

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

May 2011

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On April 25, 2011, a twenty-three-year-old woman from Temecula, CA, wrote to say, "I have had three abortions and never saw any of these pictures. They SAY it is only cells, and they lied" Her intimation was that she could never have aborted had she seen the horror before instead of after her "procedures." We hear that a lot. That's why we are so aggressive in showing the truth to people who don't want to see it. Truth can change minds -- even within the abortion industry.

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 late-term abortionist Kermit Gosnell, who killed a six-pound newborn baby and then joked that "this baby is so big he could have walked 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. I'd taken something precious from her, and she didn't even know it.

Abby Johnson says that actually seeing an abortion prompted her to leave 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. Our opponents are terrified of our abortion imagery, and rightly so.

Briarpatch Magazine, September/October 2010, published a related article which discussed the CBR abortion photos used by our Canadian affiliate, whose director is the inimitable Stephanie Gray. The article was headlined "Freedom of (hate) speech: Confronting the rise of anti-choice activities on Canadian campuses." The story reveals total panic among pro-aborts everywhere we display our abortion photo signs. The quotes are long but excerpts are remarkably revealing:

... [O]n-campus battles are the new front line of pro-choice activism in Canada. But with anti-choicers setting the terms of debate, how can pro-choice activists respond in a way that best advances women's struggles for reproductive autonomy?

We are forcing an abortion debate which would otherwise be suppressed and we are ensuring that that debate focuses on the real issues.

... [S]cenes like the ... [Canadian Centre For Bio-Ethical Reform (CCBR) Genocide Awareness Project (GAP) display] are becoming increasingly common on university campuses across the country. A new generation of anti-choice groups is establishing a reputation for itself on Canadian campuses, with increasingly visible tactics [code for our abortion photos] that many pro-choice activists call discriminatory, harassing and hateful. As the activities of organizations like the ... CCBR become more common and more publicized, the question of freedom of speech for anti-choice groups on campus will only become a more pressing issue for pro-choice activists.

Our best hope for restricting Canada's liberal abortion laws is to first liberalize Canada's restrictive speech laws.

At the forefront of this controversy is the Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform, an anti-choice advocacy organization "whose mission is to make abortion unthinkable." The CCBR's presentations take place in a variety of settings, but they have concentrated their efforts on university campuses, working closely with anti-choice campus clubs. They are most famous for their Genocide Awareness Project of billboard-sized public displays and the complementary Echoes of the Holocaust presentation, both of which use graphic imagery [pro-aborts can't bring themselves to say the words "abortion photos"] to compare abortion to such atrocities as the Holocaust and the lynchings of African Americans in the American South.

It is not often that our adversaries will concede that we are at the "forefront" of the abortion controversy but that is exactly where we work hard to position ourselves.

These presentations and displays have provoked a pro-choice response in a way the activities of other anti-choice groups have not. Pro-choice activists find the activities of the CCBR particularly inflammatory and dangerous because of the extent to which they demonize women who have had, or who support the right to have, abortions. When abortion is equated not only with murder but with genocide, women who have had an abortion are cast as perpetrators of vicious and systematic violence. For women who have had abortions, confronting this portrayal can be an emotionally distressing experience, as it's intended to be.

CBR does “demonize” demonic abortionists -- but we never castigate the women these abortionists victimize. Every aborting mother knows that what she is doing is wrong, but few know how wrong. And because about half of all abortions are performed on mothers who have already had one or more abortions, post-abortive women need to be deterred from aborting again.

Kelly Holloway, who was president of the York University Graduate Students’ Association when the student union voted to block the CCBR from participating in a debate on abortion scheduled to occur in the York student centre, cites protecting women from harassment as her primary concern when dealing with the organization. ‘The real issue for me is not so much one of freedom of speech, but of the student union’s responsibility to ensure a safe space for students on campus,’ says Holloway.

And it’s our responsibility to ensure a safe space on campus for reluctant mothers and their innocent babies.

Although the issue has never come before the courts, many pro-choice advocates have suggested that *the activities of the CCBR legally constitute hate speech by inciting hatred towards those women who have or support the right to have abortions, and should thus be restricted in order to prevent the harassment of women* [emphasis added]. Some have even likened anti-choice organizations to white supremacist groups for their inflammatory comparisons designed to stigmatize pro-choice women, as well as for their campaigns to systematically undermine the legal rights of an entire social group [emphasis added].

But the Canadian Civil Liberties Association has said of us: “The arguments against abortion engage the vexing issue of when life and/or personhood begins and the balance between the protection of such ‘persons’ and the autonomy of women. This is certainly a legitimate subject for debate.” That is why we have never been sued. Our very aggressive lawyers would quickly crush those kinds of lawsuits.

This position has been challenged by many pro-choice advocates who condemn the sexism inherent in the opinion that women’s autonomy is a legitimate subject for debate. However, the Civil Liberties Association’s position is indicative of the opinion of a broad segment of the population -- those who may not agree with the anti-choice movement’s goals or tactics, but who nonetheless believe that such groups have the right to express their opinion, on campus and off.

There may yet be hope for Canada!

Establishing that the activities of such extreme anti-choice activities [activists] are hateful has thus been one of the primary goals of student pro-choice advocates.

If they can’t win this debate, they will work to ensure that no debate ever occurs!

Hans Rollman, a Ph.D. student in women’s studies at York University: ‘But one thing that they have been really effective at doing is coming up with messaging that affects the popular discourse, which I think is a really dangerous thing because it will eventually seep into the legislature and the courts.’ The idea that curbing the activities of anti-choice groups amounts to a violation of freedom of speech is one such message that has caught on in the public, and this message has particular traction at universities where academic freedom is paramount.

Mr. Rollman clearly understands our strategy and is right to be troubled by our success.

This remains the case even when a large number of students express their disdain for the anti-choice tactics. Last October, for example, the McGill administration allowed an anti-choice student group to go forward with their plans to host CCBR's Echoes of the Holocaust presentation, despite a censure by the student union. 'The university erred very much on the side of academic freedom,' says Sarah Woolf, who was a student union councilor at McGill at the time. When the event was eventually shut down by pro-choice protesters who sang and blocked the projector, resulting in the arrests of two protesters, the university expressed its desire to try to have the event again.

The university administration took our side because they knew we would have sued them had they sided with the pro-abortion students who were trying to shut down our pro-life presentation.

Indeed, it is the financial cost of these legal battles that explains most clearly the position that universities have taken with regards to managing anti-choice activities. If their willingness to go to court is any indicator, anti-choice organizations like the CCBR have resources that pro-choice organizations simply don't, so universities are more likely to act on accusations that it is impeding freedom of speech than that it's encouraging hate speech.

... [T]he defensive stance taken by pro-choice students has limited them in taking a more proactive approach to building support for the issues at hand. Anti-choice groups are using the free speech argument to win the public relations battle, leaving some to wonder if groups like the CCBR are deliberately luring pro-choice activists into an unwinnable war.

Our goal is to take the initiative, throw the other side onto the defensive, and force them to react to us. And now even the pro-aborts admit that our strategy is working.

In 1858, President Abraham Lincoln said in his historic "House Divided" speech, "In my opinion ... it [slavery] will not cease until a crisis shall have been reached and passed." He was tragically correct, of course; and abortion will not end until we force societal crises in our schools and businesses, and especially in our churches. We must use every lawful, Biblical means at our disposal to disrupt business as usual and force Americans to stop pretending that the baby isn't a baby and that abortion isn't an act of violence.

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. Nothing dramatizes the plight of an aborted baby like an abortion photo, and the display of those photos outside classrooms and stores and churches absolutely paralyzes these entities until the photos are removed. Thanks to your faithful financial support, we are now putting the pictures where they can cause the most constructive disruption. We aren't going to remove them until the public sees the truth and stops the killing!

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