



GREAT FEEDBACK FROM PENN STATE

The University of Florida was the next stop for the giant, horrifying, abortion pictures of The Genocide Awareness Project (GAP). But as we were preparing for the trip, CBR was still receiving gratifying reports on the impact of our earlier visit to Penn State. A few months after our time in Pennsylvania, PSU student newspaper columnist Peter Buck wrote an editorial which crowned us First Amendment champions for the zeal with which we exercised our free speech rights on behalf of the unborn – notwithstanding stiff competition from "pot protesters" and demonstrators representing the "lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered community." I think he meant it as a compliment.

As you read this newsletter, we hope you will compliment our work by supporting us with your time and money. By God's grace, we are doing some of the most important

projects in the pro-life movement, but we can't do them alone.

More importantly, Carol Phillips, who directs the crisis pregnancy center (CPC) just off the campus in State College, PA, wrote the following:

I wanted to let you know that we had a client come to us ... for a pregnancy test. Her test was positive and she was leaning toward aborting her child because she was afraid pregnancy would destroy the relationship she had with the baby's father. ...[W]hen we called to check on her she said she had decided to carry her child. Many months later she told me that she had seen the GAP display on campus during the time she was deciding whether or not to carry her child. *She said the pictures had a profound impact on her* [emphasis added].

* * *

Other points of interest concerning GAP were: 1) we had an approximate 60% increase in the number of clients during the months of May, June and July ... compared to the previous year; 2) we had three calls for post-abortion counseling the week following GAP and had only two during the entire previous year.

STOPPING THE DENIAL

The fact that GAP saves babies by stimulating visits to crisis pregnancy centers is not news, but it is encouraging. Traditionally, only a small percentage of the pregnant women who visit crisis pregnancy centers are actually considering abortion. Most of the women leaning toward abortion go to abortion clinics instead of crisis pregnancy centers because they want help *getting out* of crisis

pregnancies, not help *getting through* them. GAP changes the minds of many abortion-prone pregnant women by visually force-feeding facts which compel the conclusion that abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby. We assume that many have the conscience required to care about this now irrefutable fact, but even if none did, we would be no less obligated to expose this evil.

Our pictures prove that even an embryo is as much a baby as a full-term fetus. They also prove that a suction abortion is as savage an act of violence as any partial-birth abortion. This is important because a recent Wirthlin poll found that 53% of Americans believe that abortion should be *illegal* after a baby's heart begins to beat and 61% think it should be *against the law* after brain waves develop. These numbers reveal extensive public ignorance of the fact that a baby's heart begins to beat after 21 days and brain waves are measurable by 43 days. Since few abortions occur prior to 43 days, abortion could be effectively outlawed if these Americans were convinced that the embryo and early fetus were not mere blobs of tissue (this is crucial because 90% of abortions occur in the first twelve weeks of pregnancy). And that is what our pictures prove. But the importance of this achievement is an issue over which there is much difference of opinion in the pro-life movement.

CareNet, a nationwide consortium of crisis pregnancy centers, is promoting a nationwide billboard campaign which offers free pregnancy tests. It recently placed magazine ads which solicit money to fund this billboard project. The ads assert that "Most mothers give up their babies to abortionists because they don't know help is available at a nearby crisis pregnancy center." But the Family Research Council (FRC), a spin-off of Focus on the Family, has a different view. FRC has commissioned another Wirthlin study which finds that

among American women of child-bearing age, fully two-thirds have already heard of crisis pregnancy centers (contrary to CareNet's belief, Wirthlin says women *do* "know that help is available") and half even know whether there is a center in their area. That doesn't mean there is no merit in further raising the already high public awareness of CPCs. But an even more important priority should be the goal of humanizing the early unborn baby and re-stigmatizing his slaughter.

CBR CONTROVERSIAL?

And that is exactly what we did at The University of Florida. UF Law Student Katrina Jiménez and Tim McMillan, President of Collegians for Life, sponsored our visit. It was funded by South County People for Life (Venice, FL) which is headed by Sister Judith Delany and Sister Elizabeth Gorvin. These are wonderful folks who are spiritual giants. They needed to be.

The Monday, January 11th issue of *The Independent Florida Alligator*, The University of Florida's campus newspaper, carried a front page story entitled "Anti-abortion group brings controversy to UF." The lead paragraph read as follows:

A controversial anti-abortion group will make radical comparisons between abortion, the Holocaust and the civil rights movement today through Thursday at the Plaza of the Americas – a message that has been met with opposition or violence at four other U.S. universities.

That the press would describe us as a "controversial" anti-abortion group suggests that most other anti-abortion groups are *not* controversial. This, tragically, is true. Most pro-life groups are so desperate to avoid "controversy" that they

work nearly as hard as Planned Parenthood to cover up the evidence that abortion is indefensible. They say pictures don't work (despite overwhelming experiential and historical proof that for many, they are the *only* thing which *does* work) but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that they are actually trying to avoid persecution. We are losing this battle precisely because the culture isn't sufficiently "troubled" by abortion. Most Americans are so confused about *who* the first trimester baby is and *what* suction abortion does to him that they think linking abortion with the Holocaust is a "radical comparison." This isn't the fault of students. It is the fault of a timid, irresolute, pro-life leadership that has taken our movement over a cliff.

THREATS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST CBR

But our work at UF was not without risk. The Thursday, January 14th issue of the campus newspaper contained an insert called *Detours* which featured a columnist named Jason Brown. In his essay, Mr. Brown openly incited violence against us:

The CBR is a right-wing, anti-abortion, head-up-its-ass organization. They use shocking pictures of aborted fetuses

....

* * *

But in one of my favorite gestures of all time, a Kansas student decided to drive his car through the display.

Now there is a kid with some initiative! I wish there was someone around here with a go-get-'em attitude like that.

* * *

Their display will be at the Reitz Union today.

Stop by and pay a visit.

Bring your car.

A related story in *The Los Angeles Times*, August 10, 2000 carried the headline "CBS Apologizes for Talk Show's Violent Bush Joke." The story began as follows:

CBS and the producers of "The Late Late Show With Craig Kilborn" apologized Wednesday for putting the words 'Snipers Wanted' under footage of George W. Bush's acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention during a mock newscast portion of the program.

The UF school paper, of course, offered no apology for openly inviting violence against us. It is testimony to the careful logistical work of Paul Kulas and the rest of the CBR staff that no violence actually occurred.

DEBATING PHANTOM PRO-ABORTS

We refused to be intimidated. The *Alligator* carried another story on Friday, January 15, headlined "Anti-abortion group presents one-sided 'debate'":

Nothing could stop Gregg Cunningham from doing what he came to accomplish Wednesday night.

Cunningham, executive director of the Genocide Awareness Project [sic], and UF law professor Winston Nagan were scheduled to present "An Open Debate on Abortion and the Genocide Awareness Project" in UF's Chemistry Lab Building.

But Nagan became ill and could not attend. Being that

Nagan was the only UF faculty member who agreed to take part in the debate – 28 professors were contacted – no replacement was available.

* * *

Cunningham proceeded to present his side of the debate before about 200 people, showing several graphic film clips of post-abortion fetuses.

Although the audience was forewarned about the nature of the video, sniffles and tears could be heard and seen throughout the auditorium when the lights came back on.

* * *

'Your opinion is despicable, sir. I leave in protest,' said Jerry Williamson, UF's senior chemist in the department of Food Science and Human Nutrition, before abruptly walking out.

DEAFENING BLAST

From our first hour at UF, Mr. Williamson became so obsessed with our presence that he apparently spent every moment of every available work break at our display sites. He quickly identified me as the leader of this operation and would bellow my name at the top of his lungs as he approached from afar. He would then position his face as close to mine as our crowd control barricades would permit (I had to frequently warn him to climb back down from atop them) and continue to shout a rambling diatribe against every point he imagined we were trying to make. My hearing, already damaged to the point of disability by my service in Vietnam, took as severe a beating from Jerry's deafening roar as from anything I have suffered from guns and choppers. You didn't debate Jerry, you simply marvel at his

ability to speak interminably without drawing any obvious breath.

TEACHING LAW STUDENTS

CBR also set up our display outside the UF law school. An on-line law student publication called *The Law Student's Docket*

(<http://grove.ufl.edu/jmba/docket/volume2/012599.htm>) wrote the following of our visit (also describing us as a "controversial group"):

'This display has stirred things up and gotten us [at Planned Parenthood] out here, said ... [Thomas Russell, a UF student and Planned Parenthood volunteer].'

'We have to be here to present the facts.' Allison Gilbert, another Planned Parenthood volunteer, said that CBR has used its display to antagonize people. 'They have taken the most gut-wrenching methods for their own reasons,' Gilbert said. 'Instead of a discussion about the facts, they put on this big huge emotional display.'

Some students were disgusted by the presentation and how the group went to such extremes in order to present their message in the pictures. 'I would prefer something less offensive and more tasteful,' said first-year student Christy Etheredge. 'I would like something that would appeal to me intellectually and not emotionally.'

'I have a lot of friends who have chosen to stay away from the exhibit and who are offended by it,' Etheredge said.

'I think it is a sensationalist gimmick.'

Some students supported the display as informative and

giving people a realistic display of what occurs in a fetal abortion. 'The photos show real fetal parts and puts substance to the process in which a young woman is actually contemplating [sic],' said third-year student Tyrone Adams. 'The display opens up our perception so that a person can make an informed choice based upon actual knowledge.'

Once again, GAP forced the pro-aborts out into the open where their arguments could be decisively refuted. As for Ms. Etheredge, there is no "tasteful" way to prove that a person has been tortured to death. And the argument that "emotion" is off limits when considering genocide suggests that students are heartless robots. It is also difficult to understand her supposedly unfulfilled desire for an "intellectual" approach to abortion when we offered her lectures, a scholarly essay and five days of open forums. Her pro-abort faculty's comforting propaganda may not be as upsetting as the truth but blind dogma isn't "intellectual" merely because it is spouted by Ph.D.s.

BLAMING THE VICTIM

The student press, still calling us "controversial," proved just how "intellectual" our approach was. *The Alligator*, Tuesday, January 12, reported a story entitled "Controversial group incites nonviolent debate; Students voice opinions on activists' presentation."

UF students chose to peacefully talk and debate with representatives of a controversial anti-abortion group Monday, despite the visiting group's history of inciting violence at universities.

Crowds of students, blocked from getting too close to the

pro-life activists by 4-foot-tall barricades, discussed the definition of life and the meaning of genocide with representatives of the Genocide Awareness Project at the Plaza of the Americas.

The barricades protected the activists and their graphic signs – which depicted bloody pictures of mutilated aborted fetuses, Holocaust-era pictures of piles of emaciated dead bodies and images of the swaying bodies of African Americans lynched just a few decades ago.

Debate raged on at the plaza for most of the day, as anti-abortionists butted heads with pro-life [sic], Jewish and African-American students.

'My brother is a beautiful human being that would have been aborted, except (my mother) wanted the child,' said senior Tosha Fernandez, a pro-life activist who supported the material presented at the plaza.

Standing in front of the display depicting what the project calls of genocide,' senior Yael Horowitz said, 'I'm offended that these Holocaust pictures are being used as a means to your end.'

No violence occurred at the demonstration, which primarily featured organization members speaking – and often debating – with the large groups of people that stopped by out of curiosity or because of strong opinions about the issue.

* * *

About four University police officers monitored the crowd during the demonstration.

But officers will beef up patrol if necessary for the event, which will last until Thursday, said UPD spokeswoman Stacy Badics.

As this article suggests, the police officers at The University of Florida were among the most professional we have seen anywhere, but the article also suggests how few students have any sense of history. Racists constantly blamed Martin Luther King for "inciting violence" when all he did was peacefully, lawfully expose racial injustice. Talk about "blaming the victim." It wasn't Dr. King's fault when racists couldn't manage their anger and it isn't our fault when pro-aborts can't manage theirs. But the assumption made by student journalists is that pro-lifers are violent. So they are amazed when they actually see us and discover that we are totally peaceful. They are so shocked that they write a "man bites dog" story. The working press has done a phenomenal job of duping Americans into believing that the mainstream pro-life movement is complicit or at least complacent concerning violence. But what are the facts?

"ANTI-ABORTION" VIOLENCE – INDEFENSIBLE BUT EXAGGERATED

In more than a quarter century of pro-life activism, seven abortion providers have actually lost their lives. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms says that since 1982 there have been 49 bombings and 150 acts of arson at abortion clinics (assuming that each of these property crimes was committed by someone whose motive was opposition to abortion is problematic). Each of the unconscionable killings was tactically stupid and morally indefensible. Each was carried out by a deranged individual acting alone. US Attorney General and arch pro-abort Janet Reno used the vast resources of the Justice Department to impanel a

federal grand jury in Alexandria, VA for the purpose of investigating the alleged existence of a nationwide conspiracy of violence against abortion clinics and doctors. According to the March 10, 1996 *Kansas City Star*, no such conspiracy could be found. And every significant pro-life organization in the country has unambiguously condemned this violence.

Claims of pro-life "violence" are also exaggerated by pro-aborts who, for instance, fraudulently list "picketing" under ridiculous headings like "low-level violence" (see "State of Siege: Antiabortion Violence, 1993-1998" www.villagevoice.com). One is reminded of recent news stories reporting the hysterical claim by the left-wing American Association of University Women (AAUW) that huge numbers of elementary school girls are being sexually harassed by the little boys who are their classmates. Readers who persevered past the lurid headlines and tabloid sensationalism eventually reached the AAUW definition of sexual harassment, which included in essence "being looked at in a way which made me uncomfortable." But then the far left regularly cries wolf!

And the far left can be plenty violent itself. Several of our educational activities involve the public display of large photographs of aborted human embryos and fetuses. Our painful experience has taught us to expect unprovoked violence, or threats thereof, from pro-abortion activists nearly everywhere we exhibit these images. We have been victimized by attacks from passersby who rammed their car into one of our pro-life photo exhibits, nearly running over one of our staff. A pro-abortion newspaper columnist, in print, explicitly encouraged other motorists to do the same at one of our later displays (see above). Our staff has been punched. Objects have been thrown at us. One of our staff recently had a cup of hot coffee thrown directly in his face.

Our signs have been attacked with a knife which police had to wrestle away from an assailant. Our signs have been repeatedly knocked down, punched, kicked and hit with all manner of thrown objects and substances. We have been the object of countless death threats from pro-aborts, many publicly shouted or posted on the Web. We are seldom able to display our pictures without the protection of armed police officers and crowd-control barricades.

ANTI-VIETNAM WAR VIOLENCE

But compare the real record of anti-abortion violence with the history of social reform discussed in a book by Clark Dougan, *A Divided Nation*, Boston Publishing (1984) and you get a different perspective. Dougan reports that the US Treasury Department estimates that 5,000 bombings took place across the nation between 1967 and 1970 (*The New York Times*, October 11, 1970, reported that "... another 1,174 attempted bombings were forestalled either because the devices were discovered and disarmed or failed to work"). The majority were related to anti-Vietnam war protests. The Weather Underground, for instance, (a faction of the Revolutionary Youth Movement) and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), terrorized the nation with bombings which destroyed the home of a judge, damaged the New York City Police Department and blew up restrooms in the US Senate and Pentagon buildings. A bombing at the University of Wisconsin did \$6 million in property damage and claimed the life of an uninvolved graduate student.

At the 1968 Democratic National Convention, 5,000 anti-war protestors clashed with 12,000 police, 6,000 National Guardsmen and 7,500 regular Army troops. Authorities responded to wide-spread rock-throwing with tear-gas and savage beatings.

In 1969, 300,000 anti-war demonstrators marched in Washington, D.C. and 500 of those rioted, attacking police and government buildings. Approximately 100 were arrested and an equal number were hospitalized.

In 1970, civil disobedience at Jackson State College in Mississippi was staged to protest the invasion of Cambodia. A battle ensued with police, state patrolmen and the National Guard, in which some 400 shots were fired at a dormitory, killing a student and an uninvolved local youth. Twelve other students were wounded.

Again in 1970, the Ohio National Guard shot 13 Kent State students at an anti-Vietnam War protest. Four of these students died and two of them had not even been involved in the protest. There was also anti-war rioting at Berkeley and Columbia and countless other places.

RACIAL VIOLENCE

On the racial front, in 1965, 6 days of rioting in the Watts section of Los Angeles left 34 people dead and over 1,000 injured. There were 4,000 arrests and hundreds of buildings were destroyed.

In 1966, riots in Chicago killed 2 and injured 65. In 1967, Newark riots produced 23 dead and 725 injured. At nearly the same time, 5 days of violence in Detroit killed 43 and injured 324. Federal troops were called in and 7,000 people were arrested with 1,300 buildings destroyed and 2,700 businesses looted. In April of 1968, more Chicago rioting left 9 dead.

In her book *Black Resistance/White Law: A History of Constitutional Racism in America*, Berry, The Penguin Press (1994) Mary Frances Berry reports that: "The [Black]

Panthers engaged police in more than a dozen firefights from October 1967 to December 1969, and at least 2 policemen and 10 Panthers died in that two-year period."

In 1992, a Simi Valley jury acquitted 4 Los Angeles police officers who had used massively excessive force in arresting a black motorist named Rodney King. Rioting erupted in which 38 people were killed and 1,250 were injured. The violence produced 3,600 fires and 3,000 plus arrests. Eventually, 4,000 National Guardsmen were called in to serve with 4,000 regular Army and Marine troops. During the same period, related rioting broke out in San Francisco where 1,400 people were arrested. The National Guard also had to be called up in Las Vegas. There were 80 arrests for rioting in New York City and the National Guard had to put down violence in Atlanta.

And this was only a fraction of the violence produced by the drive for social reform in the 1960s. In fact, *The New York Times*, September 6, 1970 asserted that: "So accustomed has the nation become to civil disorders that the bulk of these disturbances were not reported in the national press or on television." In light of the extreme violence which characterized the civil rights and anti-Vietnam war campaigns, it is both fortunate and amazing that there has been so much less violence on the "pro-life" side of the abortion battle. The same cannot be said of pro-aborts who have killed 40 million unborn babies just since 1973.

CIVIL RIGHTS FOR ALL RACES AND ALL AGES

Now if only pro-aborts could see the parallels which *do* exist between the pro-life and civil rights movements. The January 13th issue of the *Alligator* carried a letter from a confused student named Tom DeSimone, which offered a case in

point. It featured the usual misstatements of fact and lapses in logic:

To compare the work of a group of zealots who rely on shock value and propaganda to further their twisted agenda with the revolutionary achievements of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., is a travesty. The comparison to the Holocaust is equally troubling.

Is there really any similarity between a systematic attempt to eliminate an entire race of people and a medically safe procedure that saves the lives of thousands of women every year?

This young man has obviously not read our essay, "Why Abortion is Genocide." But in the same issue of the paper, a more sensible student, Julia Henson was also published in a guest column:

During his lifetime, Martin Luther King, Jr. used pictures of the Holocaust and pictures of abused or murdered black men to catch the hearts and minds of those who could not see the violence forced on the black nation.

CBR's goal is to allow you to see violence forced on unborn children who can feel their lives being 'sucked' from them.

The truth is that abortion is almost never "used to save the lives" of any women much less "thousands of women every year", but this exchange is an example of the power of CBR/GAP to force a debate where there has heretofore not even been a discussion.

Back and forth the dialogue went. On Thursday, January 14 the *Alligator* contained a letter from alumnus Scott Truesdell:

In Wednesday's Alligator, Tom DeSimone calls abortion 'a medically safe procedure' ('No similarity between Holocaust, abortion.'). That depends on the perspective. It always kills someone.

Mr. DeSimone argues that the unborn baby is not "someone" in the sense of personhood. That is precisely the argument used by anti-Semites and racists to justify killing Jews and blacks. Practitioners and supporters of genocide always argue that their victims are subhuman.

ACTING LIKE NAZIS

In the same issue of the paper, student Charles Jordan noted the obvious:

...[I]n this debate, you did not see facts being disputed. Instead, you saw the pro-death advocates attack the process used, using hilarious semantics and hateful personal attacks on the pro-lifers.

One dissenter so intelligently devised [sic], 'so you are saying that women who have abortions are Nazis.'

Of course we aren't saying aborting mothers are "Nazis", but we are saying that abortionists are *acting* very much like the mass murderers of the National Socialist death camps. There are profound differences between the circumstances of the mothers and those of the doctors. Unwilling mothers are often rushed into a precipitous abortion decision by the belief that abortion later in pregnancy becomes more dangerous (true), expensive (true) and morally problematic (false). They are frequently being coerced by parents who are trying to avoid the embarrassment of their daughters' out-of-wedlock pregnancies; boyfriends trying to avoid marriage or child support payments; and husbands trying to

avoid the loss of a lifestyle which is dependent on the second income a pregnant wife may no longer be able to earn. The culture is also bombarding reluctant mothers with the message that "this pregnancy will ruin your life." So much for the supposed feminist view that women are "strong and capable."

Doctors, on the other hand, are under no pressure at all. They have the luxury of taking all the time they need to decide whether they will treat and deliver babies or attack and kill them. Most mothers lack a doctor's detailed understanding of prenatal development (it really is a baby – even at the very beginning of pregnancy) and they are carefully shielded from what the doctors fully understand to be the horror of the procedure itself (it really is an act of violence – even at the very beginning of pregnancy). In every way, the doctors' culpability should be vastly greater than that of the mothers' because he enjoys so many more advantages and suffers so many fewer liabilities. The recriminalization of abortion should result in the prosecution of abortion providers, but not aborting mothers because the injurious health consequences of their ill-considered "choice" will punish most aborting mothers more severely than any prison. Concerning Mr. DeSimone's preposterous assertion that abortion is "safe", consider the following:

"SAFE," "LEGAL" ABORTION PUNISHES WOMEN

Although research on the side-effects of abortion can produce conflicting results, a recent government study in Finland shows that women who abort are approximately 4 times more likely to die in the following year than women who carry their pregnancies to term. The researchers found that compared to women who carried to term, women who aborted in the year prior to their deaths were 60% more

likely to die of natural causes, 7 times more likely to die of suicide, 4 times more likely to die from injuries related to accidents, and 14 times more likely to die from homicide (Gissler, M., et. al., "Pregnancy – associated deaths in Finland 1987-1994 – definition problems and benefits of record linkage," *Acta Obstetrica et Gynecologica Scandinavica* 76:651-657 (1997)).

According to cancer researcher Dr. Joel Brind, 13 of 14 studies conducted since 1957 show more breast cancer among American women who chose abortion and 27 of 33 studies worldwide report a similar increase. The average rate of cancer increase among post abortive women was 30% (see generally, Brind, J., et. al., *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 50:481 (1996)).

The influential *Archives of General Psychiatry* recently acknowledged for the first time the existence of a psychological disorder called "post-abortion syndrome" (PAS). Combining the 1.4% case rate described in the published study with the 40 million US abortions performed since 1973 adds up to over half-a-million cases. Another 20% of the women in the study did not experience full-blown post-abortion syndrome but did report clinical depression. It should also be noted that the study looked only at the experience of women 2 years after aborting. As their sense of immediate relief recedes, a darker mood may emerge in some.

According to Dr. David Reardon of the Elliot Institute, another shortcoming of the study is its high dropout and refusal rates, which suggest substantial underreporting of the prevalence of PAS. Even though women were offered payment to participate, 15% of the post-abortive women who were solicited refused to be part of the study and 50% of

those who initially participated dropped out before the follow-up interviews. The lead author of the study said the most often cited reason for this reticence was "guilt and remorse." So it appears that many of the women most likely to experience PAS are least likely to participate in a PAS study (Major, B., et. al., "Psychological responses of women after first-trimester abortion." *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 57(8):777-84 (2000)).

Some published clinical studies also report that women who abort are measurably more likely to experience cervical, ovarian and liver cancer; uterine perforation; cervical lacerations; pelvic inflammatory disease; endometriosis; and in subsequent pregnancies, placenta previa; other complications of labor; developmentally disabled newborns; and ectopic or tubal pregnancy. Several of these studies also report that some of these disorders become even more prevalent with multiple abortions (see generally, *Major Articles and Books Concerning the Detrimental Effects of Abortion*, Thomas Strahan, Rutherford Institute, PO Box 7482, Charlottesville, VA 22906-7482 and the Website of the Elliot Institute, at www.afterabortion.org).

In his eye-opening history of abortion in America, Professor Marvin Olasky points out that in the 1800's, "Many states gave immunity to women from all criminality, others gave women immunity from prosecution in exchange for testimony, and virtually every state allowed abortion to protect the life of the mother." The woman was viewed as a "victim" then and "victimization" is likely to remain the public's perception of her association with the death of her baby. If there existed so strong a bias against prosecuting women when "pregnancy termination" was widely condemned, future laws against abortion, to have any hope of passage, should and will prohibit the prosecution of

aborting mothers. Even were it not so, the odds of finding district attorneys willing to prosecute, juries inclined to convict and judges disposed to punish such women would rightly near the vanishing point (*Abortion Rites, A Social History of Abortion in America*, Crossway Books (1992)).

Only the most cruel of societies would further punish women who in large numbers are already suffering the painful sequelae of abortion.

SAFELY OUTLAWING ABORTION

And how should we respond to Mr. DeSimone's intimation that large numbers of women were dying at the hands of "back-alley butchers" before abortion was legalized and will again die by the "thousands" if we outlaw the practice?

In *The American Journal of Public Health*, July, 1960, Mary Calderone, then Medical Director of Planned Parenthood said the following concerning the safety of unlawful abortions:

... 90% of all illegal abortions are presently being done by physicians [A]bortion, whether therapeutic or illegal, is in the main no longer dangerous, because it is being done well by physicians.

If Planned Parenthood, the largest provider of abortions in the US, says that the vast majority of unlawful abortions were being performed "well" and by licensed physicians in the 1960s, we can be certain that the vast majority will again be "well" performed by licensed physicians if abortion is outlawed at some future time. The myth of the "back-alley butcher" is little more than a deceptive rhetorical device with which radical feminists seek to induce hysteria in a naïve public.

Bernard Nathanson, MD, an abortion expert and an obstetrician-gynecologist who once presided over the largest abortion clinic in the world, said the following in his book *Aborting America*, Doubleday, 1979:

The practice of abortion was revolutionized at virtually the same moment that the laws were revolutionized, through the widespread introduction of suction curettage in 1970. (Even before this, antibiotics and other advances had already dramatically lowered the abortion death rate.) Instead of scraping the soft wall of the pregnant uterus with a sharp instrument, the operator vacuums it out with a plastic suction curette. Though it is preferable that this be done by a licensed physician, one can expect that if abortion is ever driven underground again, even non-physicians will be able to perform this procedure with remarkable safety.... Even without a suction machine, a simple combination of catheter and syringe can produce enough suction to carry out a safe early abortion.

As for the self-induced abortion, by thrusting a coat hanger or other dangerous object into the womb, this will also be a thing of the past.

Concerning the accuracy of feminist estimates of deaths from unlawful abortion, Dr. Nathanson, a founder of what is now called the National Abortion and Reproductive Rights Action League (NARRAL), said:

...[I]t was always '5,000 to 10,000 deaths a year.' I confess that I knew the figures were totally false, and I suppose the others did too But in the 'morality' of the revolution, it was a *useful* figure

Dr. Nathanson also discusses the advent of chemical

abortifacients which many believe will allow women to unlawfully self-abort with a degree of safety at least comparable to current, lawful, physician-performed suction abortion. *Time* magazine, June 14, 1993 featured a cover story entitled "The Pill That Changes Everything, A new, simpler way to use RU 486 makes abortion a truly personal and private choice" The article concludes that chemical abortifacients "... could make abortion far more difficult to regulate. And eventually it could mean that abortions will become simpler, safer and more accessible not only throughout the US but also around the world."

The Los Angeles Times, August 14, 2000, featured a story headlined "The Abortion Pill: Finally at Hand? Describing various chemical abortifacient drugs the paper reported the following:

There is research, still inconclusive, that suggests a woman might be able to self-administer misoprostol at home at the direction of her doctor

Meanwhile, researchers report that a black market has developed for one of the abortion medications. Misoprostol, a drug sometimes called 'the star pill' for its hexagonal shape, is widely used in Brazil where abortion is banned, researchers report. And a recent survey of 610 women, primarily Latinas, in New York City found that 5% admitted having used 'the star pill' for abortion. More than a third of the women surveyed said they knew about the method.

The July 11, 1999 issue of the *New York Times* Sunday magazine carried an article headlined "The Little White Bombshell." It quoted Eric Schaff at the University of Rochester, who has supervised clinical trials for Mifepristone. The researcher says he is convinced "... the drug is safe and that administering it is a simple procedure

that midwives or nurse-practitioners could do." *The Journal of the American Medical Women's Association* (2000;55: 186-188) contains a commentary by Amy E. Pollack, MD and Rachael Pine, JD entitled "Opening a Door to Safe Abortion: International Perspectives on Medical Abortifacient Use." The abstract states that "In some countries where safe abortion is neither accessible nor legal, even unsupervised, off-protocol use of misoprostol can provide women with a means to safely terminate pregnancy."

The assertion that outlawing convenience abortion will herald a "return to the days of coat hangers and perforated uteri" is cynical nonsense. The supposed risk to women is the most dishonest argument yet advanced in opposition to outlawing abortion. When elective abortion is again against the law, pro-lifers will, of course, seek to restrict traffic in illicit abortifacients. But safe, accessible, abortion-inducing chemicals will be as difficult to regulate then as marijuana is today.

ADOPTION CONFUSION

Even a month after our time at UF, the paper was still featuring articles on abortion, albeit goofy ones. Opinion columnist Alexis Smart wrote in part:

Pro-lifers are quick to claim that the fetus has human rights, and therefore the person carrying the fetus is obligated to care for it in every way possible. How is it fair to force a woman to carry a child she does not want? How is it fair to the fetus to be left helpless inside the body of someone uninterested in caring for it?

Doesn't this lack of interest constitute an unfit mother? How can anyone find comfort in knowing a child is trapped in such

a situation? Who's rights are being protected? Pregnancy carries an immense amount of responsibility that some people simply cannot handle. However, removing the option of abortion brings infinitely more. To be a pro-lifer does not simply require you to respect all forms of life; it makes you responsible for adopting all of the unwanted babies you force into this world, regardless of their condition.

Has Ms. Smart never heard of adoption? The National Council for Adoption (NCFA) (www.NCFA-USA.org) says that in any given year there are between one and two million individuals and couples who wish to adopt children in this country – more than enough to accommodate the 1.3 million babies killed each year by abortion. The Council also reports that available babies, regardless of medical problems, "generally don't wait long for families." There are "waiting lists of couples who would like to adopt infants with Downs Syndrome or Spina Bifida." Concerning the lack of minority babies available for adoption, NCFA also states that the percentage of "Latino/Hispanic women who plan adoption for their newborn babies is substantially lower than even the tiny percentage of Blacks who do so." And even if there were hugely more babies awaiting adoption than the numbers of available adoptive parents, a country which, according to The US Department of Commerce spends \$58 billion on consumer electronics (wide-screen TVs, etc.), is a country that can afford to take care of its "unwanted" children.

THANK GOD FOR THE FIRST AMENDMENT

Thank heaven not everyone was as confused as Ms. Smart. My wife Lois had a male student approach her and say that "I am neither pro-life or pro-choice but you're starting to get through to me. Your message is coming across."

One of the most important benefits of GAP is its consistent ability to improve student understanding of the First Amendment and UF was no exception. On Tuesday, January 12, *The Gainesville Sun* carried a story headlined "UF free speech commitment bears up."

Offensive ideas welcome. Harassers go home.

Those six words sum up the University of Florida's approach to on-campus expression.

It's an approach that has been sorely tested lately. On Monday, a highly charged but peaceful display of disturbing death exhibits was shown by an anti-abortion group, and last week an allegedly harassing [street] preacher was arrested.

'The universities have traditionally been the most tolerant,' said UF General Counsel Pam Bernard. 'But not when the speech is disruptive or otherwise harassing.'

Short of that, officials say, almost anything goes.

The University of Florida, as a public university, is a place where the First Amendment must be exercised and the free exchange of ideas allowed,' said UF Student Affairs Vice President Art Sandeen. 'While we regret the pain to some members of the university community that results from that free exchange, the university must maintain its role as a forum for reasonable dialogue.'

* * *

That's why, despite protests – by Jewish, black and pro-choice groups – UF officials had little choice Monday but to allow a 'Genocide Awareness Project' display depicting victims of the Holocaust, blacks killed by lynch mobs and

aborted fetuses. The First Amendment doesn't distinguish between displays for a sorority fund-raiser and displays depicting death.

That's just the way it should be [UF President John] Lombardi said.

'In universities and the country at large no one has a monopoly on wisdom, taste, sensibility or outrage,' he said. 'One person's offensive speech is another person's clarion call to justice. The purpose of the First Amendment is to protect our freedoms, and the price of that protection is that we are, from time to time, mightily offended by the speech of others.'

CBR salutes President Lombardi's integrity.

The *Sun* also carried a "give and take" article on CBR/GAP in that same issue, this one enigmatically headlined "Anti-abortion group raises few hackles."

* * *

The project accomplished its desired effect on some students.

'I think that if I ever had to make a decision about having an abortion, these pictures could play a role in that decision,' said UF English senior Nicole Spellman. 'They tell me that everyone needs to take responsibility for their actions.'

* * *

'Their tactic is to engage in heated debates,' said Anti-Racist Action member Kate Gilleece. 'They take buzz words such as – 'torturing babies to death' – and use them over and over

again to accomplish their means.'

University police reported no incidents of violence.

'I think that they are lying to the community by using true genocide and racism to stop women from the right to control their own bodies,' said UF/Santa Fe Community College Campus National Organization for Women president [whew] Candi Churchill. 'I think that what they are doing is not only insulting but also hateful.'

HATE-FILLED AND MEAN-SPIRITED

Political humorist P.J. O'Rourke once promoted a book by taking an ad in the conservative *American Spectator* magazine. O'Rourke's tear-out order form said "Dear P.J. Your new book seems hate-filled and mean-spirited. Rush me my copy right away." P.J. was satirizing Ms. Churchill's silliness. Important though her opinion might sometimes be, things aren't "hateful" merely because she doesn't like them.

But Ms. Churchill wasn't done. In the Tuesday, January 12 *Alligator*, she expressed further outrage in a guest column:

...CBR and CFL [Collegians for Life] want to send women back to pre-*Roe v. Wade* times, when 10,000 women died each year from backroom, illegal abortions, according to the Alan Guttmacher Institute [in fairness, Ms. Churchill had not had the opportunity to read our convincing refutation of this myth since this compelling essay had not yet been published].

* * *

It is wrong that the CFL and CBR are capitalizing on slavery and the Holocaust to suit their anti-choice, anti-women

agenda and that OUR MONEY is supporting their hateful work.

It is sick that they are using graphic displays in an attempt to intimidate and shame people into 'questioning the reality of abortion.'

Campus NOW believes all women have the unconditional right to decide when and if we want to have a child.

We, like our feminist sisters before us, commit to continue the fight for unrestricted access to choice and reproductive freedom for all.

Ouch. A lie told with words is no match for the truth told with pictures.

REMARKABLE EXCHANGES

There were far too many memorable exchanges at UF to recount in this limited space but a few are especially worthy of mention.

A rabbi's wife drew some of the largest crowds of the week with her loud but poorly reasoned assertion that because she had "lost relatives in the death camps, these [Holocaust] pictures" were hers and we "have no right to use them." I patiently explained that my own father had risked his life by volunteering to serve in the war which had ended the Holocaust and that every person of conscience, irrespective of ethnicity or religious conviction, had not only the right but the duty to use these pictures wherever genocide rears its ugly head. It is elitism of the most parochial sort to care only about the genocide which victimizes one's own.

A female law professor self-consciously admitted multiple

abortions and made known to me her outrage that we had managed to force our way into a place which she apparently regarded to be her exclusive domain. And worse, we had brought with us irrefutable evidence that she had been misleading students (and perhaps herself) about abortion. I am not being patronizing when I say that I felt sincere sorrow for her.

A black faculty member argued that until we could guarantee unborn children a just society, abortion must remain legal. Talk about raising the bar into the stratosphere. To mix my metaphors just a bit, this very confused professor was putting the cart before the horse. A society which wishes to be just, must at a minimum, stop killing its children.

Throughout our visit to UF, I saw many of our most determined detractors wearing pins depicting the Christian cross, encircled in a red band with a diagonal slash through the middle. I wondered how long it would take the thought police to descend on anyone sporting a pin which similarly condemned religions favored by the political left? At many schools, internment in something like "re-education camps" would be required for forced sensitivity training. Public displays of contrition would thereafter be essential to avoid suspension or even expulsion. At least at UF, the administration seemed genuinely committed to freedom of expression. And to our great relief, so did most of the students.

Two female students approached Lois and told her that they had never seen anything like this exhibit. A crowd began to form as they asked hard questions and they eventually engaged others in a lengthy discussion of how problems could be solved without abortion. Imagine that.

A young black man confided to us that he had gotten his girlfriend pregnant at 17 and she aborted against his wishes. He lamented the fact that he had no voice in her decision, despite the enormous impact her decision would have on his life.

A Jewish male student volunteered to us that he had no problem with the comparison we were making between abortion and the Holocaust. More remarkably, Michael Spielman of our staff talked with another Jewish student (Johnny Godowski) who volunteered for us at UF and told Michael that what we were doing was "historic" in its significance. He later E-mailed Michael to say "I just don't see or hear conversations in support of abortion anymore as I used to (am I out of touch? – or have you changed the spiritual climate on this campus?).

Time and again we would just patiently answer hostile questions until our inquisitors would run out of gas and quietly move on.

One angry young man attracted a group of other students by berating us as akin to the Klan and the Nazis. Dr. Bob Seemuth, one of our volunteers gently got him to admit that *he* was actually guilty of religious bigotry.

PLEASE HELP US HELP THEM

But one student sent us an especially encouraging E-mail:

My name is Matthew Jenkins and I'm an electrical engineering student at the University of Florida.

* * *

When I first heard of GAP, I really didn't think much good

could possibly come from it. After all, our school and professors aren't very pro-life. Most of them are closed minded. I thought our student body would react negatively towards them and all sorts of problems might occur. Their reaction was more along the lines of shock. I don't think any of them knew what abortion really was. It's a hidden private murder. It's something that's never talked about on campus, until now. One by one I could see my fellow classmates walk by. They were staring with their mouths wide open in shock. It's quite disgusting, but very real. Some students even came up to the GAP people and asked questions and wanted to know more about what abortion did to the mother, the different types of abortion and especially how GAP could compare it to the Jewish Holocaust. The display attracted much attention and interest as well as stimulating debate. You couldn't miss it or avoid seeing it. The pictures are so large that they could be seen from about 100 yards.

* * *

The discussions were very calm and friendly. Even in the face of total opposition, the GAP people were cool headed [sic] and respectful.

* * *

I was really surprised and thankful that they had a chance to come to UF and make a difference. I think a lot of good will come of this. Because of this hearts will change and soften. Even our parish priest, Fr. Gillespie, thought they did a good job and commended them on their courage. He even provided food for the GAP workers every night they were here. So overall, I think that the work they did last week was a great influence on us. I've never seen anyone do this sort of thing for pro-life. It's very encouraging, especially seeing

the non-violent, peaceful side of pro-life in the news. I hope they can come again next year and witness to the new freshmen and transfer students.

With your financial help, we can do just that. Nothing the pro-life movement has ever undertaken is having the life-changing impact of these pictures. This is hard, risky work but we are willing to do it if you are willing to fund it.