

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

December 2011

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On January 14, 2012, we received an email message from a sixteen-year-old girl from Washington, D.C. who wrote because she had just seen the abortion imagery on our website. She said: “I saw these pictures at the March For Life in 2010. I saw the graphic pictures on the ‘Abortion No’ posters, and my friends and I just stopped and stared, aghast. Later I came onto the website and watched the videos, and I have never been more passionate for change. I am only 16, but I hope I can do something to make this injustice known. I went back to the March For Life in 2011 and I am returning again this year in 2012. I resolve to go every year for the rest of my life until this injustice is eradicated, until this holocaust is over.”

This young girl speaks for tens of thousands of her contemporaries whose minds and lives have been changed by our annual sign display at the March For Life (MFL) -- whose organizers (and other prominent national pro-life leaders) tried for years to have our abortion photos banned from the grounds around their assembly area. I finally had to personally threaten the director of the Park Police with a lawsuit to get them to reject the protests of our detractors. But the MFL is not the only institution trying to cover up abortion.

As previously reported, when CBR recently edited abortion video footage into an abortion industry infomercial, we were sued in a case titled *Northland Family Planning Clinic, Inc. v. The Center For Bio-Ethical Reform*, 2011, U.S. District Court, Central District of California, Southern Division. The Plaintiffs, a chain of Michigan abortion clinics, claim that CBR has actionably damaged their businesses and injured their reputations by exposing the fraud through which they deceive and exploit vulnerable young mothers and poorly informed voters. What really angered our adversaries, however, was that we didn’t merely call them liars; we conclusively proved them to be liars. We forced them to stop pretending. Northland talks about abortion, but they never show it. So we showed it for them and they became so angry they sued us.

In paragraph 37 of their Complaint they speculate that “tens of thousands” of viewers have now seen our exposé, on our site and many others, and that was back in early May. By now the number is far higher. Paragraph 26 accuses us of pirating “footage from the copyrighted *Good Woman* video, with a few seconds of graphic [abortion video] images added intermittently ....” In paragraph 25 they say YouTube.com removed the initial concept version of our *Angel of Light* parody with the explanation that “This video ... [is] a violation of YouTube’s policy on shocking and disgusting content.” Our video is “shocking and disgusting” because abortion is shocking and disgusting.

But all we did was show a few seconds of abortion video every time the Northland narrator tells a lie about abortion. We open with a George Orwell text quote about deceptive political speech, but nowhere in our video do we ever say that Northland is evil or even that abortion is evil. We merely allow abortion to speak for itself. For that, Northland became hysterical. Literally.

As a result of their very ill-advised lawsuit, we have been able to force Northland to release email messages which shed additional light on their shockingly dishonest marketing tactics and their ongoing attempt to stifle public criticism of their predatory practices. Northland’s owner, Renee Chilean, received an email message from another “Abortion Care Network” abortionist who said our *Angel of Light* video “... holds you up to public scorn and ridicule and demeans your reputation ....” Ms. Chilean replies that after

seeing our *Angel of Light* video, “I am sick to my stomach ....” She added that “I am done crying now and just need to move forward but these people are so hateful and disrespectful I can’t stand it.” But how is it hateful to show abortions when Northland’s infomercial says abortions are “sacred”?

In another email message Renee Chilean told this same abortionist that “I know that they [CBR] preach to their own choir but I am worried about this.” Then she admits that the source of her worry is the possibility that we will use our video for “... anti-D&E legislation.” The term “D&E” refers to dilatation and extraction (or evacuation) abortions in which the arms and legs of babies are torn off and removed one appendage at a time. The baby goes into shock and bleeds to death. She explains that “They [anti-abortion activists] are looking for new ammunition since PBA [partial-birth-abortion] is pretty much done.” Precisely. And Northland’s lawsuit is giving us the perfect forum in which to use that “ammunition.”

Renee Chilean ends by conceding that “... this just makes me sick. But by now I have spent several hours crying and being miserable so I am putting on my big girl underpants and getting over it.” Ms. Chilean’s “underpants” are not the sort of word picture over which we are inclined to linger, but she is right to fear a political backlash as more and more voters see our *Angel of Light* video. D&E is a viciously savage procedure and voters who see it aren’t likely to think it should be lawful.

Then the narrator of the Northland infomercial we mocked forwarded a message to Ms. Chilean which said: “... it’s despicable what Gregg Cunningham, CBR did ....” How can it be “despicable” to show the public something which Northland’s infomercial says it is an “honor” to do? Another abortionist sent Ms. Chilean a similar message (with copies to the Abortion Care Network) saying: “I also watched and it was so painful to see such a sincere and good piece of work treated so shabbily. It’s really hard to have to confront these things, emotionally big downers.” It apparently isn’t an “emotional downer” to kill these babies -- just to be caught lying about killing them.

Renee Chilean then repeats that “I am sick to my stomach as are my entire staff.” She also says: “This is just wrong and hard at so many levels” and that “This is the second time we have been attacked by an anti-abortion group for this video.” Ms. Chilean’s level of denial is absolutely delusional. She demands the right to mislead and prey upon and victimize vulnerable young women -- and do so with immunity from criticism. She may have an arguable legal right to retreat into a twisted fantasy world which transforms the horror of abortion into an act of virtue, but she has no moral right to fraudulently draw others in behind her.

She then reveals that “There is a team of four attorneys working on this [CBR lawsuit]” for Northland and that these lawyers will immediately “ask for an injunction” to force CBR to take down our *Angel of Light* video. Her lawyers apparently told her, however, that her case against CBR was too weak to warrant an injunction while litigation proceeds. That meant that petitioning for one would risk the embarrassment of the court rejecting Ms. Chilean’s request. As a consequence, Northland has still filed no petition for injunctive relief, despite our repeated refusal to stop posting our *Angel of Light* mock-u-mentary video.

Ms. Chilean concludes with a description of “... the horrible anxiety about what to do and worrying that it would be bigger and more scary than what we face every day.” She also expresses the hope that she can “... just end this easily and quickly.” Sorry. It’s too late for “easily and quickly” now.

In paragraph 48 of the Complaint, the Plaintiffs allege that as a consequence of our parody video, “... Northland has been injured ....” In paragraph 49 they complain that “The value of the *Good Woman* video as an educational and counseling tool has been diminished ...” by our parody video. In paragraph 50 they whine that as a result of our video, “Northland’s reputation has been harmed ....” Of course it has. The truth always inhibits consumer fraud and voter deception.

In the “Medication Abortions” section of Northland’s website, Ms. Chilean says: “Many women choose this method because it feels more natural.” Here is yet another of Northland’s attempts to normalize baby-killing. But there is one small problem. With RU-486 it’s harder to hide the baby from its mother. Ms. Chilean acknowledges this complication when she admits that the effective home use of RU-486 requires the presence of a support person who may or may not “... be able to handle the sight of ... the expulsion of the embryo.”

Ms. Chilean concedes, a bit self-consciously it seems, that the mother herself will “possibly” see the embryo as well. But she quickly relieves her prospective customers with the assurance that “Most women don’t see the embryo.” She then offers the very macabre suggestion that if the mother risks a peek after hearing a splash, and her baby *is* visible in the toilet, she may choose “... to examine it to say goodbye” -- or perhaps more sensibly, to “... flush it away without looking.” And to assist in the achievement of this self-induced, delusional state of mind, Ms. Chilean counsels that the mother consider “... surrounding yourself with items that make you feel good: Videos, books, a bouquet of flowers, music.”

Ms. Chilean probably need not be concerned that many RU-486 mothers will be stressed by the sight of their babies swirling down into the sewer system. The majority will reflexively avert their gaze. Most will avoid the risk of so disturbing an image becoming lodged in their memory. They will intuit the warning implicit in a February 1995 article which appeared in the journal *Hippocrates*, in which Louise Levathes described the traumatic visual impact of medically aborted babies:

The French have had several months of trials extending the period [of pregnancy during which RU-486 could be used] from 49 days to 63, but last year rejected the use of RU-486 in the eighth and ninth weeks of pregnancy. During this critical two-week period, the tiny embryo begins to look very much like a baby, with discernible head and limbs. Neither the women nor the nurses in French clinics felt comfortable with RU-486 abortions at this later stage.

Nurse Frenpzel remembers a day during the 63-day trials when she went to the back of the clinic and saw six surgical dishes with six embryos in them by the sink. ‘It was upsetting,’ she said. ‘It was like looking at a little row of people.’ The women too were shocked when they looked at what they had expelled.

Actually, the baby also looks indisputably like a baby at 49 days if viewed more closely than most mothers would prefer. In an article headlined “Abortion Group to Advise Doctors on Drug Used to End Pregnancy,” *The New York Times*, March 30, 1996, reported “... some women say they were bothered by waiting to expel the fetus, and confronting the reality of what passes out of their body.” *Time Magazine*, December 5, 1994, reported the following RU-486 experience: “I was having deep cramping when I went to the bathroom, and it was like turning a water jug upside down. I looked at the fetus and was disgusted. I flushed before I got sick to my stomach.” *Newsweek*, September 18, 1995, described another U.S. woman’s RU-486 experience: “There is a fist-sized glob of red and white at the bottom of the toilet. Becky can see the curled-up fetus .... ‘Look at that, honey,’ Becky says to Richard. Its hands are curled into tiny fists. ‘It’s sad. It’s sad,’ Becky murmurs, turning away.” No wonder Ms. Chilean seems uncomfortable describing the particulars of this method.

She evinces no such misgivings in the “Emergency Contraceptive” section of the Northland site. There she describes Plan B as “... a second chance at preventing an unintended pregnancy,” but carefully avoids any disclosure of Plan B’s abortifacient properties. That omission is grossly dishonest but it reflects the manufacturer’s disingenuous claim at PlanBOneStep.com that “Plan B One-Step® ... won’t terminate an existing pregnancy.” That claim makes sense if the word “pregnancy” is fraudulently defined. The FDA, at

<http://www.fda.gov/drugs/drugsafety/postmarketdrugsafetyinformationforpatientsandproviders/ucm109795.htm>, admits regarding “emergency contraceptives” that “If fertilization does occur, Plan B may prevent a fertilized egg from attaching to the womb (implantation).” The baby’s attempt to implant in the uterine lining occurs about one week after the embryo is no longer a “fertilized egg” but an embryo which has reached the blastocyst stage. Even the FDA plays politics with terminology.

David Stevens, MD and CEO of the Christian Medical Association, has expressed clear opposition to “emergency contraceptives” on the grounds that they operate as abortifacients. Dr. Stevens delivered testimony on this topic to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Health, United States House of Representatives, on December 5, 2011. He said that “... [C]ertain misclassified ‘contraceptives’ work by causing the destruction of a developing human being by preventing the embryo’s implantation in the womb (“Plan B”) or by destroying its vital blood supply after implantation (Ella) [conceptually the same mechanism as RU-486]. I will not recommend, pay for or prescribe such an abortifacient.” Genuinely anti-abortion doctors are divided over the issue of whether low dose birth control pills can fairly be described as abortifacients, but there is a consensus that the much higher dose “emergency contraceptives” kill babies.

Northland’s misleading description of the operation of “emergency contraception” comports with the medical community’s political fiction that pregnancy does not begin until the implantation of the embryo in its mother’s uterus. That absurd assertion means that a mother must carry her baby for a week before the medical establishment will admit that she is pregnant. Under this definition of “pregnancy,” clinicians have a week to kill the baby without “ending an established pregnancy.”

To demonstrate just how misleading arguments by pro-abortion physicians have become regarding the definition of pregnancy, consider the simple fact that “As early as 24 to 48 hours after fertilization begins, pregnancy can be confirmed by detecting a hormone called ‘early pregnancy factor’ in the mother’s blood.” (EHD.org, *The Biology of Prenatal Development*, etc., supra.) If we have a test which can detect pregnancy about one day after intercourse, why would an intellectually honest person argue that pregnancy doesn’t begin until about one week after fertilization? Instead of relying upon subjective, political arguments to fix the point at which an “*established* pregnancy” should first be deemed present, perhaps we should ask objective, scientific questions to determine the point at which a “human being” first exists.

The principal lessons which can be learned from the Northland controversy are that the abortion industry’s fraud perps are highly vulnerable to CBR’s consumer protection and voter education projects, and that the public’s willingness to tolerate abortion is far more tenuous than is widely understood. Abortion can only survive if hidden. That is why the rationale for *Roe* and *Doe* was derived entirely from a fictional right of “reproductive” privacy. Ending this secrecy will seal the ultimate fate of legal, elective abortion. We are imposing real accountability on the abortion industry by exposing Northland’s use of false advertising to facilitate exploitation and conceal brutality. Northland has counter-attacked, and we need your help to push back. They are trying to bury us with their team of four high-priced lawyers. Please stand with us.

Lord bless,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Gregg L. Cunningham', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Gregg L. Cunningham  
Executive Director