

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

June 2012

Dear Pro-Life Friend,

On July 31, 2012, a twenty-six-year-old woman from Bradford, VT, contacted us to say our abortion imagery had saved her baby's life. She had scheduled an abortion but told us that "... anti-abortion protesters outside of a Burlington, VT, Planned Parenthood really opened my eyes!!!!" She explained that she "... was met at the door by these protesters and they gave me a card ... this card I will never forget." On the back of that card was our "[CBR] web address ...." She said she then saw the abortion video on our website and its impact convinced her that "... when people have the reality of what they are doing shoved in their faces ... a lot more people will change their minds!!" She concluded by thanking us and declaring that "today I am six months' pregnant and very excited about this baby." So are we -- but Planned Parenthood isn't. Baby butchers are furious when mothers are warned away by abortion pictures. Knowledge is power and Planned Parenthood tries to keep prospective victims as powerless as possible. But we are pushing back against the abortion industry cover up and attacking pro-abort funding at its sources.

CBR, for instance, recently petitioned a federal judge to order Northland Family Planning [Abortion] Clinic to pay our lawyers \$350,000 in legal fees after Northland lost the lawsuit it filed against us for editing our abortion video footage into their principal abortion sales video. We are also using abortion photo signs to put teeth into economic boycotts against Planned Parenthood's corporate donors. The picketing campaigns of our Corporate Accountability Project (CAP) are currently focused on Marriott International. This hotel brand allows its franchisees to donate to Planned Parenthood and some unknown percentage does exactly that. Marriott employees have gone to extreme lengths to block guests' views of the abortion picket signs we use to drive away their customers. As if to reinforce our contention that the entire culture seems to be colluding to hide the horror of abortion, Facebook's censors recently took down a picture of one of our new boycott signs -- mere moments after we posted it on the CBR Facebook page.

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

That sort of Facebook thuggery is why we cheered a Reuters story, July 26, 2012, which was headlined "Facebook revenue growth skids, shares plunge." The article revealed that "Facebook Inc. reported a drastic slowdown in revenue growth and offered no financial forecasts to ease worries over the prospects for boosting advertising in its first earnings report as a public company, sending its shares to a record low." Facebook may be getting what it deserves, but other social media sites also censor our abortion photos.

This campaign of information suppression is deadly because, historically, no great injustice has ever been outlawed by hiding it. Yet huge numbers of churches and anti-abortion organizations are doing precisely that. Many pro-life groups refuse to expose the full scope of abortion's evil -- and interfere when other pro-life groups display abortion photos. Pastors seldom even mention the issue. Taking abortion seriously inhibits membership growth and drives down revenue. So our side tries to appease the culture by avoiding or concealing the truth. As a consequence, the horror of abortion remained largely invisible and almost no one was horrified by abortion -- until CBR began to display abortion photos in the public square.

CBR can now dominate the public square on abortion, and that is where we recently launched our 2012 Key States Initiative (KSI). This project involves large billboard trucks which display voter registration and voter education signs on their sides and backs. Every truck in our fleet has been deployed to political battleground states where presidential and U.S. Senate election outcomes are often decided by such narrow margins that public attention to policy issues is greatly intensified. There is little point in trying to educate voters in states which are so red or blue that election outcomes are too predictable to generate substantial voter interest. So we drive our trucks in states such as Colorado, Iowa, Virginia and Florida and, resources permitting, hope to add Wisconsin and Nevada. We are currently recruiting volunteer drivers and navigators (the latter riding along to manage maps, cell phone communication, etc.). You don't have to live anywhere near a targeted state to be a help to us (we will fly you where we need your help) unless you are a homeowner who is willing to provide temporary housing for our drivers. Our trucks have automatic transmissions and require no special licensing or experience to operate. Please contact us if you can help and let your friends and family know we need their assistance. This is a labor-intensive project.

But as challenging as our work is in the U.S., it is far more difficult in the U.K. There it is not uniformly lawful for Abort67, our British affiliate, to display our abortion photos. Our U.K. associates are periodically arrested for displaying these images but our abortion photo project at abortion clinics in Southern England has, nonetheless, been an immense success. As a consequence, a British abortion industry website, AbortionRights.co.uk, is in a state of panic. The pro-aborts are annoyed that we use security cameras to videotape every one of our educational pickets. A video record of each picket enables us to deter and prosecute the pro-abortion attackers who frequently come our way. Video also makes it easier for us to refute our adversary's false claims that we "harass and intimidate" pregnant women. Of course, they define "harass and intimidate" as showing their potential customers what abortion actually looks like.

Please designate CBR as a beneficiary of your will or trust. The abortion industry receives hundreds of millions of dollars from the estates of their supporters, but we receive virtually no help from estate planning.

It is our abortion photo signs, however, which the abortion industry really hates. They grudgingly concede that we have the right to "protest" outside Parliament, but they would deny us the right to educate mothers outside abortion clinics. They know our photo signs make it far more difficult for them to delude and victimize vulnerable mothers, so they make the cynically self-serving argument that only abortion providers should be permitted to interact with women considering abortion.

In reality, education is the only form of protest which is truly effective, and photos are the only form of education which can change minds at a glance. When we display abortion photos, abortion protests itself.

That proposition can be tested by examining the data reported in a newspaper article which appeared in *The Argus*, June 6, 2012 headlined "Teen abortion rates fall in Sussex." Sussex is where we display abortion photos and the story revealed that "There were 61 abortions recorded in Brighton and Hove in 2011 compared to 77 the year before." There was more good news in the additional revelation that "West Sussex also showed a fall in numbers with 165 abortions compared to 207 the year before, giving it a rate of 12." But the article also stated that "... the number of teenage abortions in East Sussex Downs and Weald rose from 90 to 111 and Hastings and Rother went from 54 to 71." If our huge abortion photos are driving mothers away from targeted clinics, and toward untargeted clinics, imagine the number of lives we could save if we had the money and staff to target every clinic!

Our clinic sign displays are also routinely seen by students at a school located near Brighton's Wistons Clinic and *The Argus* published a related story on May 17, 2012, headlined "Anti-abortion group under fire from BHASVIC students." As is the case in the U.S., these students are taught by instructors determined to conceal and distort the truth about abortion. One of these teachers recently tore a photo sign out of the

hands of one of our volunteers and threw it face down on the ground, sitting on it! He was eventually detained by the police and is currently facing the prospect of (reluctant) discipline by his school.

The article said: “An anti-abortion protest group has been criticised by students at Brighton Hove and Sussex Sixth Form College (BHASVIC) following continued protests outside an abortion clinic.” It seems these students resent being forced to stop pretending that abortion is not an act of violence which kills a baby. “The BHASVIC Student Union have written to the pro-life groups, Abort67 and the Jubilee Community Church of Worthing, in disapproval of the ‘graphic’ banners and pictures outside Wistons Community Clinic on Dyke Road, next to BHASVIC.” Jubilee Community Church is the fellowship at which our U.K. colleague, Andrew Stephenson, worships and they are, therefore, targets of counter protests. The most hypocritical student complaints related to freedom of speech: “BHASVIC union representative Charlie Jones said: ‘While the Student Union recognises the importance of freedom of speech, we feel there should be restrictions as to what you can show, and what you can say.’” But how can restricted speech be free speech? Without a trace of ironic awareness, these students are advocating the same repressive speech restrictions suffered in police states from Tehran to Pyongyang and Beijing.

Please consider donating to a fund CBR is establishing to provide small seed money grants to our new affiliates in Africa and Europe. In many of these countries even small donations can produce big results.

If you doubt this parallel, consider a related monograph in 2009 by the Pacific Rim Law & Policy Journal Association. It was titled “No Room for Dissent: China’s Laws Against Disturbing Social Order Undermine its Commitments to Free Speech and Hamper the Rule of Law.” It says that “While the interactions between journalists and the Chinese authorities during the [Olympic] Games highlighted the issue of censorship, the practice of denying free speech in the name of protecting social order existed long before the Beijing Olympics.” The article adds that “This practice, which has roots in Chinese history, is codified in various Chinese laws that prohibit ‘disturbing social order.’ **Despite the Chinese Constitution’s guarantee of free speech, laws against disturbing social order often triumph because of the vast expanse of potential behaviors they forbid, coupled with China’s pervasive culture of censorship**” [emphasis added].

This sort of censorship is used by Chinese authorities who are determined to conceal information related to forced abortions which frequently kill very late-term babies. In AbortionReview.org, March 3, 2011, Ann Furedi, who directs abortion clinics euphemistically known as the British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS), is much more candid than her Chinese colleagues, but she is equally ruthless regarding near full-term babies. She casually admits that “A woman at 26 weeks is usually visibly pregnant, feeling fetal movement, and an abortion often means an induced labour.” “So what?” she tacitly asks. If BPAS induced labor without first killing the baby, the mother would be relieved of her unwanted pregnancy and the baby could be given compassionate neonatal care and placed in foster care for eventual adoption -- that’s what.

But if the mother of a 24-week baby has a right to demand that her child be killed in the process of terminating her pregnancy, why doesn’t the mother of the 22-week prematurely born neonate have the right to demand that pediatricians kill that child in its isolette? Suppose, for instance, a newborn turns out to be afflicted with Down syndrome, or the mother simply changes her mind? Such a concept is called “after-birth abortion” (or fourth-trimester abortion) and it is not a figment of fertile anti-abortion imaginations. This is pure infanticide and it has actually been proposed by two deeply depraved academics named Alberto Giubilini and Francesca Minerva. Their proposal appears in the *Journal of Medical Ethics*, jme.bmj.com, and is titled “After-birth abortion: Why should the baby live?” February 23, 2012. The basic premise is that “We take ‘person’ to mean an individual who is capable of attributing to her own existence some (at least) basic value such that being deprived of this existence represents a loss to her.” We have always predicted that the abortion industry would eventually demand the right to kill newborns and here it is, rationalized by the usual lame notion that someone who lacks self-awareness is not qualified for inclusion in

the family of man. There is a perverse logic in the idea that, when we may kill a baby the day before full-term delivery, why not the day after, or week after, or month after, etc.?

Still on the subject of late-term abortion, Ms. Furedi dissolves into utter incoherence 44 minutes into a video posted at [battleofideas.org.uk](http://battleofideas.org.uk), October 30, 2011, under the headline "Abortion: How late is too late?" She is debating Slate.com's William Saletan in an exchange which he describes in a Slate post titled "After-Birth Abortion, The pro-choice case for infanticide," posted March 12, 2012. Ms. Furedi appears to reject "after-birth abortion" but not based on any developmental criteria. She says, "There is nothing magical about passing through the birth canal that transforms it from a fetus into a person."

Then she concedes that "I accept that abortion stops a beating heart and I accept that abortion ends a potential human life, even in the very earliest weeks of pregnancy. So if we think it's a morally wrong or morally coarsening thing to do, then I think we should oppose abortion right from the very earliest weeks." But everyone with a functioning conscience does think early abortion is morally wrong -- as soon as they see the horror of an early abortion photo. That is why Ms. Furedi so fears even early abortion photos outside her abortion clinics. It is why she is working to criminalize their display.

Then she answers her own flawed hypothetical by declaring that "If we don't think that [but, of course, we DO think that], then we have to ask ourselves, very clearly, who decides when late is too late? Who has the capacity to make that decision, and who has the right to intervene in this area of women's lives? Because late abortion is a very shaded thing, and it is determined very much by people's circumstances." Our only "intervention," however, is to hold up an abortion photo -- which reveals that elective abortion is indeed a "shaded thing" -- but the shades are only two in number, and they consist only of black and white.

[cbr.org/abortionNO.org](http://cbr.org/abortionNO.org) web traffic is approaching one million annual visitors (largely students) and we are upgrading our old server computers and related software. Please help us raise the roughly \$20,000 required.

Abortionists hate our photos precisely because they expose most mothers' "circumstances" as too trivial and all mothers' babies as too sacred to justify a lethal act of violence. In civilized societies, a victim's rights are seldom determined by a perpetrator's circumstances -- unless the victim is seen as subhuman. One of our principal objectives in displaying abortion imagery outside killing centers is to offer the most compelling possible evidence of a baby's humanity, from the earliest stages of pregnancy.

We are working to change mothers' minds. We are working to change consumers' minds. We are working to change voters' minds. Our goals are to save babies, empower economic boycotts and change the law -- none of which aspirations can be fulfilled without first changing hearts and minds. We don't take vacations from baby-saving because Planned Parenthood doesn't take vacations from baby-killing. Thank you for never taking time off from your support for our work. You stood with us at the beginning of this terrible economic downturn and we trust you will still be standing with us when it ends. May God honor your faithfulness.

Lord bless,

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

Gregg Cunningham  
Executive Director