

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

January 2011

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On November 28, 2010, we received a message from a twenty-three-year-old Canadian woman who lives in Halifax, Nova Scotia. She said, "I am 23 [and] 3 months' pregnant. [I am] in a relationship with the father but not ready financially to have the baby I don't want to kill it either. This site/video made me really not want to go through with ... [this abortion]." My wife Lois, a long-time pregnancy resource center director, immediately contacted her to offer help. Yet again, it was pictures which changed an anxious mother's mind about aborting her pregnancy.

As I write this letter, in the last two days we have received abortion-related messages from nine students. They wrote from Ontario, Canada; Thornton, CO; Columbus, OH; Rathdrum, ID; Garden Grove, CA; someplace in MN; someplace in TN; and the last two came from writers at unstated locations. All said they were using our website for school assignments. One was "doing research," another "an argument for college English class," another "searching for stats on abortion," another writing "a research paper," another "doing a persuasive paper," another writing an "English paper," another saying, "This website has made me think a lot about abortions," another writing a "school paper" and the seventh thanked us for a website that is "very honest" and "realistic." We are flooded with these kinds of messages almost daily. The importance of CBR as a resource for campus pro-life leaders and a source of accurate academic information cannot be overstated. CBR is a beacon in the darkness and a voice crying out in the pro-abortion wilderness which is the American academy. How bad has it gotten?

The Washington Post, March 25, 2005, carried a story headlined "College Faculties A Most Liberal Lot." It reported that "By their own description, 72 percent of those teaching at American universities and colleges are liberal and 15 percent are conservative, says the study being published this week." That means the overwhelming majority of professors are pro-abortion. They are also largely a godless lot. "Religious services take a back seat for many faculty members, with 51 percent saying they rarely or never attend church or synagogue and 31 percent calling themselves regular churchgoers." Academic antipathy toward God and preborn children has reached new levels of hysteria on campus after campus from coast to coast.

The *Post* article also quotes researcher Stanley Rothman of Smith College, who "... sees the findings as evidence of 'possible discrimination against conservatives in hiring and promotion. Even after factoring in levels of achievement, as measured by published work and organization memberships, 'the most likely conclusion' is that 'being conservative counts against you,' he said." And against CBR.

And most faculty members aren't just liberal voters. They are liberal activists. A story on faculty political donations at HuffingtonPost.com, November 12, 2007, reported that:

According to the Center for Responsive Politics, the education industry has become increasingly Democratic over the past twenty years. Whereas in 1990, 57 percent of the industry's donations - including Political Action Committee dollars - went to Democratic candidates, by 2006 that number had increased to 71 percent. The amount of money in play is also on the rise. In 1996 the total amount of contributions from academia was more than

\$8.8 million. By 2000, that had doubled and in 2004 it doubled again to more than \$36 million.

No wonder so many professors see CBR as foreign invaders. But if CBR weren't a physical presence on the campuses to which we take our Genocide Awareness Project (GAP) and a cyber presence with our internet outreach to campuses all over the world, students would be almost entirely without access to serious pro-life scholarship and leadership. It's bad out there.

Historian Paul Johnson (*A History of the American People*, Harper Perennial (1999)) cites a book by Roger Kimball which decries liberal intellectual dishonesty and details the climate of censorship which exists on college campuses. It is titled *Tenured Radicals: How Politics Has Corrupted Our Higher Education*, Dee (1998), and Johnson says the book "... drew attention ... to the omission of facts and entire subjects from university courses for fear they might offend a particular ... group." Facts about prenatal development and abortion are at the top of that list of omissions. Mr. Johnson quotes a Harvard professor who lectured activists who enforce political correctness codes that faculty members should never "introduce any sort of thing that might hurt a group" because "the pain that racial [or gender] insensitivity can create was more important than a professor's academic freedom." In other words, feelings trump facts.

And indeed, CBR is invariably criticized for "racial insensitivity" when we use photos to compare abortion with lynchings, slavery and the Holocaust. We have now conducted more than 200 campus visits with GAP – 22 so far this school year. If it made sense for Martin Luther King to use words to compare slavery to the Holocaust, it makes sense for us to use photos to compare abortion to slavery *and* the Holocaust. We are, of course, also accused of "gender insensitivity" for using abortion photos which "make women feel bad about their abortions." But if, as liberals contend, abortion is a morally inconsequential act, why would a photo of it make anyone feel bad? The Guttmacher Institute says about half of all abortions are performed on women who have already had one or more previous abortions, so post-abortive women are the very women we most urgently need to upset about their previous abortions -- so they won't kill again.

The tyranny of political correctness is so pervasive that it abounds even on the campuses of supposedly Christian colleges. Last year we were forced to fly abortion photos over the campus of Notre Dame because the "pro-life" student organization there supported the administration's ban on the display of any abortion photos at the school. One of our student interns at Westmont College had to try for months before he finally found a faculty advisor who would help sponsor his attempt to start Westmont's first pro-life student organization – and that professor took a very long time to finally say yes. Westmont's administration has even refused to allow me to show abortion photos in a campus debate with the medical director of Planned Parenthood for Santa Barbara County. Just as deplorably, we have also had to fly abortion photos over the campuses of Biola and Liberty Universities because neither school would permit us to set up our GAP display on their campuses. We must often threaten lawsuits to get onto the campuses of public schools, but private colleges can keep us out. They can't, however, keep us out of the airspace above their campuses.

CBR has played a critically important role in teaching millions of American (and international) college students the truth about abortion which their professors – pagan and Christian – are fervently committed to covering up. We also model resistance to censorship and mentor students who would be largely alone without us. We encourage them to stand up and defend life – and their faith – in a very hostile environment. And we stand up with them. We give them all the tools and the training they need. We teach them how easy it is to soundly (but politely) beat liberal professors at their own game. Faculty members and administrators hate us for forcing them into an abortion debate – and on our terms. They used to think they owned these campuses but no more. We see the fear in their eyes – and pro-life students see it too.

The best evidence that pro-aborts fear debate on abortion can be seen in the angry messages we received last night and today from three pro-abortion female students, one admitting a recent abortion. All three are

living in a fantasy world of pro-abortion propaganda and none would give us their email address. All rightly feared that our replies would debunk the delusional myths to which they desperately cling. The only real abortion debates there will ever be will be the ones we force on the majority of the population which struggles to avoid any information which imposes any obligation to behave responsibly regarding abortion.

The HuffingtonPost.com, November 28, 2010, ran an article headlined “Backlash Feared As Some In GOP Push Social Issues.” The story opens with “... Republicans who won greater control of state governments in this month's election are considering how to pursue action on a range of social issues, including abortion” But it also reports that “Some Republican legislators are already worried about getting bogged down in volatile issues or conflicts between wings of the party.” One hand-wringing Republican official says, “If Republicans overreach, ‘the danger is the citizens of the state will just say we'll clean house again” Why doesn't the press ever warn Mr. Obama about “overreaching” on social issues? It is a testimony to how little the culture knows about the horror of abortion that the right to kill babies is considered a *settled* issue but the obligation to save them is seen as a “*volatile*” issue. It is also telling that any consideration of the rights of preborn children provokes “conflict.” No wonder no one wants to discuss it, on campus or off.

David Reardon and Theresa Burke confirm this reticence in an essay titled “Forbidden Grief,” at the Elliot Institute website, afterabortion.org. Their article makes the obvious point that “Abortion causes conflict. It fragments political parties, churches, schools, and neighborhoods. It divides families. Husband against wife. Mother against daughter. Sister against sister.”

Their remarks echo Ronald Reagan's January 22, 1983 “Radio Address to the Nation on Domestic Social Issues.” The President lamented the fact that abortion “... often splits families apart.” He was in position to know. His own wife was pro-abortion (*Albany Times Union*, September 22, 1994, “Nancy Reagan Backs Abortion Rights”), as were both of his daughters and one of his sons. In his family, only he and his adopted son Michael opposed baby-killing. And there was nothing new in First Families fracturing over abortion.

President Gerald Ford opposed *Roe v. Wade* (presidency.ucsb.edu) but Betty Ford supported it (firstladies.org). President George H.W. Bush opposed abortion but Barbara Bush supported it (firstladies.org). President George W. Bush opposed abortion but Laura Bush supported it (PoliticsDaily.com, “Laura Bush backs gay marriage, abortion rights”). The Guardian.co.uk reported a story September 4, 2008, headlined “U.S. elections: McCain family split over abortion rights.” Rosalynn Carter and Hillary Clinton and Michelle Obama strongly reinforced their husband's pro-abortion orientations but Republican First Ladies pressured their husbands to shut up about the issue.

Family fissures over abortion closely mirror the bitter divisions which once existed over slavery. *A History of the American People*, Johnson, Harper Perennial (1999), says that:

Mary Lincoln [the Union president's wife] had three brothers in the Confederate Army, all of whom were killed – and her emotional sympathies were certainly with the South. [Regarding the wife of Confederate President Jefferson Davis] Varina Davis' male relatives, the Howells, were all in the Union Army. Senator John J. Crittenden of Kentucky ... had two sons, both Major Generals, one serving in the Confederate Army, the other in the Union Army. The best Union agent in Europe, Robert J. Walker, was a former senator from Mississippi, while the best Confederate agent, Caleb House, came from Massachusetts. General Robert E. Lee's nephew, Samuel P. Lee, commanded the Union naval forces on the James River, while another Union admiral, David Glasgow Farragut ... was born in Tennessee and lived in Virginia. The examples are endless.

We teach pro-life college students to use pictures because pictures are the only effective way to force the engagement of people who care more about saving relationships than saving babies. Social reform is always about pictures, displayed both consensually and non-consensually.

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 said after seeing these pictures he will “probably never be the same again”

Documentary photographer Lewis Hine, whose troubling 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 the “... 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”

Some pro-life leaders oppose pictures because they have little sense of history. Others have never seen pictures effectively used. Some know that pictures change minds but can’t cope with the abuse which pictures invite. We have never said everyone needs to use pictures. But if no one uses them, the effectiveness of every other pro-life project is compromised. Most people aren’t very imaginative and abortion is unimaginably horrific. If it isn’t visible, it simply can’t be visualized.

We are teaching students to use pictures to disrupt business as usual. Our pictures disrupt the coverage of news organizations. They disrupt lesson plans and force class cancellations. They disrupt conversations and thought processes. They disrupt study and work and play and sleep and meals and friendships. They even change the weather; we frequently see women’s studies professors scurrying about with a dark cloud hanging over a scowling visage.

All this disruption forces people to stop and think. All this thinking converts pro-abortion students on abortion but it also converts pro-life students on pictures. We are why surveys show students are more pro-life than their parents but we are also why the next generation of pro-life leaders will use pictures. Bless you for helping us take the fight deep behind enemy lines. Bless you for helping us inspire real pro-life students to take real risks and make real sacrifices to do real pro-life activism. Please help us do even more.

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