

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

July 2012

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

By far, the most common exclamation we hear from viewers who encounter our abortion imagery is “I had no idea how bad abortion actually is.” On August 8, 2012, someone who listed no demographic information emailed us after seeing one of our abortion videos and said: “I never knew that it looked like a person. I thought it was just a cluster of cells scraped out of the cervix.” On July 11, 2012, a fifty-four-year-old woman from St. Augustine, FL, said: “I knew abortion was wrong, but these graphic pictures make it a very dismal and horrific reality.” On July 9, 2012, a twenty-eight-year-old woman from Germany said: “I have had an abortion in 2008. By God’s grace I have given birth to a son last year, and I really wish I had seen this [abortion] video before I have aborted my first baby.” She ended by saying: “I want to fight against abortion and found your internet site.” Changing the public’s understanding of the facts is the first step toward changing collective attitudes and individual behaviors.

Two donors have pledged \$75,000 in a matching gift program for our Key States Initiative. Will you help us reach that goal so we can keep our trucks continually running through the election? If so, please note “KSI matching gift” when you make your donation.

“Fight against abortion” is exactly what we continue to do with our war against Planned Parenthood’s corporate donors, including the Susan G. Komen Race for the [breast cancer] Cure organization, which recently stopped donating to Planned Parenthood but was quickly bullied into resuming their lethal cash flow. We responded by picketing Susan G. Komen race events with huge abortion photos, not least to heighten public awareness of Planned Parenthood’s determination to kill babies, as well as the widely reported link between abortion and breast cancer. And our pickets are beginning to pay off. *The Orange County Register’s* August 11, 2012 edition carried a local story headlined “Abortion flap hurts Komen, Personal donations are down by 25 percent for next month’s Race for the Cure.” We intend to exploit this controversy with increased picketing of Komen events and the distribution of literature intended to make the public aware of the chilling revelation published by LifeNews.com on January 17, 2011 in a story headlined “Abortion has Caused 300K Breast Cancer Deaths Since Roe”:

Professor Joel Brind, an endocrinologist at Baruch College in New York, worked with several scientists on a 1996 paper published in the *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health* showing a ‘30% greater chance of developing breast cancer’ for women who have induced abortions. He recently commented on how many women have become victims.

‘If we take the overall risk of breast cancer among women to be about 10% (not counting abortion), and raise it by 30%, we get 13% lifetime risk,’ Brind explains. ‘Using the 50 million abortions since *Roe v. Wade* figure, we get 1.5 million excess cases of breast cancer. At an average mortality of 20% since 1973, that would mean that legal abortion has resulted in some 300,000 additional deaths due to breast cancer since *Roe v. Wade*.’

Brind said his estimate excludes deaths from the use of abortion to delay first full-term pregnancies -- a recognized breast cancer risk.

‘During the last 21 months, four epidemiological studies and one review reported an abortion-breast cancer link....’ [In fact], ‘One study included National Cancer Institute branch chief Louise Brinton as co-author. We count nearly 50 published epidemiological studies since 1957 reporting a link. Biological and experimental studies also support it.’

Planned Parenthood falsely claims that abortion is safer than full-term delivery, but BreastCancer.org says: “About 39,520 women in the U.S. were expected to die in 2011 from breast cancer.” How many of these unfortunate mothers might have lived had they not aborted? Susan G. Komen was saving women from breast cancer when they cut off Planned Parenthood’s funding. Komen condemns women to breast cancer when they resume that funding. What about the babies Planned Parenthood slaughters -- and those being killed by the British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS) near Abort67, our CBR affiliate’s office in England?

Ann Furedi, BPAS president, writing in AbortionReview.org, March 3, 2011, “Late abortion: The new clash in the Choice Wars,” said: “... I believe that the moral responsibility of decision-making, whatever the gestation, should rest with women and their doctors, because they most understand their circumstances and the results of their actions” She then refers to a “desperate woman” who aborted two weeks short of nine months and adds that “Thinking about that 38-week abortion, and what that woman and her care team must have thought and felt, is what keeps me committed to support for abortion ‘as late as necessary.’” But Ms. Furedi’s “desperate personal circumstances” rationale for even full-term abortion is conceptually similar to the “desperate personal circumstances” justification slave owners used to oppose abolition.

[Please visit the sidebar on the homepage at abortionNO.org and click on the “Archives” link to forward a digital copy of this letter to friends and family. We need your help to expose abortion industry corruption.](#)

In the book *Inhuman Bondage* by David Brion Davis (Oxford University Press, 2006) the author says: “By 1857, many knowledgeable Britons agreed with the London *Times*: ‘... [T]he process [of abolition] was a failure; it destroyed the immense property, ruined thousands of good families, degraded the negroes still lower than they were, and after all, increased the mass of Slavery in less scrupulous hands [i.e., Cuba, Brazil, and the United States].’” I doubt that even destitute former slaves viewed abolition as a failure.

The English History Series, History of England Part 3, at Britain.library4history.org, explains the personal financial losses which abolition imposed on British slave owners: “The government appropriated £20,000,000 to compensate slave owners for their losses and allowed them in the way of service three-fourths of the slave’s time for twelve years. The compensation was inadequate, as the losses of the slave owners amounted to about £50,000,000, while the service arrangement proved to be of little value.” Tragically, former slaves received no compensation whatsoever.

Ms. Furedi told BBC Radio 4 news anchor John Humphrys that our display of abortion photos is wrong essentially because the pictures decontextualize abortion. She said they remove this “medical procedure” from the circumstances which compelled it. But the vast majority of abortions are purely elective decisions motivated by little more than a simple wish to avoid the routine difficulties of pregnancy. I would argue that our photos actually help contextualize abortion decisions. They provide precisely the context required to decide whether the desire to relieve oneself of pregnancy’s common burdens is sufficiently compelling to justify torturing a baby to death. Ms. Furedi, however, insists that no one else has the right to second-guess a mother’s decisions regarding the disposition of her pregnancy. She calls this notion “the principle of moral autonomy” I call it being too narcissistic to even bother rationalizing homicide.

Some species of a claim to moral autonomy is exactly the sort of argument slave owners made regarding decisions involving their slaves. Society was once just as “pluralistic” regarding slavery as it is today concerning abortion. The feminist chant “It’s my body” merely echoes the slave trader’s cry “It’s my

property.” We don’t grant mothers moral autonomy regarding child abuse and abortion photos prove we shouldn’t grant it concerning abortion. Yet Ms. Furedi says “... tolerance is the price we pay for our freedom of conscience” Tolerance for gross injustice, however, is no virtue. No reasonable person would offer a moral autonomy argument in defense of employers guilty of child labor abuses. Freedom of conscience may be a noble concept where self-interest is the only interest at issue. But where one’s choices have life and death implications for the interests of others, moral autonomy must be subordinated to the rule of law. Ms. Furedi, of course, suggests that there are no “others” when a woman becomes pregnant. But practitioners of genocide always dehumanize their victims to strip away their rights of personhood.

In a Spiked-Online.com December 20, 2010 article titled “A moral defense of late abortion,” Ann Furedi says: “The heated character of the debate around ‘late’ abortion is curious, given that ‘early’ abortion is almost beyond controversy.” Ms. Furedi is correct about early abortion being relatively noncontroversial -- until, that is, people are forced to look at it. Then settled issues suddenly become unsettled and people who had sought the safety of some mythical middle ground are forced to take sides. That is why she fears our photos, and rightly so. She adds that “Later abortions are undoubtedly grueling for both the patient and provider” All abortions, however, are “grueling” at some level and pictures communicate the stress of that experience beyond aborting mothers and doctors. When we show pictures to BPAS’ prospective customers, lives are saved. When we show them to U.K. voters and their MPs, laws are changed.

Please consider a \$120 donation to purchase one day’s diesel fuel for one of our voter education billboard trucks (Key States Initiative) operating in CO, IA, VA, FL and WI (the latter if we can fund that state).

Ms. Furedi then gets to the heart of the matter in her December 20 article, asserting that “In essence, early abortion is justified pragmatically: It is socially necessary because, without it, the inevitable and unavoidable large numbers of unplanned pregnancies will result in the social cost of unwanted children born to unwilling mothers.” As noted above, the social costs of ending the British slave trade and abolishing British slavery were at least as daunting as those we must endure to end abortion, but Great Britain of old had the integrity to pay the high price which justice always demands.

David Brion Davis teaches that “If Parliament had not outlawed the British slave trade in 1807, British West Indian plantations, especially in Jamaica and the recently conquered colonies of Trinidad and Demerara, would have produced much greater wealth, the kind of productivity and wealth later enjoyed for many decades by slave-importing Cuba and Brazil.” Davis adds that “In 1975, historian Roger Anstey ‘... showed that by every canon of national economic interest, 1806-07 was the very worst time for Britain to abolish its slave trade.’” Davis also notes that “In 1977 Seymour Drescher’s hard-hitting book *Econocide: British Slavery in the Era of Abolition* argued that abolition of the slave trade was comparable to committing suicide for a major part of Britain’s economy.”

He finally concludes that “By 1861, one [American] Southern woman could write to her cousin in England, arguing that the British West Indies had provided the South with a ‘window’ ... for viewing the total disaster of slave emancipation when British abolitionists won their way. By watching the British since 1834, she added, the South had learned that only resistance, even the resistance of war, could prevent a West Indian-like collapse into social and economic ruin.”

Ms. Furedi seems to argue that the preborn are not worth the high price required to protect them. In her “Moral defense of late abortion,” she writes: “At 28 weeks we can see it is human -- at eight weeks a human embryo looks much like that of a hamster. But are we really so shallow, so fickle, as to let our view on moral worth be determined by appearance?” She well knows the answer to that question and that is why she is desperate to prevent her prospective customers from seeing our abortion photos. She is dehumanizing her victims in exactly the way Davis describes in *Inhuman Bondage*: “... [F]rom the earliest Sumerian tablets and other records dating from the mid-third-millennium B.C.E., captive slaves have been equated with domesticated animals in ... the way they have been described.” Dehumanizing rhetoric facilitates genocide.

Arguing for an end to the cumbersome pretense that abortion is meaningfully regulated in the U.K., Ms. Furedi rationalizes that “Left to make their own moral judgments, some women will inevitably make decisions that we would not; perhaps even those we think are ‘wrong.’ And we must live with that: In a world where women can exercise their human capacity through their moral expression.” Perhaps Ms. Furedi can “live with” abortion on demand but British babies cannot, any more than British slaves could live with planters exercising their “human capacity” through “inhumane moral expression.”

Please consider making a contribution of \$150 to fund one of the new Corporate Accountability Project (CAP) signs we are now displaying outside the businesses of Planned Parenthood corporate donors.

Bury the Chains, by Adam Hochschild, published by Mariner Books (2005), says that “Once European ships started cruising the African coast offering all kinds of tempting goods for slaves, kings and chiefs began selling their human property to African dealers who roamed far into the interior.” Hochschild adds that “Groups of captives, ranging in size from a few to six or eight hundred, were forced-marched to the coast, the prisoners’ hands bound behind their backs, necks connected by wooden yokes.” He also notes that “... over 11 million slaves were herded onto vessels ... for the middle passage and that some 9.6 million survived to finish it.” Eric Metaxas, in *Amazing Grace* (HarperOne, 2007), says: “The captured Africans suffered and died in shocking percentages during every part of the journey from their homes.”

But the British people could see none of this horror. Hochschild points out that “... in England itself, there were no caravans of chained captives, no whip-wielding overseers on horseback stalking the rows of [Caribbean] sugar cane. The abolitionists’ first job was to make Britons understand what lay behind the sugar they ate, the tobacco they smoked, the coffee they drank.” Abort67’s first job is to make Britons understand what lies behind the procedure room doors of BPAS abortion clinics. The public now doesn’t like the pictures used by anti-abortion activists any more than the public then liked the pictures used by abolitionists. Hochschild documents the rage provoked when abolitionists such as Thomas Clarkson used pictures to dramatize the shocking facts the slave traders were trying to suppress. “More than once people would threaten to kill him, and on a Liverpool pier ... a group of slave ship officers would nearly succeed.”

Yesterday I confronted a man who had called to threaten physical violence against one of our Key States Initiative (KSI) billboard trucks operating in Colorado. I told him to retract that threat and apologize or I would have him arrested. He did both and by the end of our conversation I think I managed to at least partially change his mind about the utility of our voter education trucks. Thanks for helping us operate these trucks which made it impossible for this man (and many such as he) to pretend that abortion is a morally inconsequential act. The IRS forbids us from telling voters for whom to vote but we have every right to make certain that the plight of the preborn is made an issue -- whether the candidates like it or not.

Lord bless,

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

Gregg Cunningham
Executive Director