

## THE USE OF PICTURES IN THE HISTORY OF SOCIAL REFORM

The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR)

Gregg Cunningham

The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR) has conducted an extensive study of the history of social reform. Our goal was to identify principles often associated with successful campaigns against injustice which principles could be adapted for application to pro-life activism. We discovered that the first principle of social reform is that injustice which is invisible is injustice which defies reform. It must be made visible before public opinion can be mobilized against it. Pictures are the only effective means through which inexpressively evil injustice can be fully exposed. The written and spoken word alone will never suffice. No great evil has ever been outlawed by activists who covered it up. Exposing evil invites persecution. Effective activists are seldom liked. Liked activists are seldom effective.

In his Wilberforce biography, *Amazing Grace*, Harper San Francisco, 2006, author Eric Metaxas offers an account of an English slave ship captain named Luke Collingwood who was sued for throwing slaves overboard to collect on the insurance which covered the cargo of the ship Zong. Collingwood prevailed at trial, and on appeal, Lord Mansfield ruled that "... it was just as if 'horses had been thrown overboard.'"

Metaxas also explains why it was critical for abolitionists to make the horrors of slavery real to British voters:

Of the many social problems Wilberforce might have thought needed his attention, slavery would have been the least visible of all, and by a wide margin. In fact, the answer to how Britain could have allowed something as brutal as West Indian slavery to exist, and for so long, has much to do with its invisibility. Few British people ever saw the slightest hint of it, for only a tiny handful of the three million Africans who had been pressed into British slavery over the years ever set foot on British shores. They were kidnapped [in Africa] and shipped straight to the West Indian sugar plantations thousands of miles away. The sugar and molasses from these plantations came to England but who could have known of the nightmarish institution of human bondage that attended their making? Who could have known that much of the wealth in their nation's booming economy was created on the other side of the world by the most brutal mistreatment of other human beings, many of them women and children. Most British citizens had never seen anyone branded or whipped or subjected to thumbscrews. They had no idea that conditions on West Indian sugar plantations were so brutal that most of the slaves were literally worked to death in just a few years and that most of the female slaves were too ill to bear children. Black faces were very rare in Britain in the late eighteenth century, especially before the 1770s, and any blacks one might have seen would probably have seemed to be treated rather well.

Abortion is as invisible today as British slavery was in the Eighteenth Century. The Telegraph.co.uk explains the importance of expressing the inexpressible savagery of slavery in a

feature article headlined “Am I Not A Man And A Brother?” on 11 March 2007. It reported that “Slavery was undermined by the very thing that kept it going - a brutality unendurable by the slaves or by the awakening sensibility of the British public.” It was awful pictures which “undermined” it, shifting public opinion in support of abolition when nothing else had worked.

Anti-slavery imagery was at least as provocative in 18<sup>th</sup> Century England as anti-abortion imagery is in 21<sup>st</sup> Century America. But abolitionists used it anyway, because slavery was shocking and voters needed to be shocked. At BBC.co.uk, in the section titled “Religions, William Wilberforce,” May 7, 2011, we read that “... [T]he abolitionists were brilliant at public relations and devised radical new ways of bringing their cause to public attention.” The writer says “They had pamphlets full of eye-witness testimony. They had extraordinary graphics such as the famous image of the slave ship, *Brookes*, which showed captive Africans packed like sardines in a can.” Most importantly, “The potter Josiah Wedgewood struck a brooch that depicted an enslaved man on bended knee. At the bottom of the brooch was the inscription: ‘Am I not a man and a brother?’”

#### **PICTURES ABOLISHED THE BRITISH SLAVE TRADE:**

For his confrontational tactics, Wilberforce was denounced as an extremist. In the book *William Wilberforce: The Life of the Great Anti-Slave Trade Campaigner*, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (2008), William Hague quotes Wilberforce declaring, “If to be feelingly alive to the sufferings of my fellow-creatures is to be a fanatic, I am one of the most incurable fanatics ever permitted to be at large.” At BBC.co.uk, in the section titled “Religions, William Wilberforce,” May 7, 2011, we read that: “For Wilberforce personally it meant enduring vitriolic attacks in the newspapers; he was physically assaulted, he faced death threats and he had to travel with an armed bodyguard.”

Abortion today is as invisible as slavery was in antiquity. We must make it visible exactly as abolitionists exposed the unspeakable evil of human bondage. But how can we if making it visible provokes arrests pursuant to complaints from those who have an interest in maintaining its invisibility? How could Wilberforce have ended the slave trade and slavery if The Public Order Act had jailed abolitionists each time their disturbing pictures offended those with an interest in keeping the horrors of slavery invisible?

On April 15, 2007, *The Guardian* published a story headlined “Of Human Bondage” which referenced the shocking pictures slaves being tortured to death which were created by UK artist William Blake during the campaign against the slave trade and slavery. “Blake's engravings ... are horrifying - brutal whippings, torture and hangings ....” These sickening images are at least as shocking and every bit as indispensable as any abortion picture.

#### **PICTURES IN CONGO:**

At academia.edu, CBR supporters can find an important essay by Derrick M. Nault, a professor at the University of Calgary, in Alberta, Canada, titled “‘At the Bar of Public Sentiment’: The

Congo Free State Controversy, Atrocity Tales, and Human Rights History.” I have excerpted below certain portions of the text which can help us better understand the degree to which the church has become indifferent to injustice and human suffering over the last century. Christian higher education is producing Christian leaders whose ministry priorities bear little resemblance to those of the Good Samaritan -- but closely reflect those of the priest and the Levite who passed by “on the other side” of the beating victim in Christ’s salvation parable. We can change this pathetic state of affairs with the judicious use of the same sort of horrific pictures used to save children in Congo.

The tragic saga of the Congo Free State commenced with King Leopold II, who in 1873, after scouring the world for unclaimed territory, hired ... [an agent to] establish posts, and seek out economic opportunities in the Congo River Basin.

\* \* \*

Initially the Congo Free State seemed to possess few other exploitable resources than ivory, but with the rubber boom of the early 1890s Leopold and his concessionary companies secured hyper profits through terror and forced labor. Outsiders did not learn of human rights abuses occurring under Leopold’s rule until the 1890s .... By that time, between 8 and 10 million Congolese had perished in one of the worst crimes of humanity of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which were documented and exposed through a wide array of atrocity tale texts.

\* \* \*

... [T]he writer Joseph Conrad, intrigued by the mysteries of central Africa since he was a young boy, also ventured to the region, securing work aboard the steamship *Roi des Belges*. The disturbing scenes he witnessed in his six month visit in 1890 served as the inspiration for his *Heart of Darkness*, which first appeared in serial form in 1899 in *Blackwoods Magazine* and was published as a novella in 1903 (Conrad, 1987/1903).

\* \* \*

Mark Twain joined the Congo Reform Movement later than Conrad but was more directly involved in the cause, delivering public lectures, granting interviews, and writing letters to newspapers and influential figures. His literary contribution – *King Leopold’s Soliloquy* (1906) – was published in the US and then Europe during the peak of the rubber boom, when conditions had deteriorated beyond what ... Conrad had witnessed.

A sample from Twain’s satirical interview with King Leopold:

In the early years we had no trouble in getting the press to 'expose' the tales of the mutilations as slanders ... lies, inventions of American missionaries ....

\* \* \*

Then all of a sudden came the crash! That is to say the incorruptible Kodak .... The only witness ... I couldn't bribe. Every Yankee missionary ... sent home and got one; and now – oh well, the pictures get sneaked around everywhere, in spite of all we can do to ferret them out and suppress them.

Returning to Nault:

The true turning point in the international human rights campaign, however, occurred in 1903, when public pressure forced Lord Lansdowne, Secretary of the British Foreign Office, to authorize Roger Casement, His Majesty's Consul at Boma, to lead a fact gathering mission. The resulting *Congo Report* (1904) (aka the "Casement Report"), based on three months of field research, confirmed allegations of forced labor, floggings, kidnappings, murders, and mutilations. Casement concluded that alarming population decreases were due to years of compelling Congolese to gather rubber.

\* \* \*

E.D. Morel, founder of the Congo Reform Association (CRA), aided the humanitarian movement for the Congo through numerous publications, such as the *West African Mail*, the CRA's official newspaper, and his books *King Leopold's Rule in Africa* (1905) and *Red Rubber* (1906). Morel's initial concern was not with Leopold's cruelties but his obstruction of free trade, which not only ran counter to the king's promises to the European powers during the Berlin Conference but also violated Africans' rights to freely sell their labor and resources (Grant, 2001, pp. 36-37, 39). As noted by Grant (2001, p. 41), such rational arguments were less effective in swaying public opinion than emotional appeals using graphic images.

\* \* \*

The international campaign against King Leopold coincided with the improvement of photographic technology as well as invention of techniques to reproduce photographs in publications. The Kodak camera, compact, portable, and simple to use, in particular proved revolutionary for its ability to record images of situations and events.

\* \* \*

The most prominent individuals taking such photographs were Alice Seeley Harris and John Harris, English missionaries who arrived at the Congo Balolo Mission in 1898 (See Sliwinski, 2006, 2010 and Thompson, 2002). One widely circulated photograph from Alice Harris, of a man named Nsala of Wala, shows him gazing at the severed hand and foot of his 5-year-old daughter who had been murdered by sentries of the Anglo-Belgian India Rubber (ABIR) Company (Figure 1). Another features a young man named Mola, who lost both hands when Force Publique soldiers tied them too tightly and crushed them with rifle butts, and a boy named Yoka, whose right hand was severed by soldiers when his village failed to make their rubber quota (Figure 2). These images and others appeared in Casement's *Congo Report*, Mark Twain's *King Leopold's Soliloquy*, and E.D. Morel's *Red Rubber* and *King Leopold's Rule in the Congo*. Atrocity photos were also used in 'lantern lectures' delivered by the Harrises and other reformers to packed American and British audiences (Grant, 2001).

\* \* \*

It was atrocity photographs ... that had the most pronounced effect on international public opinion (Sliwinski, 2006, 2010). Until photographs of mutilated Congolese were shown to the world, doubts still remained in some circles that reports of violence in the Congo were overblown. However, after Alice Harris circulated photos in late 1905 with dates, names and other details Leopold found it more and more difficult to refute the charges of abuse against him. The Australian newspaper the *Advertiser* commented that '[T]he Kodak cannot lie' and Harris' photographs proved that the Congo Free State was 'a hell of horrors.' Describing numerous 'heart rending,' 'ghastly,' and 'dreadful' photographs of destroyed villages, women and children with severed limbs, the newspaper spoke of how such images 'make our blood alternately run cold with horror and boil with anger' ('The Kodak on the Congo,' 1905). Also recognizing the importance of atrocity photographs for the reform movement, Twain in *King Leopold's Soliloquy* had Leopold examine photos of mutilated Congolese and sigh that 'The Kodak has been a sore calamity to us. The most powerful enemy that has confronted us, indeed' (Twain, 2005/1906, p. 53).

\* \* \*

In an interview with an unnamed US senator, the *Washington Times* in 1906 inquired as to the correspondence he received 'in this day of typewriters and cheap postage.' He mentioned receiving letters from Americans nearly every day calling for intervention in the Congo 'because some lecturer has been touring my State telling people about the Congo outrages, and in nearly every audience there are a few people who write about it' ('Congressman's Samples,' 1906). On their speaking tour in the US that year, John and Alice Harris, encouraged by large and enthusiastic crowds, informed E.D. Morel that they soon expected the

US President to take action as a deluge of letters to elected officials following their lectures was making inaction less and less likely (Hochschild, 1999, pp. 242-243).

Mark Sealy, director of Autograph ABP (previously named the Association of Black Photographers, a British, non-profit organization devoted, among other objectives, to global human rights advocacy) said in 2010:

In the early 1900s, the missionaries Alice Seeley Harris and her husband, Reverend John Harris, produced what was probably the first photographic campaign in support of human rights. A significant moment in the history of photography. The Harris Lantern Slide Collection was, at the time of its presentation in Europe and America, a radical and significant shift in the representation and understanding of the impact of colonial violence in the Congo. Instead of the charade of civilization that masked the Belgians' presence in the Congo, these photographs exposed the deep-rooted hypocrisy of so called colonial benevolence.

How ironic that the person responsible for the first use of horrifying photos in a campaign of social reform would be a Christian missionary, depicting the severed hand and foot of a child who had been tortured to death. When CBR displays a horrifying photo depicting the severed hand and foot of a child who has been tortured to death, today's Christian leaders emulate King Leopold and work to suppress the same kinds of disturbing, life-saving images. Alice Harris was in The Congo to spread the Gospel, but she knew the Gospel included a Biblically-mandated duty to intervene in defense of victims of injustice, and to do so as disruptively as possible. By her lights, saving victims of violence was not a departure from her mission, but an opportunity to take the risks and make the sacrifices necessary to convince the world that Christ is real.

Ms. Harris, unlike her missionary associates (who remained silent as they received subsidies and grants and tax breaks from the Belgian authorities) was willing to expose atrocities by displaying disturbing photos. Many missionaries also feared ejection from the country if they spoke out against the killing of children. Today's Christian leaders are silenced by similar fear that their expressions of opposition to child killing will compromise their ability to proclaim.

Ms. Harris, unlike most other missionaries of her era, was determined to create discomfort in the pursuit of justice. Today's Christian leaders are determined to avoid the creation of any discomfort they deem inimical to their "ministry's" business interests (while pretending that they aren't really wimping out). These misplaced priorities must surely grieve the Spirit of God. One can easily envision a missionary graduate of today's Christian colleges and seminaries arguing that any aggressive intervention to protect victims of systematic butchery could compromise that missionary's ability to preach salvation to the lost. "True," they might concede, "people are being hacked to pieces all around us -- but we boldly preach John 3:16 while they bleed to death." Alice Harris' shocking pictures disturbed a lot of people, but they saved a lot of lives and -- made the Gospel more real by making it more relevant.

In *National Review* magazine's November 25, 2013 issue, Matthew Scully published an excellent comparative analysis of the animal rights and pro-life movements. Under the headline "Pro-Life, Pro-Animal," he wrote that "In their PR campaigns, it is the all-important mission of both lobbying groups [the meat industry and the abortion industry] to prevent images like those ... [in an abortion video] from getting out. Indeed, it is hard to think of any two enterprises, at least in developed societies, that have more to fear from simple photographic images than abortion and factory farming." He adds that "... livestock interests have leaned on legislators to make it a crime to take pictures of factory-farmed animals, and in some states they have already succeeded." Biola University, along with virtually every other American Christian college, has made it a crime to display abortion pictures, with Biola actually threatening one of its students with arrest and criminal prosecution for holding an abortion picture in the public square on her campus. Planned Parenthood cheered. The school later apologized – but only after the PR damage became unsustainable. The president promised that no student would again be punished for displaying abortion photos. Our student interns will soon test the sincerity of that claim.

With God's help, we know how to restore the spirit of Alice Harris to today's Christian leadership. It starts with asking today's pastors whether they are willing to allow children to be hacked to death so the Gospel can be preached – as though God would not have us save both souls and babies at the same time.

### **SHOCKING PICTURES IN CHILD LABOR REFORM:**

At the dawn of the Twentieth Century, the U.S. National Child Labor Committee was established to end then rampant child labor abuses. The 1900 census estimated that nearly two million children had been forced into the labor pool. Society was in massive denial about these atrocities because large numbers of parents and consumers profited from the commercial exploitation of children. Efforts to reform the law were going nowhere.

To counter bogus claims that child labor didn't harm children (industrial accidents, stunted growth through repetitive motions, etc.), the Committee hired Photographer Lewis Hine to document actual conditions and their effects on American children. Beginning in 1908, Hine took hundreds of photographs which were widely shown in traveling exhibits and magazines. "Often photographing children looking directly into the camera, Hine brought them face to face with people throughout the country who would rather believe that such poverty and hardship did not exist."<sup>i</sup>

The public didn't like being made to feel more guilty than they already felt about child labor, but Hine didn't care. A recent PBS documentary called "American Photography, A Century of Images" quoted Hine's reaction to the inevitable criticism: "Perhaps you are weary of child labor pictures. Well, so are the rest of us. But we propose to make the whole country so sick and tired of the whole business that when the time for action comes, child labor abuses will be creatures of the past."

In the book *Kids at Work: Lewis Hine and the Crusade Against Child Labor*, Freedman & Hein (Clarion Books, 1994) we read, “A newspaper reporter who saw an exhibit of Hine’s photos at a conference in Birmingham, Alabama, was stunned by the power of the images. He wrote:

There has been no more convincing proof of the absolute necessity of child labor laws ... than these pictures showing the suffering, the degradation, the immoral influence, the utter lack of anything that is wholesome in the lives of these poor little wage earners. They speak more eloquently than any [written] work – and depict a state of affairs which is terrible in its reality – terrible to encounter, terrible to admit that such things exist in civilized communities.

The author adds that “Hine’s photos were meant to shock and anger those who saw them. They were intended to mobilize public opinion, and that is exactly what they did. The photos became a powerful weapon in the crusade against child labor.”

### **ROSA PARKS INAUGURATED THE CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENTS BECAUSE OF A HORRIFYING PHOTO:**

Court TV’s Crime Library ([crimelibrary.com](http://crimelibrary.com)) describes the impact of the pictures in a story by Mark Gado entitled “Mississippi Madness: The Story of Emmett Till.” Emmett was a black teenager gruesomely murdered by the Klan in Mississippi:

The woman [Rosa Parks] saw a newspaper photo of the boy’s corpse. The image deeply disturbed her and because of it, she hadn’t been able to sleep lately. No, she wouldn’t give up her seat.

\* \* \*

Things are not right here, she said to herself. Maybe if people just didn’t go along with it anymore. Maybe if everyone just stuck together. Something had to happen. She saw a red-faced cop moving toward her but little did she care.

The only thing Rosa Parks thought about was the boy, Emmett Till.

Till’s mother chose a glass-topped casket so mourners could see her son’s ghastly injuries. Photographs of Till’s body in the coffin published in *Jet Magazine* became powerful images of the civil rights movement.

Philip C. Kolin wrote about this effect: “Horrified by the *Jet* photo but empowered by Till’s example, numerous young black leaders in the 1950s and 1960s forward ... heard and heeded Emmett Till’s plea (and his mother’s) for justice and change ....” (Usm.edu, “The Legacy of Emmett Till”)

“The young people who later led the civil rights movement were roughly Emmett’s age, (and) all of them say that was a formative moment for them, that someone their own age was being lynched for virtually nothing,” said Taylor Branch, the Pulitzer Prize-winning author of a three-volume biography of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

“I once asked Mrs. Parks, ‘Why didn't you move to the back of the bus?’” the Rev. Jesse Jackson said last week, standing with members of Till’s family at the cemetery. “She said, ‘I thought about Emmett Till and I couldn’t go back.’” (HuffingtonPost.com, “Emmett Till’s Old Casket ...” July 13, 2009)

Martin Luther King came into the civil rights movements to lead the Montgomery, Alabama, bus boycott because Rosa Parks had been arrested for not moving to the back of the bus. She remained seated because she had seen a picture of Emmett Till’s mutilated body. A horrifying photo started the civil rights movement.

### **MARTIN LUTHER KING AND SHOCKING PICTURES:**

Why is it critically important to show the public shocking photos of social injustice? Martin Luther King determined that as long as racists were allowed to abuse black people outside the view of the national news media, most Americans would remain ignorant of the frequency and severity of the mistreatment and the abuses would never end. He too struggled in vain to rally the church against the brutalization of helpless victims. He concluded his “Letter from the Birmingham Jail” with a description of just the sort of racial violence that, as is true of the violence of abortion, few Americans were allowed to see.

At some point, Dr. King had an epiphany. Suppose that instead of passively accepting random attacks against blacks in inconspicuous settings, civil rights leaders would organize protests specifically intended to provoke the racists into making their attacks in public? And suppose those same civil rights leaders would arrange with sympathetic journalists to photograph and film those attacks for publication and broadcast? Suddenly the public would be forced by the ugly pictures to confront the shame of racial violence. The civil rights movement realized it could use these shocking images to “shame America before the world.” Richard B. Speed’s review of Mark Kurlansky’s book *1968: The Year That Rocked the World*, describes this enormously successful strategy:

In discussing the impact of civil disobedience, Kurlansky relates a telling incident that took place during a 1965 march in Selma, Alabama. Martin Luther King apparently noticed that *Life Magazine* photographer, Flip Schulke had put down his camera in order to help a demonstrator injured by the police. Afterward, according to Kurlansky, King rebuked Schulke, telling him that ‘Your job is to photograph what is happening to us.’

Social reform is always about the pictures, whether in the context of civil rights or child labor or anti-war campaigns or abortion. No one wants to see sickening pictures but until the public is

forced to look, the sickening violence can't be stopped. Dr. King and his associates had paid a terrible price for provoking these bloody attacks and without pictures to disturb the American people, their sacrifice would be futile. Oppressors have always tried to suppress the evidence of their abuses. At [JessieDanielsPhD.com](http://JessieDanielsPhD.com) (Thinking at the Interface) we read a quote by Gary Olson, speaking of slavery:

In his recent book, *The Slave Ship*, maritime historian Marcus Rediker documents the role played by emotional and especially visual appeals in ending the trans-Atlantic slave trade. The visuals were indispensable because, as the abolitionist James Field Stanfield argued, the terrible truths of the slave trade 'had been withheld from the public eye by every effort that interest, ingenuity, and influence, could devise.'

*Roots* author Alex Haley says Martin Luther King "... decided to create a crisis in 1963 to 'dramatize the Negro plight and galvanize the national conscience.'" He used shocking photos to do it.

In *Why We Can't Wait*, Martin Luther King, Jr., Mass Market Paperback (2000), wrote of the media coverage of the of the Birmingham movement he helped orchestrate in 1963: "The brutality with which officials would have ... [abused blacks] became impotent when it could not be pursued with stealth and remain unobserved."

The oppressors always try to suppress the pictures and they always dupe good people (often Christians) into helping them sweep the evidence under the carpet. Like their slave-owning forbearers, 1960s racists quickly understood the dangers of news coverage and journalists, especially those with cameras, became targets. Harry F. Rosenthal, an Associated Press reporter who covered the James Meredith march to Jackson, MS, is quoted in the book *Breaking News*, Associated Press (Princeton Architectural Press, 2007): "'We never knew who to be afraid of,' he said. 'Nobody wanted us there.' He recalled that about twenty of the twenty-five cars that had been rented by reporters were returned damaged, many with bullet holes."

The *Washington Post's* obituary of Mr. Schulke (May 17, 2008) quotes the photographer on the dangers of taking pictures of Klansmen attacking civil rights marchers:

Mr. Schulke was threatened by white mobs, tear-gassed by police and locked in squad cars so he couldn't document demonstrations. He usually rented Cadillacs while on assignment in the South, he said, because they were heavy and could outrun the old pickup trucks favored by Ku Klux Klan members.

In the fall of 1962, he was in Oxford, Miss., where James Meredith was attempting to enroll as the first black student at the University of Mississippi. With federal marshals confronting an angry white mob, Mr. Schulke got onto

campus hidden in the trunk of a professor's car. A fellow photographer was shot and killed by a sniper, shortly after Mr. Schulke urged him to take cover.

Mr. Schulke was hiding in the trunk of a car because Mississippi authorities had banned cameras from the streets of the campus (*Press-Telegram*, Long Beach, CA, October 1, 1962). They knew the world was watching and they didn't want pictures of literally thousands of Klansmen trying to kill one, lone, black man.

The evidence that distressing pictures changed public opinion was undeniable. Associated Press photographer Jack Thornell was interviewed by *Smithsonian* magazine (*Smithsonian.com*, "Down in Mississippi," February 2005) about his photo of James Meredith, later writhing in the pain of multiple shotgun blasts on a march specifically intended to defy the Ku Klux Klan:

Of the many photographs that Thornell made of the incident, one shows the fallen man on dusty Highway 51 screaming in agony. It was published in newspapers and magazines nationwide and went on to win a Pulitzer Prize. The image suggests the very pain and frustration of being black in the Deep South of the 1960s. 'When people saw scenes like this in newspapers and on TV—when they saw what was actually happening down South—they couldn't believe it,' says Thornell, who is 65 and retired and lives in Metairie, Louisiana. He says his one lasting regret about that day four decades ago is that he didn't put his camera down to help the wounded Meredith.

Heaven knows how many children were traumatized by horrifying photographs such as this one of the badly wounded Mr. Meredith. Should these pictures have been suppressed to avoid "infuriating" the white parents of the upset children?

Dr. King told Mr. Schulke that his job was to "photograph what is happening to us" and the pro-life movement's job is to photograph what is happening to aborted babies. Planned Parenthood and the rest of the abortion industry hate us for it and they aren't alone. On February 29, 2007, *The Willamette Weekly*, in an article on CBR's truck billboards ("Truck You!") quoted a very angry abortionist named Dr. Elizabeth Newhall, the director of the Downtown Women's Center, in Portland, OR: "They've [CBR] clearly stolen tissue and posed it in order to horrify and maximize gruesomeness." She adds, "They had to go to great lengths to produce this. It's pathetic." She's not "pathetic" for killing these children, we're "pathetic" for exposing in public what she is doing to them in secret.

When we have shown these huge aborted baby photos on college campuses, despite police protection without whose presence we would have been prevented from even setting up our displays, we have been punched, shoved, had hot coffee thrown in our faces and had innumerable objects hurled at us. On one campus, two students crashed a car into our exhibit, knocking signs into the street and nearly running down one of our staff. We have had our photo display torn down, and had signs slashed, spray painted, and stolen. Our billboard truck drivers have been threatened with shooting and being run off the road. Callers and e-mail

writers have threatened to sabotage our trucks and our tires have been slashed. The pilots who fly our billboard planes have been threatened with shooting and have had to have police escort them to their cars at airports. In Montana a man was arrested while pointing a gun at one of our planes.

Many pro-lifers offer essentially the same criticism of CBR as was offered by church leaders who condemned Martin Luther King for his “divisive” civil rights activism. Dr. King’s insistence that evil be brought out into the open and confronted split the church just as vehemently as it split the community. Joan Walsh, writing for Salon.com, August 19<sup>th</sup>, 2003, described the division he created in the Body of Christ:

So it’s hard to imagine that when King wrote his famed ‘Letter From a Birmingham Jail,’ he was facing national criticism for bringing the wrath of the civil rights movement down upon a hapless city that, despite its ugly past, was supposedly doing its best to change. But that’s exactly what provoked King’s great work. On the eve of the minister’s April 1963 direct action campaign against Birmingham, its citizens had just held an election that repudiated the administration that backed Bull Connor [the viciously racist Commissioner of Public Safety who controlled the violent Sheriff’s Department] (though Connor’s allies were challenging it in the courts). A covert alliance between conservative blacks and white businessmen concerned about the city’s brutal image was trying to find ways to dismantle local segregation gradually. And many Birmingham black people were skeptical of King’s crusade. The civil rights leader went to jail that Good Friday, April 12, 1963 -- on the trumped-up charge of parading without a permit -- at least partly because almost nobody else would. Three-quarters of the city’s black ministers, for instance, at first withheld support from King’s campaign.

\* \* \*

And the clergymen weren’t alone in their condemnation of King: As Taylor Branch details in ‘Parting the Waters: America in the King Years 1954-1963,’ *Time* magazine called his Birmingham campaign ‘a poorly timed protest’ and the *Washington Post* insisted it was ‘prompted more by leadership rivalry than the real need of the situation.’ *The New York Times* praised the new administration of Mayor Albert Boutwell and editorialized that it didn’t expect change in Birmingham ‘overnight’ -- and cautioned that King ‘ought not to expect it either.’ President John F. Kennedy and his brother Robert, meanwhile, were fed up with the Atlanta minister’s jail-going ways and resisted his wife Coretta’s pleas to intervene.

Pictures of Dr. King and his associates being abused by the police had a profound effect on public opinion. Martin Luther King believed that there would have been no civil rights movement without the public display of sickening photos of black people being wounded and

even killed by racists who thought Negroes to be subhuman. This shocking imagery convinced the public that, as was the case with terrible photos of child labor, racial injustice was an evil of far greater enormity than most people ever imagined. It was terrible pictures which changed public opinion at the levels required to change the law.

*Newsweek*, August 8, 2005, makes precisely that point in a story titled “Back on the bridge”:

The carnage on the Edmund Pettus Bridge (miraculously no one was killed) shocked the nation and led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act. Signed by Lyndon Johnson 40 years ago this month, that measure put teeth into the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment, which guaranteed blacks a right to vote that most of the South had never bothered to honor. The act gave the Feds tools to challenge the endless gambits used to keep blacks away from the polls, and it required ‘covered jurisdictions,’ primarily in the South, to get federal approval before changing voting rules or practices.

\* \* \*

Due in large measure to that legislation, Selma [and the entire South] has been politically transformed.

“Carnage” perfectly describes abortion but only those who have seen it would understand it as such. Few Americans would have known what happened that day in Selma had cameras not documented the horror which the press then published and broadcast.

Many people who saw those terrible pictures felt guilt and therefore resentment toward Dr. King. The photos forced them to confront their own complicity and complacency. Again we must ask, should Dr. King have cared more about the feelings of whites or the lives of blacks? Should white children have been spared the trauma of seeing these pictures – even though suppressing the photos would have meant that black children would continue to die in arson attacks and church bombings? Many selfish white parents demanded an end to the pictures, not the killings.

The May 2006 issue of *Smithsonian* magazine (“Fearing the Worst”) reports that the protests which landed Dr. King in the Birmingham Jail involved, “... demonstrators [who] faced down fire hoses and police dogs and inspired President Kennedy to introduce federal legislation outlawing segregation.” This change in the President’s willingness to offend Southern Members of Congress was a direct result of disturbing pictures of disruptive protests. Dr. King, in his “Letter from the Birmingham Jail,” defended his “outside agitator” status by saying “... I am in Birmingham because injustice is here.” He added that “The purpose of our direct action program is to create a situation so crisis packed that it will inevitably open the door to negotiation.” He understood that he needed to create that crisis by dramatizing and photographing the injustice which was being ignored.

## PICTURES IN MODERN SOCIAL REFORM:

In *Sociology in Perspective*, Kirby *et al.*, Heinemann Educational Publishers (2000), the author interviews the British disaster relief organization Oxfam: "Pictures have power. They can convey information *and* emotion [emphasis added]. They can provoke a response and leave a lasting impression. The right pictures can mobilize people and change events."

In the 1986 essay at OxfordJournals.org, "'Icons of the Dispossessed': Bert Hardy and the Documentary Photograph," Boyd Tonkin discusses "... the use of the photographic record as a language of persuasion" to record the horrific suffering of East African children stricken with advanced malnutrition and disease. He quotes another writer who conceded that after seeing these jarring photos he will "probably never be the same again ...."

Documentary photographer Lewis Hine, whose disturbing photographs helped stop child labor abuses in America, is quoted at SouthAlabama.edu in his monograph "Social Photography," arguing that his pictures enabled him "... to refute those who ... spread the news that there is no child labor in New England."

In *Natural Visions, The Power of Images in American Environmental Reform*, Dunaway, University of Chicago Press (2008), the author writes that "... history of environmental reform is ... the story of images representing and defining the natural world, of the camera shaping politics and public attitudes." He describes the "... activists who used the camera in the service of politics, hoping that images could galvanize concern for their reform efforts ...."

Without the same sort of shocking pictures which convinced voters that child labor was an evil of sufficient enormity to criminalize, our swing-state candidates will struggle to overcome huge competitive disadvantages and our blue state candidates won't stand a chance. It is, therefore, important that we make unborn babies as visible as the women who conceive them. But you can't communicate the full majesty of prenatal development with words alone. Political activists in film and television industries have long used sympathetic depictions of gay and lesbian characters (think "Modern Family," or "Will & Grace") to foster empathy among viewers whom surveys suggest are consequently more supportive of the homosexual policy agenda. If gays and lesbians need to be rescued from dehumanizing stereotypes, can that need be any less pressing among unborn children slurred as "blobs of tissue"?

We must also expose abortion as being more horrifying than unwanted pregnancy is terrifying. Pregnancy resource centers can remove much of the "terror" in unwanted pregnancies and our candidates must be taught to argue that "turning back the clock" on *Roe v. Wade* is historically impossible because today there are 3000 pregnancy resource centers ensuring that no mother need face unwanted pregnancy alone. In 1973, there were virtually none of these centers available to provide compassionate support.

But neither can you communicate the full horror of abortion with words alone. When pregnant mothers are concrete, sympathetic figures but their unborn babies are abstract, vilified, non-

entities, then ill-informed voters will tend to side with the mother they know against the baby they don't. If the mother's plight in a crisis pregnancy is allowed to seem more compelling than her baby's plight in an abortion, voters will see abortion as "the lesser of two evils" and our political prospects will remain as pitiable as ever.

By allowing the pro-aborts to frame the issue and control the debate, the pro-life movement has created an environment in which pro-life candidates are forced onto the defensive. They can't avoid seeming extreme as they struggle to justify the loss of cherished "choice" in a culture which defies unfettered discretion.

But would a candidate seem "mainstream" if they championed the right to butcher bothersome two-year-olds to death with meat cleavers? Of course not, because everyone agrees that two-year-olds are human beings entitled to rights of personhood and that butchering them would be an indefensible act of violence. Only pictures can quickly and convincingly establish how little difference there is between the *humanity* of eight-week embryos and two-year-old toddlers. And only pictures can quickly and convincingly establish how little difference there is between the *inhumanity* of butchering and abortions.

#### **STRESSFUL PICTURES STRESS KILLERS:**

In their WWII Battle of Britain book titled *Finest Hour, The Book of the BBC TV Series* (Hodder & Sloughton, 1999), Tim Clayton and Phil Craig describe RAF pilot Bob Doe's fifth aerial victory over the Luftwaffe aircraft then attacking England. This particular "kill" made him an "ace" and since the downed enemy bomber had crashed near his home airfield, Doe accepted a celebratory offer to drive out and inspect the wreckage. But as he approached the crash site, he was stopped by a bystander who shocked him with a disturbing description of the dead German aircrew:

There must be five bullet holes in every helmet. Come and take a look. Doe was sickened by the consequences of his moment of triumph in the sky. What had felt like a victory now seemed more like a kind of execution. An execution with eight machineguns. Biggles [a fictional WWI fighter pilot he had idolized in his youth] hadn't turned people into a bloody mess like this. He turned away. He would not come sightseeing again.

Had Doe embedded so horrifying a picture in his brain, could he have kept fighting? Would he have been as aggressive in his pursuit of the nine additional enemy aircraft (plus two shared kills) he would have to shoot down by war's end?

Despite the nobility of his mission, Doe elected to keep the carnage as abstract as possible. Abortionists face the same problem, but to an even greater degree, because their mission is immeasurably more difficult to rationalize.

It is easy to overlook the fact that a substantial percentage of abortion clinic workers serve in capacities in which they never see abortions or even bloody fetal remains. That is why AbortionRights.org.UK posted a February 23, 2012 article headlined “Anti-choice extremism in Brighton which complained that our abortion photos are “... causing distress to ... [British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS) clinic] staff.” Is it possible that many clinic workers can only function if they never have to look at what their employers are doing to unborn children?

This is a universal problem. Viewers can see an undercover video shot by a doctor who secretly filmed several late-term saline abortions in Madrid, performed on babies at 20-plus weeks ([http://abortionno.org/index.php/blog/secret\\_abortion\\_practices\\_in\\_spain/.](http://abortionno.org/index.php/blog/secret_abortion_practices_in_spain/)) As the babies are about to emerge from their mothers’ birth canals, an abortionist hovers over the mothers’ pelvic areas with a disposable towel she uses to immediately cover the babies and whisk them out of sight. The undercover doctor observes that, “As soon as the baby is born, the doctor covers it. No one looks at it. No one examines it.” The abortionist admits, “***I really never look at them.***” The undercover doctor asks, “Why?” The abortionist answers, “***I don’t like it.***” [emphasis added]

Showing abortion photos outside abortion clinics is disruptive because it distresses abortion clinic staff members, and that is a good thing. At DRHern.com, abortionist Warren Hern has posted a related paper he presented at a meeting of The Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians, titled “What About Us?” The late-term abortionist says: “National statistics are beginning to suggest that dilatation and evacuation (D&E) may have important advantages for the patient experiencing a second-trimester abortion. However, significant emotional reactions of medical and counseling staff tend to accompany this procedure.” Those reactions to the dismembered fetus “... ranged from purposely ***not looking at it***, to shock, dismay, amazement, disgust, fear, and sadness ...” [emphasis added].

Inability of staff to cope with the stress of seeing abortions or fetal remains is a serious problem for abortion providers. A former Planned Parenthood clinic director, for instance, changed her mind about abortion after recently seeing what it looked like. She has now described her epiphany in a book titled *unPlanned*, Abby Johnson, Tyndale (2010):

‘Thirteen weeks,’ [meaning eleven weeks since fertilization] I heard the nurse say after taking measurements to determine the fetus’s age.

\* \* \*

At first, the baby didn’t seem aware of the cannula. It gently probed the baby’s side ...

\* \* \*

The next movement was the sudden jerk of a tiny foot as the baby started kicking, as if it were trying to move away from the probing invader. As the

cannula pressed its side, the baby began struggling to turn and twist away. It seemed clear to me that it could feel the cannula, and it did not like what it was feeling. And then the doctor's voice broke through, startling me.

'Beam me up, Scotty,' he said lightheartedly to the nurse. He was telling her to turn on the suction ... [imitating the dark humor of late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell, who killed a six-pound newborn baby and then joked that "this baby was so big he could 'walk me to the bus stop.'" Post-Gazette.com, "Philadelphia abortion doctor charged in murder ..." January 20, 2011].

\* \* \*

The cannula was already being rotated by the doctor, and now I could see the tiny body violently twisting with it. For the briefest moment the baby looked as if it were being wrung like a dishcloth, twirled and squeezed. And then it crumpled and began disappearing into the cannula before my eyes. The last thing I saw was the tiny, perfectly formed backbone sucked into the tube, and then it was gone. And the uterus was empty. Totally empty.

\* \* \*

Ten minutes, maybe 15 at most, had passed since Cheryl had asked me to go help in the exam room. And in those few minutes, everything had changed. Drastically. The image of that tiny baby twisting and struggling kept replaying in my mind. And the patient. I felt so guilty.

Abby Johnson says that the stress of actually seeing an abortion drove her out of the abortion industry. CBR is often criticized for posting videos of abortions as they are being performed, but experience has taught us that some viewers are so hard of heart that they will remain unmoved after merely seeing photos of dismembered limbs. Abby was one such person. She had "... worked for years as a products of conception technician, the abortion industry term for someone who reassembles baby body parts after an abortion" (LiveAction.org press release, April 22, 2011). But she wasn't converted until she watched the actual killing process with her own eyes.

Many abortion workers who are not directly involved with the killing process are going to find the sight of fetal remains to be stressful. That is why clinic management is desperate to force our photos from their sidewalks. Our pictures create morale and even retention problems for staff members who can persevere only if they can pretend. We need to exploit this systemic vulnerability all across the country.

*The Wall Street Journal* reported a story June 6, 2012, headlined "Shareholder group warns of U.K. bank losses: Report." It said "... Britain's banks are sitting on a GBP40 billion (\$61.5 billion) black hole of undeclared losses that are preventing them from making vital loans to businesses

and households, *The Daily Telegraph* reported Wednesday.” Perhaps these banks are reluctant to admit these liabilities because, as the article speculates, “... Royal Bank of Scotland ... was in the worst condition ... with GBP18 billion of undeclared losses that would wipe out more than a third of its capital buffer and potentially force the 82% state-owned lender back to the taxpayer for another rescue ....” From British banks to BPAS (the UK’s largest abortion provider), powerful institutions tend to hide ugly truth. The press can be counted to expose banking scandals but conceal abortion scandals. That’s where pro-lifers must step into the picture.

### **PRO-ABORTS FEAR ABORTION PHOTOS:**

The *Los Angeles Times* published a most remarkable essay on the abortion wars, January 22, 2008. It was headlined “Abortion’s battle of messages,” and was authored by Frances Kissling and Kate Michelman, who are among America’s most outspoken proponents of abortion rights. Ms. Kissling was president of the oxymoronically named “Catholics for Choice” and Ms. Michelman was president of the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL). The article’s sub headline asserted that: “It’s not 1973. Pro-choice forces must adjust to regain the moral high ground.” The authors then revealed their darkest fears:

Twenty years ago, being pro-life was déclassé. Now it is a respectable point of view.

How did this happen? Did the pro-choice movement fail? Or did those opposed to abortion simply respond more effectively to the changing science as well as the social shift from the rights rage of the ‘60s to the responsibility culture of the ‘90s?

\* \* \*

Advocates of choice have had a hard time dealing with the increased visibility of the fetus.

\* \* \*

In recent years, the anti-abortion movement successfully put the nitty-gritty details of abortion procedures on public display, increasing the belief that abortion is serious business and that some societal involvement is appropriate.

Two prominent, abortion industry flacks admit that the tide of battle began to turn against them when CBR (which pioneered the public display of truly representative and truly graphic abortion imagery) “successfully put the nitty-gritty details of abortion procedures on public display.”

With Channel 4’s recent broadcast of a Dispatches episode titled “Abortion: What we need to know,” a major television network made history by airing riveting video depictions of abortion

and aborted fetal tissue. Those shocking video clips were provided by the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform. Our two-plus minutes of footage defined the entire program and became the focus of virtually every television critic's column. With breath-taking displays of intellectual dishonesty, most lambasted the broadcast. Our pictures were changing minds and the cultural elites were not amused.

*The Independent*, October 21, 2007, published a story which captured the panic that spread among defenders of abortion rights. Its sub-headline read "The days of brutal back-street terminations are long gone, but debate still rages over the legal time limit."

Last Wednesday a Dispatches programme on Channel 4 showed shocking images of the remains of foetuses pulled or sucked from the womb in bits: Long, slick trails of blood and jelly-like tissue containing a tiny foot here, or a hand with five translucent fingers there. 'We are quieter than usual today,' says the clinic manager, who says women have cancelled after seeing the film. 'They will probably ring us again, though, in a couple of days' [she said, trying to put on a brave face despite disaster].

The images were given to Channel 4 by the anti-abortion (or pro-life) movement which is using the anniversary to campaign for a reduction in the legal time limit.

\* \* \*

Liz Davies, head of Marie Stopes [the British version of Planned Parenthood] in the U.K. says ... 'The needs of the woman are paramount. Not the needs of the foetus.'

\* \* \*

Meanwhile, the cross-party group of MPs [Members of Parliament] on the Commons [House of Commons] science and technology committee has been hearing from both sides. Their inquiry was partly provoked by the astonishingly detailed '4D' scan pictures of young foetuses made by Professor Stuart Campbell, who says they appear to suck their thumbs and make faces in reaction to movement.

A high-traffic abortion clinic "quieter than usual" because "women have cancelled after seeing the film"? How phenomenal is that? No wonder there was pandemonium among the pro-aborts! We have always known these images save lives, but God willing, we shall see them change laws.

The latest ultrasound technology has undeniable power to persuade but with the broadcast of our abortion video, the British Parliament now has images which are far more "astonishing" than any ultrasound could ever be. CBR's abortion pictures will linger in the minds of the

lawmakers who will be considering legislation which would reduce the age limit for abortion from the current twenty-four weeks to perhaps twenty weeks. They may also vote on a proposal to eliminate the current requirement for a second doctor to sign off (essentially rubber stamping a foregone conclusion) on what already amounts to abortion on demand. In the process, they will evaluate new evidence on fetal pain, the reported relationship between abortion and breast cancer and a child's ability to survive premature birth at progressively earlier stages of pregnancy.

In reporting the run-up to this Parliamentary debate, Dispatches approached abortion providers with requests for permission to film inside a clinic. The abortionists must have thought themselves clever by agreeing to be interviewed doing abortions – while banning filming of the images on the ultrasound monitor and shots of aborted baby body parts. The clinic's only concession to candor was a cynically deceptive grant of permission to film the body of a baby after a six week abortion, knowing that the suction device would liquefy and render unrecognizable an embryo at this early stage. Anyone who has seen direct videography of a six-week-old embryo, alive in the uterus, moving its hands and turning its head (which images Dispatches didn't show, despite our having lobbied for its inclusion) would have gotten a very different impression of early abortion, even at only six weeks.

The abortionist who appeared on camera was performing a sixteen-week "procedure." He recognized the danger of allowing filming of the bloody arms and legs he was tearing off but he gravely underestimated the horrifying impact that his description of the abortion would have. Viewers were aghast. His bland affect was reminiscent of the dead soul of the Waffen SS; a man so inured to cruelty that he was no longer capable of revulsion.

Abortion has never been as controversial in the UK as it is in the US and until very recently, there has been no truly activist pro-life movement. This lack of serious opposition has given rise to arrogance and complacency among defenders of abortion rights. They have become careless and Dispatches exploited their negligence.

Their naiveté was nowhere more evident than in their failure to anticipate that Dispatches would counter their censorship of the ultrasound monitor by showing one of Professor Campbell's even higher resolution ultrasound images. But their nastiest surprise came with the realization that Dispatches had out-manuevered their ban on filming body parts by obtaining abortion footage from CBR. Planned Parenthood's abortionists, battle-hardened veterans of the American abortion wars, would never have placed themselves so recklessly at the mercy of investigative reporters. But Planned Parenthood has little to fear from American journalism which, as a general proposition, lacks the investigative integrity of the Dispatches team.

*The Independent* article describes the debacle:

... Dr. John Spencer, senior clinical director for Marie Stopes, was quoted by Dispatches describing what it was like to abort a foetus that was much older and larger, when it could not be removed like this or even all in one piece. 'The

foetal parts are soft enough to break apart as they are being removed,' he said. Using an ultrasound as guidance he was seen using forceps to pull out the parts bit by bit, describing those which were too big. 'Those parts are the skull and then the spine and pelvis and in fact they are crushed.'

Liz Davies says Dispatches showed pro-life propaganda, namely a whole foetus being wrapped in plastic. She thinks it was a still birth, not an abortion. But what about her own doctor's words? Were they an exaggeration?

'These are the bald facts of abortion' she admits flatly. 'We make no attempt to hide from them. The foetus is not removed whole in late abortion. We give a general anesthetic. Death of the foetus is instantaneous at the commencement of the procedure. The purpose of abortion is to bring about the demise of a foetus for the betterment of a woman's life.'

\* \* \*

When the procedure is over, what happens to the foetus? That is not something they like to talk about. 'We don't want the pro-lifers getting hold of this stuff,' says Liz Davies.

First of all, Ms. Davies sounds just like the Holocaust deniers who can't defend genocide against Jews so they claim death camp photos are fake. The late-term abortion footage we provided Dispatches depicted an abortion which occurred from start to finish, on a living baby, at an abortion clinic. Ms. Davies will be hearing from our lawyers.

Again and again, she fails to tell the truth. She says "we give a general anesthetic," but she fails to note that the anesthetic is given to the mother, not the baby. Her disingenuous implication is that the baby feels no pain but it is preposterous to suggest that anesthesia given the mother consistently if ever reaches the baby at the level of a therapeutic dose. She misstates the truth again when she claims that the "death of the fetus is instantaneous at the commencement of the procedure." Her own abortionist, John Spenser, says on camera that, "This instrument [the crushing forceps] is passed through and whatever tissue is grasped just within the cervix [*sic*] and gradually tissue is just removed." He admits that he slowly nibbles away at the baby, piece by piece. He says he just grabs whatever body parts happen to present near the cervix. Death will generally come as shock sets in and the baby bleeds to death. This excruciating process is far from instantaneous.

The only time Ms. Davies does tell the truth is when she says "We don't want the pro-lifers getting hold of this stuff." By which she means aborted baby body parts falling into CBR's hands. But it's too late. Years ago, we recognized the need to create a vast archive of commercial grade abortion video and still photos. We raised the money and negotiated the agreements and have conducted photo shoots again and again. We now provide abortion

imagery to organizations all over the world. The truth is out and no amount of pro-abortion lying or pro-life timidity can cover it up again.

On October 18, 2007, *The Guardian* published another screed by an angry feminist who complains bitterly about Channel 4's use of our pictures. Lucy Mangan's column was titled "The Dispatches on the issue of abortion aimed at impartiality, but was it really fair and balanced?" Behind the fury, you can hear the fear in her voice:

Like most viewers, I think, the arguments and spokespeople marshaled by the documentary team in *Dispatches: Abortion – What We Need to Know* (Channel 4) have probably been largely obliterated by the footage (filmed by US anti-abortion activists [meaning CBR]) of bloody foetal sacs being pulled from vaginas and dozens of tiny, jellied crimson limbs spread before us, a massacre of the innocents laid out on a hospital towel. It was shocking as an image, and arguably shocking as an inclusion in a documentary purporting to be an unbiased look at the controversies surrounding the issue terminations before MPs [Members of Parliament] gather to discuss possible changes to the law in a few months' time. A picture in the abortion debate is worth far more than a thousand words, but only – as the programme itself had pointed out earlier in reference to modern ultrasound scans – in fueling the emotions rather than accepting or rejecting the rational arguments on either side.

\* \* \*

Without the pictures, *Dispatches* laid out the arguments relatively fairly about the appropriateness of current abortion limits in the face of medical advances and the possibility of older fetuses feeling pain; save perhaps for the lingering over a doctor's descriptions of extracting foetal tissue, and allowing some of the most militant anti-abortion activists ... to state their positions without being required to defend them as the scientists and pro-choice workers were required to defend theirs.

There can be no more eloquent argument in favor of pro-lifers using aborted baby pictures than a prominent defender of abortion rights admitting that our video "obliterated" the lies of the abortion industry. She complains that our pictures were better at "fueling emotions" than helping viewers evaluate "rational arguments." Emotion, however, has a proper place in this debate and pictures sometimes make "rational arguments" which are more compelling and comprehensible than could ever be made by words.

She finds the inclusion of our abortion video "shocking" because she is accustomed to a "lapdog, poodle press" maintaining the cover-up which has relieved her of any responsibility to defend the indefensible.

She is so desperate to hide the truth that she is frightened even by the abortionist's relatively euphemistic description of the killing process. Her final lament is that Channel 4 didn't press pro-lifers to defend their positions. But the *video* is our defense of our position. As Professor Campbell noted in the broadcast, "The fetus is its own advocate." To which we would add, "A picture of an aborted baby is sufficient to condemn the act." The indignant complaints of the pro-aborts admit as much. They think killing these babies is fair, but showing them is unfair.

Many more examples can be cited but these suffice to establish that as long as pro-life activists persist in helping Planned Parenthood hide the horror of abortion, it will remain lawful to kill babies.

---

The Center for Bio-Ethical Reform  
P.O. Box 219  
Lake Forest, CA 92609  
(949) 206-0600  
[www.AbortionNo.org](http://www.AbortionNo.org)