give inaccurate embryo and fetal ages to make them appear more developed.

Mr. Dunn is wrong. *All* our age captions have been verified by physicians and a pathologist who are experts in this field. One example of this type of authentication can be found in a letter provided to us by Anthony P. Levatino, MD, JD. Because Dr. Levatino is both a physician and an attorney, he speaks with unusual authority in evidentiary matters:

I, the undersigned, having performed induced abortions earlier in my career, have examined the photos depicting the aborted human embryos and fetuses used by the Center For Bio-Ethical Reform in their public education projects ([www.abortionNO.org](http://www.abortionNO.org)). It is my professional opinion that the photos depict aborted human embryos and fetuses and that the depicted aborted human embryos and fetuses are

accurately captioned as to age, in weeks from fertilization.

*Feminist Majority Foundation Online*, August 23, 2001, reports "Misleading Anti-Abortion Billboards Causing Congestion on Freeways."

The anti-abortion extremist group, Center For Bio-Ethical Reform, continues to harass, endanger and misinform the American public, as it takes to the streets in large trucks with pictures of aborted fetuses this month.

The feminists are wrong. We never "harass." We merely drive. The pictures, however, are another story. We never "endanger." We merely save unborn babies and their moms from danger. We never "misinform." We only make it more difficult for The Feminist Majority and their kindred spirits to misinform.

As noted above, *The Orange County Register*, July 25, 2001, carried a story called "Abortion Foes Drive Point Home" with a subhead which read "Trucks Emblazoned With Graphic Images Of Fetuses Shock Some Commuters:"

Critics maintain the images are distortions – 'tremendously enlarged to cause greater impact,' [Linda] Schwarz [co-chairman, Pro-Choice, Orange County] said.

Ms. Schwarz is wrong. All of our aborted baby photos also depict objects which can be used as size references. In terms of people's perception of the image, the size of the photo, therefore, makes no difference whatsoever.

*The Washington Times*, August 23, 2001, published a feature entitled "A Vehicle For Change:"

Feminist Majority Foundation Vice President Katherine

Spillar, who is based in Los Angeles, says the campaign will accomplish only traffic accidents 'and make people mad. The typical abortion is done at 8 weeks or less and when we are talking about a pre-embryo the size of a grain of rice. Women know from their experience that those photos aren't what an abortion is.'

Ms. Spillar is wrong. Outside the lexicon of pro-abortion propaganda, there is no such thing as a "pre-embryo." This is a political term with no basis in science. The "crown to rump" length of an embryo eight weeks after fertilization is the same size as a quarter (as in twenty-five cent coin). An embryo the size of a "grain of rice" would be three to four weeks after fertilization, at which age hardly any abortions are ever committed. Concerning what women "know from their experience", women are almost never shown their aborted baby.

In a story (noted above) which begins with the phrase "Pro-Life Caravan Targets Florida," *The Miami Herald* reports in its September 5th edition that:

It is 'abortion distortion' said Joyce Tarnow, administrator and president of the Women's Clinic in Fort Lauderdale. Tarnow, an abortion provider for 25 years, said ... 'What is removed looks nothing like these pictures.'

Ms. Tarnow is wrong. What is "removed" looks exactly like these pictures because these pictures are taken of exactly what is removed. We know that because we take the pictures ourselves and we take them at abortion clinics.

Here is an E-mail from a pro-abort who not only accuses us of altering the pictures, she says we manufactured *bogus* "experts" with whom to authenticate our "fake photos."

For your information, Pro Choice people are NOT pro 'abortion' we simply would rather have THREE options to us instead of TWO! How dare you think it's right to take away our rights to choose .... I think you need to take this Website and shove it. You all are nothing but sickening frauds. Pro 'abortion' doesn't exist. And YOU know it. Call yourselves professionals? Puhleez! You need to be a little more educated on this subject. Oh sure you can make up FAKE medical professionals. Anyways, Pro choice does NOT NOT NOT NOT Mean pro abortion. GET THAT RIGHT! Morons.

These pictures produce some serious anger. Someone who thinks it should be legal to lynch African Americans is a racist and someone who thinks it should be legal to abort unborn babies is a pro-abort. Would we call lynchers "pro-choice?" No, but at one time lynchers wanted to be called proponents of "states' rights."

Allegations that CBR is guilty of "photo fraud" almost always come from abortionists but almost never from the general public. Some abortionists, for example, make the strange charge that our photos are actually pictures of stillborn and miscarried fetuses. This gambit doesn't even pass the snicker test. Obviously, neither stillbirth nor miscarriage will tear off a baby's arms and legs, or rip off its head and face or scald its skin with chemical burns. The bodies of the babies in our pictures all display the unmistakable injuries of abortion. It should again be noted that we took all of our photos at abortion clinics. Women don't typically go to abortion clinics to miscarry pregnancies. They go to have their babies killed. If pro-aborts are going to lie, surely they can do better than these feeble falsehoods.

As regards suggestions that we misrepresent late term babies as embryos or early fetuses, no accusation is more

easily debunked. As noted above, every one of our photos includes some common object which acts as a size reference. When CBR conducts our Genocide Awareness displays on college campuses, we carry medical textbooks (also quoted on our Website) which can be used by skeptics to confirm the accuracy of the age captions on our aborted baby pictures. Our accusers need only compare our size references to the textbooks' prenatal development scales. We encourage anyone who wishes to verify the truth to compare our pictures with the embryology photos in the following academic texts, used in medical schools the world over:

The first source is the authoritative, *William's Obstetrics*, 20th Edition, Gary Cunningham, MD, Paul C. MacDonald, MD, Norman F. Gant, MD, Kenneth J. Leveno, MD, Larry C. Gilstrap III, MD, Gary D. V. Hankins, MD & Steven L. Clark, MD (Copyright 1997 by Appleton and Lange, A Simon & Schuster Company) beginning at page 1026, Table 44-4, "Predicted Menstrual Age (MA) in Weeks From Crown-Rump Length (CRL) Measurements (in Centimeters)."

CBR's physicians also use a highly regarded book called *The Color Atlas of Clinical Embryology*, 2nd Edition, Keith L. Moore, T.V.N. Persaud & Kohei Shiota (Copyright 2000 by W. B. Saunders Company) at page 49, Table 2-1, "Criteria for Estimating Developmental Stages in Human Embryos." This reference contains age to crown-rump length relationships, etc. from 19-21 days post-conception through 56 days (the end of the embryonic period). At page 52, Table 3-1, you will find criteria for establishing age through the fetal period, including age-crown-rump length relationships from 9 weeks through 38.

Dr. Moore has also published a popular text entitled *The*

*Developing Human, Clinically Oriented Embryology*, Keith L. Moore & T.V.N. Persaud, 6th Edition, (Copyright 1998 by W.B. Saunders) which can be used for aging unborn babies by turning to page 91 (see also, tables on pages 4 through 7).

How persuasive is all this supporting evidence? If the skeptic is inquiring in bad faith, no amount of evidence will be convincing. Pro-aborts would deny that the photos were legitimate even if they had taken them themselves. After the release of the “smoking gun” video in which Osama bin Laden took credit for planning the September 11th attacks, his fanatical loyalists simply said the tape was fake. *The Los Angeles Times*, December 14, 2001, reported a story which began with the phrase “Tape Stirs Widespread Doubt in Already Skeptical Arab World.” The article quotes a true fanatic: ‘This tape is fabricated evidence,’ declared Hani Sibaii, a London-based Islamist.” *The Orange County Register*, on the same day, carried a similar story headlined “Tape stirs up divisions.” It read “Of course it is fabricated said Dia’a Rashwan, a Cairo-based expert on Islamic movements ....” Also on the 14th, MSNBC.com carried a story headlined “Reaction To Bin Laden Tape Mixed.” Egyptian Moatez Mohamed said “I think the American government has made the tape and America can do anything by modern technology and computer.”

Concerning the authenticity of CBR’s “evidence,” any good faith questioner will be easily satisfied. A reporter with *The San Francisco Chronicle* recently covered the truck project and his article (quoted above) was refreshingly free of allegations of “photo fraud.” When I thanked him for his even-handedness, he sent back an E-mail which said in part “Anyway, the issue of the photos did emerge in

conversations, but I chose to stay away from the topic because it seemed like you had all the evidence and anyone making accusations against you didn't. So you win." We do indeed "have all the evidence" but it is the public which wins when news organizations report with integrity.

If there is any humor in this grim topic, it is that the abortionists can't seem to keep their "fraud" stories straight. Tammy Sobieski, who works for a chain of abortion clinics called Women Care Centers Of Florida, was interviewed in September by Orlando, FL Channel 2 News and she contradicted many of her baby-killing colleagues by actually *confirming* the accuracy of our pictures: "I think what is disheartening for me is the lack of trust they [CBR] have in women that they think women don't know that that's [our photos] the reality of abortion." Either no one let her in on the smear campaign or she can't bring herself to lie about her victims.

Our counter punch to all this slander has been our hand-delivered warning letters (confusingly reported in news coverage quoted above) which threaten defamation lawsuits if the allegations are repeated. The letters also contain the aforementioned academic references which authenticate our photos. This gets CBR over the legal hurdle of proving that subsequent allegations were made with knowledge of their falsity or in reckless disregard of the truth. CBR must do more than merely prove that the pro-abort statement was false because we are considered by law to be "public figures." This status requires a higher standard of proof to prevail against anyone defaming us. It is amazing how quickly our detractors toned down their rhetoric when the warning letters began to go out.

INTERNET DIALOGUE

Even pro-lifers sometimes criticize our trucks, frequently on the theory that trucks don't afford opportunities for dialogue with passersby. Au contraire! (which, loosely translated, is French for "no way"). Nearly everywhere we operate the trucks we get newspapers writing about the project (read them on our Website at [www.abortioNNO.org](http://www.abortioNNO.org)) and then the television news crews start calling. Last but not least, we are swamped with invitations to appear on radio talk shows -- many of them hosted by hostile liberals. Hundreds of thousands of listeners have heard us defend life against the arguments of angry callers.

Our Website also provides an E-mail forum for lively debate. In fact, last week it received more than *fourteen thousand* visits. This average of two thousand visits per day rivals the traffic on many commercial sites and our viewers are coming in from all over the world. A recent printout of countries from which visitors accessed our site included Russia, Chile, Canada, Italy, Ukraine, Australia, Poland, Estonia, Japan, Mexico, Malaysia, Germany, Columbia, Singapore, United Kingdom, Spain, New Zealand, Indonesia, Argentina, Sweden, Netherlands, Taiwan, Belgium, Portugal, Denmark, Hungary, France, China, Austria, Brazil, Philippines, Trinidad and Tobago, Norway, Guatemala, Turkey, Switzerland, Belize, Czech Republic, Israel, Cyprus, Nicaragua, South Africa, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Pakistan, Ireland, Finland, Uruguay, Vietnam and Ecuador.

News coverage of our truck project has also dominated countless Internet chat room discussions (see [www.970wfla.com](http://www.970wfla.com)). Here are some more excerpts from the messages people E-mail in response to our photos -- and this list doesn't include the hundreds of phone messages we receive. One such message was left by a woman who told us that somebody should "blow up our building." Another

was from a man who said "you should all die."

[Loves Us Not] -- Get your trucks off my highway. I almost had an acute case of road rage this morning on the way to work, stuck in an already frustrating traffic jam, when I saw your disgusting trucks. As the father of two children, I was sickened by your graphic displays. Regardless of politics, your truck campaign is blatant sensationalism and therefore totally unethical -- would you recommend gun control advocates drive trucks around with graphic photos of gunshot victims? Or seatbelt advocates with photos of car-crash victims? Well, your trucks nearly caused me to have an accident, and left me feeling queasy for hours. Although I am a busy working- and family-man, I will take the time to press Oakland [CA] politicians to keep your trucks off the I-80!! The thought of my 5-year-old daughter (or any children) being subjected to your revolting trucks is so enraging ....

CBR note: Nobody is confused about whether gun shots or car crashes are acts of violence which kill human beings who are entitled to rights of personhood. So pictures are unnecessary to dispel those kinds of misapprehensions. But many people are confused about whether abortions are acts of violence which kill human beings who are entitled to rights of personhood. Pictures of abortion do, in fact, clarify that confusion.

[Loves Us] -- I recently read an article about your Reproductive "Choice" Campaign on WorldNetDaily.com and I wanted to commend you on this brilliant strategy. These ads unavoidably point out the moral depravity, logical contradictions, and horrific violence involved in the pro-"choice" positions by making viewers immediately uncomfortable with the obvious implications of this perverted perspective marketed as 'choice.'

[Loves Us Not] -- SHAME ON YOU! How do you define terrorism ... religious fanatics trying to terrorize American citizens by driving around with rolling displays of oversized photographs of mutilated fetuses. Keep your religious beliefs to yourselves and stay out of Northern California.

CBR note: Who said anything about religion?

[Loves Us] -- Hooray for you!!!!!! I was absolutely ELATED when I read the article in WorldNetDaily about your truck convoy. What a fantastic way to expose the evil of abortion .... What you're doing takes tremendous courage and I just can't commend you enough!

[Loves Us Not] -- PREGNANT WOMEN, CHILDREN AND NORMAL PEOPLE DO NOT NEED TO BE SUBJECT TO YOUR PROFANITY. SHAME ON YOU. YOU WILL NOT WIN YOUR CASE THIS WAY. JUST A BUNCH OF RADICALS PUTTING YOUR PICTURES IN PEOPLES FACES. HOW DARE YOU !!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

CBR note: Killing these babies is right but showing them is wrong?

[Loves Us] -- I first found out about your trucks in the *OC Register* and I was so proud of you!!! ... I just finished reading the letters people have sent you and wow! you are pushing some buttons, GOOD!! All those people that feel offended and call you names and insults will get my prayers! May God Bless You and please, please, please DO NOT STOP EVER!!

[Loves Us Not] -- Well you sick [expletive] got your religious fanatic message out even here in Florida. You are doing more harm for your sicko organization. I will spread the word that you are a bunch of freaks. Abortion is a personal choice

in which you morons have no choice in [sic]. Stop trying to tell people what to do. You freaks would not like me telling you what to do with personal choices. What about rape pregnancies???? Is that evil to you bigots...? The un-born is just that...UN BORN. You wanted a response well here it is [expletive] YOU!"

CBR note: Our truck signs don't tell anyone to do or refrain from doing anything. They merely depict a dead baby with the word "CHOICE." Perhaps it is this person's barely functioning conscience which is telling him/her "what to do." As to rape, killing the baby won't "unrape" his mother. It won't take away her injury or even her memory of the sexual assault. Abortion will merely compound one painful memory with another. Let's offer the rape victim real help by giving her real support and eventually arranging a loving adoption if that would really help. It would certainly help the baby and its new parents. It could also reduce the injury done the rape victim.

[Loves Us] -- I just read about your mighty convoy rockin' through California, and had to write and say, 'Bravo!' The reason so many are offended is that you're effective in spreading your message this way. The power of pictures!

[Loves Us Not] -- YOU GUYS ARE AN ABSOLUTE DISGRACE TO SOCIETY. IT IS AN INDIVIDUALS [sic] RIGHT TO CHOOSE; GOD HELP YOU IF ONE OF YOUR TEENAGE DAUGHTERS ARE RAPED AND BECOME IMPREGNATED WITH HER RAPIST'S BABY. OR BETTER YET, IF DADDY OR UNCLE BOB HAVE SEX WITH HER AND SHE BECOMES PREGNANT WITH YOUR HUSBAND'S, SON'S, ETC. CHILD. WOULD YOU BE SO QUICK TO FORCE THESE PHOTOS DOWN HER THROAT THEN????

CBR note: "Force down throats?" Every viewer has the right to look away. We don't force anything on anyone. But this writer's assumption seems to be that many mothers won't be able to kill their children once they have seen what abortion is and does. This assumption is correct if the mother has a functioning conscience. Is a baby less human because it is conceived in incest? Why kill the child in a misguided attempt to help her mother? Shouldn't we help them both?

[Loves Us] -- I read the article in the *OC Register* regarding your trucks going up and down the freeways in Southern California, and I say "RIGHT ON!" ... When I read how well thought out every aspect of your truck caravans were, I marveled at your ingenuity.

[Loves Us Not] -- Congratulations you stupid [expletive]. Your truck campaign [sic] pissed me off so much that I have decided to donate \$10,000 to pro-choice! Many of my dot-com millionaire friends feel the same way. Whoops. Guess your little scheme backfired!

CBR note: "Backfired?" Does this person really believe that Planned Parenthood will become more effective through the donation of additional money? They are rolling in cash! What would they do differently with more? What a hollow threat.

[Loves Us] -- Absolutely AWESOME! I watched Fox11 news last night and they profiled your convoy campaign. There are so many people out there who don't even think before having an abortion. With your graphic trucks, people can't help but THINK!! Thanks and GOD BLESS YOU ALL!

[Loves Us Not] -- If ever, even once, my child is with me in a car & we pass one of your trucks, it will be your responsibility to pay for his therapy. If you're so concerned about children,

how about concerning yourself with those children you expose to your drummed-up carnage.

CBR note: If abortion is such a good thing, why would the sight of it drive a child into psychotherapy? If a mere glance at the results of an abortion is that damaging, perhaps it should be against the law. Maybe this writer should care a little more about the *lives* of unborn children than the *feelings* of born children.

[Loves Us] -- Sad but true. Keep up the good work. As more and more people see these horrible pictures, it will make them start thinking that, 'Yes, these are really babies and this is murder.'

[Loves Us Not] -- That has to be the lamest Website I've ever seen. You say you're against abortion. Well, get raped and then see how you feel you 1950-age morons. And let's see; I suppose you disagree with stem-cell research as well, right? It would figure you wouldn't support it, even though it promises to cure any degenerative disease. Congratulations, you win the 'Most Inane Website of the Year' award, and will be featured on <http://miller.axisproductions.com>.

CBR note: Killing a human being two weeks into his existence is morally indistinguishable from killing him two years later. The only real difference between these homicides is age. When age is allowed to decide rights of personhood, the very young and the very old are in very big trouble -- because the babies and the elderly *consume* resources instead of *producing* them. By the way, the 1950's view of the unborn was rather more civilized than that of the late 20<sup>th</sup> Century but don't bother looking at this guy's Website, there is nothing there.

[Loves Us] -- My local TV news station did an article on your trucks on the evening news this evening. I have a message for you. Please, no matter who does what, don't give up doing what you're doing. I was dancing in my living room as I watched. The cameras, the follow cars, the letters to the local police departments---you've covered all the bases. My family not only considers what you do as exceptional, we call it magnificent!

[Loves Us Not] -- I can see walking horror every day and I don't think your stupid (yes stupid) truck idea will do anything to solve that. Your single-mindedness is not helping and the tactic smacks of Hollywood sensationalism, no wonder no one I know takes you, or your ideas, seriously. Have a good day (don't waste any time helping the ones already here) and look out while you're on our streets.

CBR note: Here is the threat of violence which characterizes so many of the messages we receive from pro-aborts. Hollywood may “sensationalize” violence but we don't. We just report the unvarnished truth.

[Loves Us] -- I have wanted, for years, to see a campaign exactly like the one you are sponsoring. At last, at last! I have been quite choked up by this. Victory seems in view, all of a sudden.

[Loves Us Not] -- I have a lot of friends who believe that society needs to see horrific images because it is good for people to be desensitized. The same friends that do that like to visit your Website because they feel that your site has great images. As an example I am going to use your group. They hope that if enough people see images such as the ones depicted on the Website and by the trucks that eventually people will be so used to seeing these images

that getting an abortion will not be a big deal and it will actually be easier.

CBR note: This writer is confusing a strong stomach with a dead conscience. Repeated exposures to the carnage of gun shot wounds may make it is easier for a trauma surgeon to control his emotions in the emergency room; but if he has a functioning conscience, the sight of gore is unlikely to persuade him that gun shot wounds are a good thing. People with a severely diminished sense of right and wrong are beyond any persuasion short of spiritual rebirth. They may not be deterred by pictures of aborted babies but few will say "That looks cool, where can I get one."

[Loves Us] -- I am listening to you on John and Ken show and God bless you for getting this out into the public. It is radical, however no more radical than PETA throwing blood on people wearing fur. Where is that outrage?

[Loves Us Not] -- I don't believe in abortion, but I do agree with what one caller calls your display. It is a form of pornography. I don't wish to see it -- period. I believe that what you are doing is very clever and I wish that there were a better way for you people to get your desperate message out. But this will traumatize children. At the present time there are no laws governing your displays on public transportation corridors. But give it time! I would be the first one in line to sign my name towards a class action lawsuit against this kind of abuse of personal liberties. Do you really think that these disgusting photos are going to change peoples' minds significantly? They are not. If you put planes and such into the air [to tow aerial banners displaying aborted baby photos] be prepared for war, because there are a lot of people that will take serious efforts to shoot you down. And over sporting events! For the love of God -- stop

it. You are worse than the cure.

CBR note: This person is so committed to complacency that he/she will give up his/her First Amendment rights to maintain it. The abortionists don't seem to bother him/her as much as we do. In point of fact, America isn't "bothered" nearly enough about abortion. As noted above, we intend to change that. And, of course, here again is the threat of violence.

[Loves Us] -- Heard you on KFI today. Great job! Congratulations and Hats off! Rushed to send you some money .... Thanks for a fantastic idea and for a very, very good job on the radio today! I found myself screaming out of my car window - Go Gregg Go! God bless you!

[Loves Us Not] -- I witnessed your gross display of aborted fetuses. Yes, it was horrible. What is just as horrible is your chosen venue. There are good ways of making a case for your point of view. Obviously, you didn't choose one. Your behavior is unforgivable. This is an outrage to me and I consider myself pro-life. What is your next step...to start killing the doctors? I see you as sick and evil people with twisted hating souls. And may God see the hatred in your hearts as well.

CBR note: Unmasking the horror of abortion makes us potential murders? Talk about a "twisted hating soul!"

[Loves Us] -- Please tell me how I may be involved in your project. I heard Gregg Cunningham on the Stand to Reason show with Greg Koukl.....what a powerful and anointed voice.

[Loves Us Not] -- After my grade school grandchildren saw your shocking and tasteless photos on one of your trucks,

me and my family were outraged. Not all of us were previously sympathetic to your cause but you have now made our entire family unanimous...every single family member is now utterly opposed to your organization.

CBR note: But our organization isn't trying to win a popularity contest. We don't care so much what people think of us as we care what they think of abortion. We are quite willing to get them angry at us if that's what it takes to get them angry at baby killing.

[Loves Us] -- Just heard you on the radio. Go! Go! Go! BE ENCOURAGED! I thank the Lord for your opportunity on KFI. Your representative was SOOOOOO winsome. Great links too on this Website. You have your arguments DOWN! EXCELLENT!

[Loves Us Not] -- Your unwarranted display of pornographic material on the freeway this morning is contemptible at best. Terrorists like you will stop at nothing to get your message heard. Your morality is suspect, your methods reprehensible and your character non-existent, so much for your ethics! If I had been on your side, I would certainly be against your cause now. I shall urge my Congressman to have your organization declared "terrorist" so that NO financial aid can be given to your reprehensible organization by any law abiding US citizen.

CBR note: Terrorists use weapons of war to kill and destroy. Their purpose is to create a climate of fear that will produce a "desired" political outcome. We neither "kill nor destroy" but we do use weapons-grade photos that are a "terror" to those who are complicit or complacent regarding abortion. Of course, we *do* desire a political outcome which criminalizes abortion (for the abortionist, that is). If that

makes us “terrorists,” the term should be used advisedly.

[Loves Us] -- I heard Greg [sic] on the John and Ken program on KFI and was extremely impressed with his message, his composure, his logic, and his passion. Thank God for the work you are doing! It's no surprise that the majority of callers were appalled at your campaign. I think it is brilliant because it forces people to deal with the reality that abortion is murder.

[Loves Us Not] -- Who whipped up the little hands and feet on the blob of protoplasm? What are you people thinking? You may have your point of view but there is no need to inflict your extremist and backwoods fetish on the rest of us. Those trucks? Disgusting. If I see one, I'll be sure to throw eggs at it. Embryo for embryo! Please cease the baby-smear campaign. It's too bad most people aren't quick enough to recognize **BLATANTLY MODIFIED PHOTOGRAPHS** and **NAZI INSPIRED PROPAGANDA TACTICS**. And by the way, you suck.

CBR note: If abortion is such a good idea, why do pictures of it make its defenders so angry?

[Loves Us] -- I heard your wonderful representative on KFI today and I just want to say, "Bravo" for his eloquent and dignified presentation on the radio.

[Loves Us Not] -- While on the freeway here in San Diego I came across two of your ‘illustrated’ trucks. The pictures were so disgusting that traffic refused to pass them, staying well behind and clogging lanes ... causing potential traffic accidents. Since you seem compelled to shock people and misrepresent the abortion debate, you then won't mind if I tell you that you're simply ... [expletive] nuts! Keep this

...[expletive] off my roads. If you think you're gaining support, your ...[expletive] stupid as well as nuts. Nothing like dumb-[expletive] moral crusaders like yourselves to make me affirm my opposition to the kind of archaic, fundamentalist, jingoistic crap you people portray as 'sensible reasoning.' You're doing a great job of making converts to the other side.

CBR note: We have now been operating our trucks for fully six months and have not caused a single accident. Aborted baby pictures don't "misrepresent" the abortion debate, they force it and insure that it is well informed. As to our sanity, we actually question it from time to time ourselves. We don't, however, intend to "convert" people such at this one. We are aiming this kind of project at people who still possess a civilized sense of good and evil. Most people do, but not everyone. *The San Francisco Daily Review*, December 4, 2001, carried an opinion editorial concerning our truck project. Columnist Rory Laverty writes that our trucks obscure the 'painful stories' of women who abort. He quotes a young mother who 'terminates:'

'The strange thing was that even though I knew I was going to kill the baby, I stopped smoking and taking medication, because I didn't want to hurt it,' she said.

\* \* \*

'I just felt empty, literally and figuratively,' she said. 'I think of it all the time. People say it gets better -- but the only thing that has improved is the ability to numb myself. The hollow feeling doesn't go away, and it probably never will.'

Perhaps like our E-mail writer, this woman feels guilty enough to be haunted but not guilty enough to be deterred. The pictures just won't work with someone whose sense of right and wrong is badly impaired.

[Loves Us] -- I praise your work with the truck pictures... I also would like to suggest that you consider smaller pictures that we 'civilians' could put on our cars just like the new advertising program now being done. I'll bet you could have millions of pictures on our cars in a few months. Once again, thanks for your service.

[Loves Us Not] -- Since you don't have the good sense to mind your own business, don't be surprised when the citizens of the Bay Area treat your disgusting convoy like the evil, wicked, un-American, lying propaganda it is. I plan to make extra donations to NARAL, CARAL and Planned Parenthood, aside from my normal giving, during the period when your Convoy of Female Oppression is in the Bay Area. Freedom of choice is legal in this country and I and many others aim to make sure it stays that way. Your organization is not better than the Taliban. You seek to oppress women through attempting to legislate your repressive morality, just like the Taliban. Your operatives know that if you control a country's women, that you control everything through fear. That's how the Taliban did it, and that's exactly what your organization seeks to achieve.

CBR note: It is 'evil, wicked, and un-American' to kill babies, not to show them. It is 'lying propaganda' to portray abortion as a morally neutral way of resolving crisis pregnancies. Finally, the term 'Taliban' has become the latest ad hominem with which the political left seeks to change the subject when caught defending the indefensible.

[Loves Us] -- I saw the pictures and they are so heart-

sickening, but I and others need to see and really know what happens during an abortion. I have never seen such graphic pictures. Thank you for all you do.

[Loves Us Very Not] -- May the scum suck ... [expletive] of your organization rot in their own (and very personal) ... [expletive] hell for the trauma my wife has experienced. Should I meet one of your 'trucks' on the road, I do hope they are 'well protected'. There are folks out there who might be itching to play a game of hard-ball your drivers might find 'interesting'.

CBR note: More threats of violence. People who use violence to eliminate annoying unborn babies may also be capable of using it to eliminate annoying pro-life activists. That is why we wear body armor and travel in the company of armed, off-duty police officers.

[Loves Us] -- [From someone identifying herself as a 17 year old female.] At first I was pro-choice but after viewing [the photos on] this Website am having doubts. This Website change [sic] my way of thinking.

[Loves Us Not] -- To whichever fanatic that is running the asylum, I feel that your 'choice' campaign is terrible. Nobody needs to see those pictures, especially children. How does one explain that image to a child? How did you explain it to your child? But then again, you are just raising another lunatic for your asylum. Now, you 'pro-life' people preach that abortion is killing, but yet you 'pro-life' people blow up abortion clinics and shoot the doctors that run them. And just how is that 'pro-life'? But you fanatics don't think about that sort of thing, do you???? You don't see 'pro-choice' people going around blowing up your disgusting trucks, do you??? But then again, you would probably like that to happen so

you could add that to your advertising campaign. Why don't you all get at least half a brain and realize just how inappropriate your trucks are and take them off the streets.

CBR note: You explain an aborted baby image to a child in the same way you explain images of airliners exploding into skyscrapers. You reassure the child that you will protect him from harm. You explain that sometimes people do evil things, but violence against innocent victims is never acceptable behavior. You emphasize that love is better than hate and generosity is better than selfishness. Unless you think Peter Jennings, Dan Rather and Tom Brokaw are "lunatics" for showing horrifying images of terror to children, your view of our activities is curious indeed. Every week millions of children see shocking terror pictures on the covers of news magazines in the check-out lines at supermarkets, etc. Are the editors of these publications "lunatics?" When you accuse us of complicity in attacks on abortionists and their facilities you are associating yourself with the racists who disingenuously blamed Martin Luther King for the violence of the Black Panthers. It is a crude attempt to change the subject. It didn't work when the Klan did it, and it doesn't work when it is pulled by pro-aborts. Every successful campaign of social reform has historically been waged by activists who publicly displayed horrifying pictures to dramatize injustice. They made injustice impossible for a complicit culture to camouflage. Remember the disturbing photos used by the civil rights movement? Remember anti-Vietnam War activists and shocking imagery from the battlefield? 'Inappropriate' is an inappropriate term for mainstream tactics of social reform -- tactics which will always be normative behavior for political activists.

**FORCE-FEEDING FACTS**

*The San Francisco Chronicle*, November 24, 2001, in an article entitled "Abortion Foes Plan A Convoy, Pictures Of Fetuses Displayed On Trucks," also made our point that the trucks make abortion impossible to dodge. The article begins with the statement "This is not the usual -- nor avoidable -- display occasionally seen outside a few Planned Parenthood facilities in the Bay Area." That is the very complaint offered by abortion provider Jane Gerhardt of the National Women's Health Organization. In a September television news interview on Channel 6 in Orlando, FL she said of our trucks:

If they had picked a hall and sat down and said we are offering information to people who want to come – fine, that way people would have a choice. People on I-4 had no choice.

This, of course, is what racists told the civil rights activists who wanted to stage a protest march from Selma to Montgomery, Alabama in 1965. No one much cared what they had to say as long as they stayed in the black church and didn't bother any white people. Effective reform never begins until people are bothered enough to finally engage. Supporters of injustice will always try to keep reformers from confronting those who are indifferent.

## CHILDREN

*The Orange County Register*, July 25, 2001, carried a story called "Abortion Foes Drive Point Home" with a subhead which read "Trucks Emblazoned With Graphic Images Of Fetuses Shock Some Commuters." "It's distasteful and very inappropriate for children to see," said Linda Schwarz, co-chairwoman of Pro-Choice Orange County [California]. "It's a low kind of tactic."

*The Orlando Sentinel*, in its September 6, 2001, issue, reported a story under the headline "Anti-Abortion Convoy Cruises I-4 Today," in which abortionist Gerhardt offers another complaint:

'Little kids [in cars] will see this' said Jane Gerhardt of the National Women's Health Organization, Orlando abortion clinic.

\* \* \*

A spokeswoman for the Catholic Diocese of Orlando's Respect Office said the church does not support the tour.

*The Oracle* (Univ. South Florida) September 5, 2001, in an article headlined "Fetus Truck Tour Rolls Into Tampa" reports:

Eddie Gilley, area director for the Baptist Christian Ministries at USF said he is a supporter of the pro-life movement but doesn't agree with the tactics being employed. He said the fact that young children riding on the roadways may come in contact with the pictures is disturbing.

\* \* \*

Gilley said the streets are not the place for such a display but a college campus is a good forum for the debate.

It is sad but true that the church works as hard as Planned Parenthood to cover up the horror of abortion. But concerning children, our pictures hurt the feelings of born children and save the lives of unborn children everywhere they are displayed. For that reason, CBR plans truck routes which consciously avoid elementary school, daycare centers, playgrounds, etc. There is no public forum,

however, that is not occasionally visited by children. Saying we can't show these pictures anywhere that the occasional child might inadvertently see them is tantamount to saying we can't show them anywhere that large numbers of adults are likely to see them. That is a double standard to which we will not submit. We care very much about the *feelings* of born children but we care more about the *lives* of unborn children. We *are* more pro-life than pro-*feelings*.

## RATIONALE

The pro-aborts have framed the abortion issue in terms of "choice." We must reframe it as a careful consideration of *what is being chosen*. Public opinion surveys reveal that only a small minority of Americans support "pregnancy termination" in the second and third trimesters – especially if performed by "partial-birth" abortion. A large majority, however, supports a right of abortion if committed in the first trimester of pregnancy. This fact is problematic from a pro-life perspective because The Centers For Disease Control report that some 90% of abortions are committed in the first three months of pregnancy.

These same surveys also disclose that public support for early abortion derives from the inaccurate perception that the first trimester baby is a mere "blob of tissue." In contrast, most Americans see the mid and late-term fetus as a real "baby" whose level of gestational development entitles it to rights of personhood. It is also clear that few Americans believe a suction abortion to be the moral equivalent of a "partial-birth abortion." We, therefore, conclude that it is vital to convince the public that the first trimester baby is as fully entitled to rights of personhood as a more mature fetus and that even an early suction abortion is as indefensible an act of violence as any "partial-birth" abortion. Extensive focus

group research has proved conclusively that our pictures are the most means by which to achieve that goal.

The problem isn't merely that most people don't know any of this. It is that they don't want to know it. It's like the old joke about the pollster who asked a respondent which is the greater problem, "ignorance or indifference." The interviewee said "I don't know and I don't care." Concerning abortion, that sort of denial can only be penetrated with pictures.

For the first time in recent history, political conservatives are using shocking pictures to reform an unjust status quo which is being defended by political liberals. Our trucks are not the solution but they can make the solution possible. Until most Americans are convinced that early abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby, few will boycott businesses which support abortion, few will support pro-life candidates and few will take their crisis pregnancy to the crisis pregnancy center instead of the abortion clinic.

SEND HELP

*The Reader's Digest*, November, 2001, in an article called "Please Don't Call Me Mommy," said the following concerning fundraising:

During the last 15 years, the number of non-profit groups competing for donations has doubled to more than 750,000 says Michael Nilsen, public affairs manager at the Association of Fundraising Professionals.

Needless to say, the vast majority of those non-profit's are pulling donations away from the unborn. National Public Radio station KPCC in Los Angeles reported during its "Morning Edition" program on December 10, 2001 that the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation had just contributed a

quarter of a *billion* dollars to a group called Conservation International -- to save the environment. If only wealthy pro-life Christians could be persuaded to send that kind of money to pro-life groups – to save the unborn. It seems the secular world cares more about the environment than the church cares about the babies. And so it has always been.

On the eve of His crucifixion, Christ was moved to repeatedly exhort all but one of His disciples to remain awake while He prayed in the garden at Gethsemane. St. Thomas More observes that the only one of the twelve who was not asleep was Judas, the one who was serving Satan. He was wide awake. He was the energetic, self-starting, risk-taking servant of evil – while the church slept. How little things have changed.

Perhaps that is why, as pro-life groups struggle, *The Chicago Tribune*, October 31, 2001, quoted William Lutz, spokesman for the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARAL) as boasting that “The pro-choice community was very motivated [after September 11th] and fundraising has actually exceeded our goals.” NARAL goes on to exult that their donations are running 10% *ahead* of projections.

Abortion is happening with the permission of the church. The church is permitting to happen a genocide which God has given His people the where-with-all to stop. You, faithful reader, are among the few who claim Christ's name and also stand up for His little ones. The burden to fight abortion, therefore, falls disproportionately on you. Mark 12:42, describes Christ's observation of a poor widow contributing her "mite." In addition to seeing what she gave, He paid careful attention to what she kept. It is our prayer that you will keep as little as you must to give as much as you can.