



PO Box 219
Lake Forest, CA 92609-0219
949-206-0600

www.abortionNO.org / cbr@cbrinfo.org

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

January 2012

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On the 30th of January, 2012, I stood with CBR volunteers holding abortion photo signs outside the Wistons abortion clinic in Brighton, East Sussex, England. By God's grace, a young mother walked up and told us we had changed her mind about the abortion appointment she had scheduled that morning. A few miles away, two of our CBR-UK associates, Andrew Stephenson and Kathryn Sloane, were in a courtroom awaiting prosecution for violating the UK Public Order Act. Their "offence" was gently, peacefully "disturbing" passersby with the same abortion photo signs we had just used to save a baby at the same clinic at which they have now been arrested three times. UK law protects so little speech that Kathryn was charged in part for wearing a T-shirt on which was printed the CBR slogan "Abortion is Genocide."

To fight this sort of censorship, a coalition has been formed with an influential UK organization called Christian Concern, and two British lawyers who are affiliated with the Alliance Defense Fund to litigate a test case designed to create in Great Britain the functional equivalent of America's First Amendment. A favorable outcome could help strengthen expressive rights for activists all over Europe. The UK is a high priority for us because it is arguably the most influential country in Europe. Trends on the Continent often find their origins in the British Isles.

Our strategic use of shocking photos to picket UK abortion providers and liberalize British speech restrictions was reported by a local newspaper at WorthingHerald.co.uk, December 6, 2011, in an article headlined "Worthing church accused of 'intimidation' at abortion clinic." The story was almost comically inaccurate. The lurid lead sentence contended that "An abortion clinic has accused members of a Worthing church of intimidating women by showing graphic images of aborted fetuses and comparing it to the Holocaust." The article also said bpas (British Pregnancy Advisory Service) "... has criticised Worthing's Jubilee Community Church for its role in the regular Abort67 [CBR's UK affiliate] protests, held outside Wistons Clinic, in Brighton." We thank God for "its role"! Newspapers have no problem with aborted fetuses inside the clinic -- where no one can see them -- but not outside.

The clinic in question is run by bpas, a deceptively named agency called whose sales force "advises" mothers to kill their babies and then whisks them into operating rooms before they can change their minds. Imagine a used car dealership cheeky enough to call itself the "British Automotive Advisory Service" and you will have some idea of the degree of objectivity these "advisors" bring to the counseling process.

To better understand the depth of the evil bpas represents, it may be useful to know that Telegraph.co.uk, October 10, 2004, reported a shocking exposé concerning these abortionists. It was headlined "British Pregnancy Advisory Service helps women get illegal abortions." The story revealed that "The British Pregnancy Advisory Service, the NHS-funded [National Health Service] charity that is the country's largest abortion provider, is facilitating illegal late terminations of healthy pregnancies for hundreds of women without medical justification, an investigation by The Telegraph has revealed." The paper also disclosed "... a horrific underground industry in which women carrying healthy fetuses beyond the [British] 24-week legal cutoff and who want to end their pregnancies for 'social' reasons, travel to an abortion clinic in Spain on the recommendation of bpas. The organisation refers them there as a matter of 'policy.'"

The supposed “age limit” on the killing of late-term British babies is a cruel joke. Frequent circumvention of this meaningless law routinely results in the casual execution of healthy, near-full-term babies. It is about as inhumane as humanly possible. Yet Clare Murphy, bpas Director of Press and Public Policy, without a trace of ironic awareness, complained in her blog at AbortionReview.org, December 1, 2011 headlined “Abortion Protesters” that “... a burgeoning number of anti-abortion activists ... are running short on either compassion or the ability to differentiate logically between a campaign to alter public opinion on abortion and one that simply seeks to hector and distress individual women as they try to access advice and services.” CBR is working hard to recruit the “burgeoning number of anti-abortion activists” to whom she refers, but how sick is it that Ms. Murphy doesn’t think she lacks compassion when she kills babies? She thinks we lack compassion when we save them. And why should we be permitted to inform voters but be prohibited from warning mothers? We intend to do both!

Ms. Murphy then whines that in educating bpas abortion clients there must surely be a “... [m]ore moral way than causing distress ...” Abortion photos may cause momentary distress but abortion itself causes endless agony. She hates our photos because they refute the bpas lie that abortion is too trivial a matter to be anyone else’s business.

That is why this remorseless butcher, who makes her living torturing babies to death, absurdly claims it is immoral for us to show her intended victims what she is going to do to their babies as soon as she gets her hands on them. In her twisted world, it isn’t immoral for bpas to mislead and exploit mothers; it’s immoral for us to offer mothers incontestable visual evidence of the humanity of a fetus and the inhumanity of an abortion. Ms. Murphy wants no debate and will tolerate no criticism. She demands the right to kill babies but she also insists that we not interfere with her efforts to deceive and victimize her customers. CBR rejects those demands. We refuse to abandon these mothers.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines “intimidate” as to “frighten or overawe (someone), especially in order to make them do what one wants.” But we aren’t frightening mothers. It’s our abortion photos which frighten them -- because they see at a glance that abortion is a frightful act of violence which kills a baby. The ubiquity of abortion offers incontrovertible evidence that genocide analogies are fully appropriate in describing these crimes against humanity. In 1946 the United Nations adopted UN Resolution 96 which asserted that “Genocide is a denial of the right of existence of entire human groups, as homicide is the denial of the right to live of individual human beings ... whether the crime is committed on religious, racial, political or any other grounds” Unwanted preborn children are the human group whose “right of existence” is placed at risk by abortion. That is genocide and Kathryn has the right to wear a T-shirt which says so.

The *Worthing Herald* story also quotes Clare Murphy adding insult to injury with the untruth that “I cannot reiterate enough our support for freedom of speech, and people’s right to campaign to overturn the abortion law.” Ms. Murphy is, in fact, desperately trying to interfere with the exercise of our speech rights. She is pressuring the pastor of Andrew and Kathryn’s church to withdraw his support for our work. Ms. Murphy’s associates have also created a new pro-abortion organization (rumored to have anarchist and Green Party connections) specifically to oppose CBR. They are pressuring the school in which Andrew’s church meets to kick his fellowship out of their building. How is that support for freedom of speech?

So we quietly infiltrated their first meeting and now we are on their email distribution lists and receiving their Twitter feeds. One of their organizers tweeted that “There is no place in this country for ... [CBR] and no way are they going to keep scaring vulnerable women in my town.” Bold threats, but these lefties are giving themselves migraines straining to figure out how they might oppose us without creating the sort of

conflict which will attract news media attention and thereby raise our profile. Sorry. Not possible. We, therefore, welcome all the opposition they can mount.

The *Herald* article further explains that "... Colin Nichols, leader of Jubilee Church, confirmed his church did support Abort67, with members of the congregation taking part in the protests." God bless Pastor Colin, with whom I have twice met, and with whom I am greatly impressed. The *Herald* also says, "He admitted giving sermons on the topic and agreed abortion was worse than the Holocaust, if based on the number of terminations carried out." Colin added: "I agree with Abort67's pro-life message and if people do not like that I can't do anything about it as a Christian."

Oxford defines "admit" as to "confess to be true" It defines "confess" as to "acknowledge something reluctantly, typically because one feels slightly ashamed or embarrassed" Where is the evidence that Pastor Colin is or should be "ashamed" or "embarrassed" or even "reluctant" to acknowledge his fulfillment of the Biblically mandated responsibility to teach Christ's command that we protect "the least of these"? He is so committed to defending life that he is even resisting pressure from the leadership of the parent church which started his fellowship but now wants him to repudiate CBR. But he is having none of this treachery.

In his 1963 *Letter From a Birmingham Jail*, Martin Luther King said: "In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churchmen stand on the sideline and mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities." No such complaint could fairly be made of Pastor Colin's inspiring stand against the "blatant injustices" of abortion.

A post-abortive mother quoted in the *Herald* article says: "The stress on people they're going through is enough, but then to be shown graphic pictures is sick and shouldn't be allowed." It's not "sick" to kill these babies? It's only "sick" to show them? This deluded woman is the living embodiment of the prophetic warning in Isaiah 5:20: "Woe to those who call evil good and good evil" What she means is that abortion is so inherently indefensible that it can only be rationalized where it can be concealed. Our photos are stressful precisely because they force everyone to stop pretending. And that is what Clare Murphy complains about CBR at AbortionReview.org, where she says: "... graphic material [is] pushed into their [abortion clients'] hands." This objection mirrors her November 15, 2011 letter to Pastor Colin, claiming "... women do not need to see pictures of aborted fetuses to understand the 'truth' about abortion" Tell that to the many mothers who have thanked us for showing them the photos which changed their minds about killing their babies.

The *Worthing Herald* then repeats the false and defamatory "... accusations made by the clinic of protestors 'encircling and haranguing' women and calling them murderers." If true, such harassment would constitute criminal misconduct. The clinic would have a moral, if not a legal, obligation to report such abusive behavior to the police. So show us the police reports. But, of course, there aren't any. The police have never questioned us, much less arrested or charged us, concerning such accusations. If clinic personnel witnessed this supposed criminality but failed to report it, they must care little about their customers' well-being. And it is absurd to intimate that the police, who closely monitor our demonstrations (not least because we tell them when and where we will demonstrate), would fail to notice this sort of criminality.

I again say Ms. Murphy is a liar. I demand to see her surveillance video. If she has no security monitoring system, it strains credulity to suggest that a responsible abortion provider (can any abortion provider be "responsible")? would not install one in response to what she claims are repeated acts of criminal menacing at her clinics. In the alternative, we demand that Ms. Murphy give us the locations, dates and approximate times of the alleged incidents. We tape every minute of every demonstration and can easily disprove such allegations.

At about this same time, a pro-abortion blogger at EducationForChoice.blogspot.com said: “For 40 days last month anti-choicers ... stood outside MSI [Marie Stopes Int.] and bpas abortion clinics in London. Many people found the sight of these vigil-antis standing in judgment over women entering abortion clinics repellent” But we aren’t judging the guilt of mothers; we are exposing the horror of abortion. That intuitive sense of guilt is seldom mature enough to deter the decision to abort but it is often strong enough to cause the guilty to cringe in face of the slightest expression of disapproval. These women need to see the pictures.

AbortionRights.org.uk posted an equally alarmist screed which says: “... [W]e still live in hope that we can find more constructive ways to conduct debate about abortion in this country -- ones which recognise most people in the UK think abortion should be an option for women.” But our abortion photos are the only reason there is any debate at all over abortion. She is essentially saying “our minds are made up so don’t confuse us with inconvenient facts.” She demands the right to wage war on the preborn but disputes our right to wage war on the abortion industry? Au contraire.

Most people in the UK once thought that the slave trade “should be an option” for British planters. Does that mean that William Wilberforce was out of bounds when he disturbed passersby with horrifying pictures of brutalized African slaves? His tactics were so confrontational that he eventually required protection by armed bodyguards. Of course the pro-aborts don’t want a war over abortion. They like abortion and they want it to remain free of restrictions and free of charge. They won’t give up the status quo without a fight and the best way to avoid losing a fight is to avoid fighting a fight. But they reserve to themselves the right to wage a savage war against the preborn while denying us the right to wage an information war against abortion. That is exactly why we must force a fight over abortion. They are weak and we are strong because we have the truth which changes hearts and minds and votes. But we can’t communicate that truth without laws which protect disfavored expression. That is because there can be no social reform where there is no free speech.

The EducationForChoice blogger then adds that “... [T]hese people are fanatics. You won’t change their mind by reasoning with them or confronting them.” What she really means is that it is futile for feminists to stand in front of abortion photos and try to argue that abortion is a morally inconsequential act. She adds that “I am not linking to Abort 67 [CBR’s UK affiliate] because a gory video opens up within seconds of clicking on the site” If abortion is a socially responsible act, why would its most ardent advocates recoil from the sight of it?

A related post at AbortionRights.org.uk said our abortion photos are “causing distress to [abortion clinic] clients and staff.” If abortion is just another of life’s mundane transactions, why would a photo of it be so very stressful? This post quotes an aborting mother who says: “It’s wrong to make you feel uncomfortable - they continued to talk as we tried to walk away and wouldn’t accept our views. It’s very intimidating.” Comfort is always more important than morality in the nanny state, where a lifetime of government coddling produces a society of emotional invalids who are unable to cope with the slightest rejection of their views.

The AbortionRights.org writer also says: “While Abortion Rights respects the rights of those who object to abortion to express their opinions openly, we feel that intimidatory tactics which target individual women as they seek to access legal medical treatment is unacceptable.” What she is really claiming is that bpas has a right to lie to clients but anti-abortion activists have no right to show them the truth. We are submitting that question for judicial review and we are confident the courts will eventually level the playing field outside British abortion clinics. Baby-killers always hate the pictures and that is why this writer insists that we “...

find an alternative means of expressing ... [our] anti-choice views” But we aren’t “expressing views.” We are revealing facts. And until they stop the killing, we won’t stop the photos.

At AbortionReview.org, Ms. Murphy says she is outraged that our volunteers, “... without a flicker of interest or concern as to how it might feel to be that young woman, on that day, descended upon by a group of people who felt at liberty to tell her what she was doing was wrong -- despite not knowing the first thing about her and her own very personal circumstances.” But that begs the question, what circumstances could ever justify an elective abortion? In her November 15, 2011 letter to Pastor Colin, Ms. Murphy proffers the pathetically lame thesis that abortion can be necessitated by an “... unhappy upheaval in personal circumstances which make having a baby no longer possible.” Does she really mean that “unhappiness” entitles a mother to kill a child she could readily place for adoption?

That sociopathic inclination is conceptually similar to the tragedy described in a February 7, 2012 CBSNews.com story headlined “Josh Powell’s final voicemail: ‘I’m not able to live without my sons.’” Powell was a one-time Utah resident on the losing side of a child custody dispute, so he hacked his little boys to death with a hatchet before blowing them and himself to bits -- rather than allow anyone else to raise them. People of conscience rightly recoil in horror at Powell’s depravity but yawn at the perversity of mothers who would rather have abortionists hack their preborn children to death rather than place them for adoption. Conventional wisdom holds that it is ridiculous to compare an aborted seven-week embryo to a chopped-up toddler, but if so, why do we get arrested for holding up an aborted embryo photo which so many angry passersby attempt to cover up or tear down? Perhaps this comparison is more apt than our critics wish to concede.

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