

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

March 2014

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

By God's grace, our campaign to persuade Biola University to expand students' expressive rights has just made important progress. University President Barry Corey has announced a new policy which will purportedly permit students to exhibit abortion photos in public on campus. Biola is the second Christian school (after Westmont College) we have successfully pressured to permit the display of abortion photos in their public square. Students at Christian colleges will lead our churches in years to come and they need to see abortion even more acutely than students at the secular colleges we visit. The new regulation was announced in the February 5, 2014 edition of the school newspaper (*The Chimes*). According to the president, "Our new policy lays out guidelines for graphic images, such as those portraying victims of injustice, to be displayed on Sutherland Way, between the small fountain and the Bell Tower." The regulation, however, is so vaguely drafted that it may still grant hostile administrators the latitude they need to interpret it restrictively. We intend to see that that doesn't happen, because the new policy could be a dramatic departure from Barry Corey's June 5, 2013 press release titled "Biola University Response to Recent YouTube Video of Student Demonstration." In that statement he contended that "The public displaying of very graphic, disturbing images ... is not an appropriate venue [sic] of student expression on our campus." Overwhelmingly negative public reaction to Biola's abortion photo ban -- and its brutally vindictive enforcement -- apparently changed his mind.

Yet Barry Corey and his subordinates refuse to even say the word "abortion" when describing the pictures which the policy now assumedly permits. Vague references to "victims of injustice" are as close as they get to conceding that this conflict is about whether and by what means the church will fight baby-killing. In his February 5th *Chimes* essay, the president claims that "At Biola, we encourage you as our students to follow Christ wholeheartedly, to speak up boldly for those who cannot speak for themselves, and to speak the truth with grace. We will not silence students who believe God is leading them to speak up for victims of injustice." But then he adds that "Displaying ... images ... on Biola's campus is a privilege, not a right." CBR has always maintained that Christian schools which expand students' expressive rights can and should retain the authority to bar materials which are inconsistent with their institution's statement of faith. The issue in dispute, however, isn't a ban on what students are permitted to "speak" regarding abortion. It's about what they are permitted to *show*. That is important because there are no words which are adequate to expose the full horror of abortion. No reasonable construction of any Christian school's doctrinal statement would bar the display of abortion photos. But the potential for censorship abounds in the broad discretion given to the administrators who will apply this regulation -- the same administrators who threatened and abused Diana Jimenez for displaying the banned abortion photos which began this skirmish.

The regulation, for example, requires that the content of signs intended for display "... must be submitted to the Office of Student Development 24 hours in advance of desired posting date(s)." That may sound reasonable until you read the section which warns that "... Student Development [will not approve signs determined] ... to be threatening, derogatory, disruptive, offensive, inflammatory, intimidating or in poor taste" How could an abortion photo be "tasteful"? In a *Chimes* article headlined "Administration seeks to manage graphic images on campus," February 19, 2014, Associate Dean of Students Matthew Hooper

(who orchestrated the abuse of nursing student Diana Jimenez in 2013) said (laughably), “‘The approval of images is dependent on several factors, and no specific topic is being targeted by this policy’” He added that “‘It depends on the goal or intent of the image, we are open to anything within reason’” How about the “goal or intent” of saving babies whose mothers are among those women who will be victimized by abortion unless they see it? What will be deemed “within reason” when this is the same Matthew Hooper who told *The Chimes* on May 8, 2013, that “‘In the past we’ve had groups wanting to display those images. We’ve asked them not to do that in open public places.’” In other words, Mr. Hooper believes disturbing photos should only be displayed where viewers must go out of their way to see them. Perhaps he is unaware that viewers seldom go out of their way to be disturbed. That is why Martin Luther King put disturbing images of racial injustice right in people’s faces on the television sets in their living rooms -- whether they wanted to see them or not. They could change the channel, but the images were on all the channels. They could turn off the television, but the images were on the front pages of newspapers and magazines. There was nowhere to hide from the ugly truth. That is how Dr. King forced passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Thank Heaven he was so relentlessly confrontational with shocking pictures.

Under Biola’s new photo display policy, “‘Student Development [meaning Matthew Hooper] will determine whether to approve, deny or delay any displays or postings based on timing, location, content, community appropriateness and posting policy requirements.’” Pro-life students will not, however, allow Mr. Hooper to unreasonably “deny” or “delay” the display of abortion photos because many Biola students aren’t “denying” or “delaying” surreptitious sex, pregnancies and abortions. It took multiple acts of civil disobedience to get a more enlightened expressive rights regulation at Biola, and it may require still more civil disobedience to ensure that this regulation is interpreted expansively enough to save babies and protect mothers and inspire students to consider careers in anti-abortion ministry. In his earlier “apology” letter, Barry Corey asked a related but confused question: “‘... [A]t what point might images be deemed too graphic or distasteful?’” Our abortion photos are “graphic and distasteful” precisely because abortion is graphic and distasteful. If Biola restricts our displays to the use of only less disturbing photos, the school will convey the mistaken impression that abortion is less evil than it really is. Censoring the most disturbing aspects of the abortion procedure would delight Planned Parenthood and return Biola to its long-running abortion concealment partnership with the abortion industry.

The revised image display regulation claims its policy goal is to pursue “... a Christ-honoring community experience,” but it would hardly honor Christ if Biola were to continue its long-standing practice of helping Planned Parenthood hide the horror of abortion. Additionally, Student Development “will not allow the posting, display or distribution of any materials (images, films, photographs, flyers, posters, etc.) that are contrary, in appearance or content, to the below guidelines, to the Doctrinal Statement or the Community Standards of the university.” And what are those standards? The regulation explains that “‘...[T]he following questions [should] be asked by those seeking to display or post graphic images: 1. What is the purpose of this imagery or display?’” As regards abortion, the purpose is to visually expose that portion of abortion’s evil for which no words can ever be adequate. Abortion is unimaginably evil. Only with pictures can we reach that percentage of passersby who will never reject abortion until they have seen it. Pictures are the only way this group can be made to understand that abortion is not a nominal evil. It is not the lesser of two evils. It is an unutterably horrific evil of the same moral magnitude as the Old Testament child sacrifice against which God so frightfully rages.

2. The next question: “‘Is the primary purpose to provoke an emotional response or to educate about a particular topic?’” Why not both? These are not mutually exclusive propositions. Our purpose is both emotive and educational. Holocaust memorial activists have always worked to place horrifying death camp imagery in textbooks and on television to provoke emotions such as revulsion and outrage. This imagery is also educational in its power to express the inexpressible brutality of genocide -- and make more compelling

the “Never Again” demand that crimes against humanity not ever be permitted to target Jews.

3. Mr. Hooper will then ask, “Is showing disturbing images or film the most educationally effective way to communicate a message about this topic?” It is not only the most effective way, it is the only truly effective way. Social reform has historically been propelled by imagery which is as distressing as the injustice sought to be reformed. For this reason, child labor activists confronted the culture with heart-rending photos of little children abused in mines and mills and factories. Before practical photography, these activists failed in the courts and in the legislatures for decades. Words alone failed to convey the full, sickening truth about child labor. Shocking pictures, however, changed everything.

4. Matthew Hooper will also want to know “What is the message that viewers should receive by seeing these images?” The message is an explanation -- comprehensible at a glance -- of why God hates child sacrifice, and why He will judge what each of us does about abortion, not merely what we think or say.

5. Another regulatory criterion is “Will the viewers be provided with adequate context to understand the message accurately?” Our aborted baby photos provide their own context with the depiction of an age caption and a size reference and a thought-provoking sign title. We have refined our messaging during years of field testing in front of millions of college students. Some passersby may reject our message but nearly no one fails to grasp it.

6. Signs will be further evaluated by asking “Is this imagery appropriate for the audience that will see it?” The audience, rather than the paternalistic Mr. Hooper, should decide that. We are losing the Abortion Wars precisely because we have lost the churches, and we have lost the churches because we have lost the pastors, and we have lost the pastors because Christian colleges and seminaries are helping the abortion industry conceal abortion’s demonic carnage from future Christian leaders. To mobilize the church against abortion, future Christian leaders are the perfect audience for abortion photo signs.

7. The administration will then want to know if “... these images [will be] useful in making inferences, deductions or generalizations about the topic?” How’s that for pedantic gobbledygook? A few months ago a pregnant Biola sophomore found our images highly “useful” when she saw them on campus and consequently cancelled her abortion appointment. She “inferred” that her baby really was a baby. She “deduced” that abortion really is an indescribable act of violence for which she would be held accountable by God. She “generalized” that Biola was grieving the Spirit of God by ruthlessly persecuting Diana Jimenez, the student who showed her the full truth about abortion. Three for three!

8. Oddly, the regulation next asks “Are the images in a controlled environment?” But the regulation itself answers this question by controlling the only environment in which abortion photos may be displayed -- that section of Sutherland Way which is bounded by the Bell Tower and the small fountain.

9. Still more oddly, the regulation inquires whether “... people have the choice to view or avoid the images?” They will certainly have that choice because they can read our conspicuously posted warning signs. They will have that choice because they can choose a different route -- or, easier still, merely avert their gaze as they pass. We have always posted warning signs along avenues of approach to our abortion photos -- long before Barry Corey’s February 5th *Chimes* essay announced that “...we will ensure that clear warning signs are posted concerning public displays that may be disturbing.”

10. The oddest question of all, however, is the last: “If viewers choose to see the images, do they have the appropriate resources to process their response(s) to the images?” Biola’s public relations office has spent months describing all the marvelous methodologies by which the university supposedly educates students about abortion. If Biola really does educate its students regarding this atrocity, how could viewers not have

“... the resources to process their response(s) to the images?” If they need additional processing assistance, don’t they have the entire Biola faculty and staff at their disposal?

In the February 5th article, Barry Corey asserts that “The decision of the Dean of Students (or his/her designee) on these issues will be based on the approval processes outlined below, and will be final.” But we can assure Biola that any disapproval of abortion photos proposed for public display will not be “final” at all. It will merely mark the beginning of another campaign by students risking discipline to save babies.

In the February 19th article, Vice President of Student Development Chris Grace expresses a desire to ban images which might “offend” or “hurt” students. He says nothing about the power of those images to also save babies and protect mothers. Mr. Grace appears to care more about the feelings of born people than the lives of preborn people. Ditto with Matthew Hooper. In the same article Mr. Hooper says, “Our baseline is holistic care for students in view of the diversity within the student body. If there is something potentially offending or hurtful on campus, we care about that” Mr. Hooper also says, “The spirit behind this policy is to place a loving limit behind what the university allows” Why not place a “loving limit” on abortion by allowing the horrifying truth to be exposed? The “diversity” concern he raises apparently refers to his desire to never “offend or hurt” the sensibilities of Biola students who are pro-abortion. Better they be abandoned to sin than be upset. The Christian church is pastored by large numbers of weak men because schools such as Biola infantilize their students, patronizing them as fragile children who can’t cope with the injustices Christians are commanded to confront. (9 Isaiah 59:15-16.) This while secular schools toughen *their* students in the feminist studies programs which groom them to become abortion industry shock troops. Is it any wonder that we are losing the Abortion Wars?

On January 15, 2014, I received a long and disheartening message from a Biola University professor. He was dismayed by our expressive rights campaign at his school. He said, “I ask you to let this situation go. I ask for peace. I ask that you not continue to use your precious time ... bringing a war to Biola.” Also, “I don’t know why you need to bring the fight to Biola’s campus.” Again, “My purpose in writing this email is just to be a peacemaker” Finally, “Please, I beg you, let us have peace.” He has not read Jeremiah 6:14: “They offer superficial treatments for my people’s mortal wound. They give assurances of peace when there is no peace.” Planned Parenthood has waged an invisible war against Biola students and their babies for decades. We are merely making that war visible and pushing the school to fight back.

During the American Civil War, Judah P. Benjamin served as Confederate Secretary of War, Attorney General, and Secretary of State. He was a pro-slavery propagandist who disingenuously claimed that “All we are struggling for is to be let alone.” (*The Civil War*, Shelby Foote, Random House, 1963.) That was a compelling argument -- unless you are among the black people whom the Confederacy refused to let alone. We won’t let Christian colleges alone until they let their abortion photo-wielding students alone.

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

P.S. Please forward to friends and family a digital version of this letter from the “Archives” section of abortionNO.org; please include CBR in your estate planning; please encourage your pastor to watch my YouTube pro-life sermon using abortion video in the main services of Calvary Chapel, Pearl Harbor, HI; please host a fundraising coffee at which I can present CBR’s work to those in your circle of influence.