

Gregg L. Cunningham, Executive Director

July 2015

Dear Pro-Life Supporter,

A member of our staff just told me that he was picketing a Planned Parenthood abortion clinic a few days ago with one of our large abortion photo signs. A woman drove into the parking lot and passed our nearby sign. She drove back out some twenty minutes later and when asked through the open window of her car whether she was going to keep her baby, she replied “Yes,” as she drove away.

These are the same photos we have been exhibiting outside abortion clinics in England and to our delight, the most recent newsletter of the UK’s largest abortion provider, the British Pregnancy Advisory Service (BPAS) (whose general “advice” is “kill your baby and let us do the job”), revealed that “... an abortion clinic is to close as a direct result of protest activity – a first in the UK ....” We had picketed that clinic with our photo signs and our victory was particularly painful for abortion providers because these abortion services were located in a general practice facility of the sort into which abortionists are trying to expand to mainstream abortion and make it seem more like legitimate healthcare. Not only were pregnant women seeing our signs, but pro-life nurses who worked in the non-abortion side of the facility spoke confidentially to our staff and intimated that complaints from the non-abortion patients and workers who were subjected to our pickets had contributed to the decision to suspend abortion services.

I will say more about the astonishing successes we are, by God’s grace, scoring in England in just a moment, but right now I want to remind you that none of this would have been possible without your help in funding our projects. Few Christians will provide financial support for any pro-life work, much less projects as controversial as ours. We cannot thank you enough for your sacrificial kindness. But right now we need more than your money. **We need you to support CBR the way Warren Buffett supports Planned Parenthood.** No, I don’t expect you to draft a seven-figure check. I am referring to an effective philanthropic strategy which is commonly employed by pro-abortion donors, but seldom considered by Christians who support pro-life activism.

Those who help finance the abortion industry are focused in their giving. They seek out the most effective baby-killing organizations and concentrate on empowering them – not only by writing checks, but by urging their friends, and families, and even mere acquaintances to write checks of their own. They host fundraising gatherings in their homes and they don’t just tell invitees “I hope you can make it.” They say, “I really need you to attend this meeting and I want you to bring your checkbook.” They use their social capital to press for more of a commitment than “I’ll try to make it” – which is usually a polite way of saying “Don’t count on me.”

Donors such as Bill Gates, George Soros, Ted Turner, etc., arrange one-on-one meetings between liberal activists and potential donors who won’t usually attend group meetings. High-net-worth liberals want to change the world. Comfortable Christians largely want to be left alone. Liberal business owners give their money to their causes. Christian business owners tend to give their wealth to their churches and their children. Their money seldom ends up defending life.

As a consequence of this comparative indifference toward the unborn, pro-life organizations must rely on support from donors of more modest means. CBR's typical supporters aren't flying high above the economic shocks of every-day life. Our donor base is under constant stress from job losses, pay cuts, shortened work-weeks, accidents, illnesses, etc. We must constantly add new donors just to maintain current revenue. That is why we need your help to get us into the room with Christians who might support our work if they knew about it.

No other group in the world is doing all the strategically vital projects pioneered by CBR. But we can't do them alone. Anna Johnson of our staff is going to contact you to ask if you are willing to **host a "Warren Buffett" event at which I can ask help from people with whom you have influence**. It would be an immense blessing to us if instead of waiting for her to contact you, you would contact her through our office, by calling 949-206-0600. With your help, we have rocked the British abortion industry back on its heels. It would be tragic if CBR's shrinking donor base allowed these baby killers to regain their balance.

How badly have Britain's baby butchers been hurt? BPAS persuaded the police to arrest our staff members for displaying abortion photo signs which the Crown Prosecution Service said violated the UK Public Order Act's ban on signage which is "threatening," or "insulting," etc. What the authorities didn't realize was that I had designed our signs with my computer mouse in one hand and a copy of the Public Order Act in the other. I carefully avoided any imagery or captions which might have been objectively "threatening" or "insulting." Our signs merely depict a living baby before an abortion, and a dead baby after an abortion. The subjective feelings of passersby have no legal significance if the signs are objectively devoid of explicitly insulting content. The judge predictably dismissed the charges against us, ruling that if signs could only be judged by the unpredictable reactions of random viewers, the law could never be known in advance of any sign display, and every sign would be potentially unlawful.

To better understand the absurd consequences which would result in a world governed by feelings instead of facts, consider a pathetic story which appeared in the *Sidney (Australia) Morning Herald*, August 5, 2004, headlined "Abortion is science's grim story." The article reports that "An abortion clinic in Perth last month lodged an objection to a proposed child-care center next door because the sight of children playing might upset its clients." The solution? A cover-up, of course! "The dispute was resolved when the local council ordered a [6-foot-high] ... brick fence be built between the properties." The abortion clinic doesn't care that post-abortive women are often later upset by the sight of children. The abortionists just don't want the distress to arise before the abortion decision has been finalized.

So when the courts wouldn't use current law to keep our abortion signs off the sidewalks outside her clinics, BPAS Chief Executive Ann Furedi turned to Parliament with demands for new laws – in the form of "buffer zones" into which no pro-life activist could enter. She says her goal is to "move us away from her clinic doors," but we aren't blocking her clinic doors. What she really wants is to move us down the street, where her potential customers can't see our abortion photos.

Her efforts to persuade Parliament to outlaw our abortion photos are also failing. Only two MPs, one a female member of the Labour Party and the other a woman from the Green Party, have introduced buffer zone initiatives and neither has attracted more than a few dozen cosponsors. The rest of Parliament's 650 members apparently don't want to be picketed as aggressively as we are picketing these two women. We are also gaining traction with the argument that banning pro-life picketers could lead to demands from corporations that striking union picketers also be banned.

In her January 29, 2015, article for *Spiked*, "Why restricting clinic protests is not an attack on political freedom," Ms. Furedi called CBR's abortion photos outside her clinics "the most degraded form of political expression imaginable," and added that "they are simply attempts to intimidate and embarrass ..." A LeftFootForward.org article, "How the U.K.'s abortion debate was revived," December 4, 2014, echoes this

lament, decrying the fact that potential BPAS customers are “regularly subjected to placards showing pictures of dismembered fetuses, or lists of misleading information about abortion.”

On February 16, 2012, however, LifeSiteNews.com posted a story headlined: “Performing abortions is ‘extremely gratifying’ – leading UK abortionist.” It quotes BPAS Medical Director Patricia Lohr, an American doctor, proclaiming abortion to be “self-evidently moral” and gushing that performing them is “extremely gratifying.” How can an abortion photo “embarrass” and “intimidate” if abortion is “self-evidently moral”? How can it be a “degraded form of political expression” to display abortion photos outside abortion clinics if it is “extremely gratifying” to perform abortions inside abortion clinics?

These sorts of discontinuities might have been on the minds of the U.S. Supreme Court Justices who recently unanimously invalidated abortion clinic buffer zones in the case of *McCullen v. Coakley*, June 26, 2014. The Court rejected the same arguments asserted by Ms. Furedi. She intentionally mischaracterizes CBR’s campaigners as “protesters” to make their conduct appear extreme and inappropriate. The U.S. abortion industry tried the same dishonest tactic but the Court wasn’t buying it. Their opinion held that buffer zones “impose serious burdens on [pro-life] petitioners’ speech, depriving them of their two primary methods of communicating with arriving patients: Close personal conversations and distributing literature.” The majority also ruled that “while the [buffer zone] act may allow [pro-life] petitioners to ‘protest’ outside the buffer zones, petitioners are not protesters; they seek not merely to express their opposition to abortion, but to engage in personal, caring, consensual conversations with women ...” The Court observed that the law already prohibited every form of misconduct alleged by abortionists outside their clinics, but that despite “a significant police presence outside Massachusetts abortion clinics ... not a single prosecution or injunction against individuals outside abortion clinics [had occurred] since the 1990’s.”

Even liberal American abortion rights lawyer and writer Wendy Kaminer disagrees with Ms. Furedi’s buffer zone proposal. Ms. Kaminer says, “Protesters and picketers ... have a right to ‘engage’ us, whether we’re seeking access to abortion clinics ... [or anywhere else]” (*Spiked*, Jan. 26, 2015, “Pro-choice *and* pro-free speech: say no to buffer zones”).

Ms. Furedi justifies this outrageous violation of British expressive rights with the contention that CBR activists are “protesters” who “interfere with women’s access to abortion clinics.” She alleges that CBR is guilty of “bullying and harassment” and “intimidat[ing]” women who are “vulnerable and distressed” (*Spiked*, “Why anti-abortion protesters must back off,” Dec. 29, 2014). If true, such misconduct would be unlawful and CBR campaigners would be arrested for it. But that has never happened, despite the fact that virtually all CBR outreach events take place under the watchful gaze of the police whom CBR invites to monitor our activity. Even many of Ms. Furedi’s prospective customers disagree with her false claims regarding our behavior. A November 25, 2014, BBC story headlined “Calls for law to stop anti-abortion protests outside clinics” quotes an abortive mother who said of CBR campaigners, “They’re not aggressive or angry or anything ...” Then she adds tellingly, “You’re already aware that you’re about to decide to take something’s life away. I mean it’s not a life yet truly ...” It is our photos and literature which prove that this “something” is indeed a baby, who already has a “life.” This sense of guilt – troubling, but not yet intense enough to deter the “termination” – is compounded by the offer of evidence that abortion is an act of violence which kills a baby. This is why another aborting mother quoted in the story said, “They did not say anything to me directly, but they are so ... intimidating outside the clinic.” Still another mother said, “Being told I’d be prayed for is an invasion of privacy.” Ms. Furedi agrees and would jail anyone offering prayer for prospective customers approaching her clinics. The BBC story also quotes a mother named Susan Briggs who changed her mind about abortion after encountering CBR’s abortion photos outside an abortion clinic.

The UK Department of Health *Reference Guide to Consent for Examination or Treatment*, paragraph 20, warns that, “The mere fact that the patient might be upset by hearing the information, or might refuse

treatment, is not sufficient to act as a justification [for withholding potentially distressing facts].” We offer admittedly upsetting information outside the clinic which BPAS conceals inside.

The BPAS newsletter quoted above also illogically argues buffer zones are needed to protect clinic staff from being harassed outside of work. What? How does a buffer zone prevent harassment outside the buffer zone? The fact is that pro-lifers are not being convicted of harassment, because exposing the horror of abortion is not a crime – but concealing that horror should be!

The newsletter also decries the fact that “the Home Office continues to insist that the police have the powers [required] to deal with the protesters.” That means the Tory government isn’t acceding to Ms. Furedi’s demand that the police push abortion photos out of sight of her prospective customers. The *UK Independent Newspaper*, June 24, 2015, reported a story headlined “‘Establish buffer zones around abortion clinics to protect women from protesters,’ say MPs.” This very liberal newspaper tries to marginalize CBR by saying we are a “religious group,” which opposes abortion for “religious reasons.” In fact, we are also a secular group which opposes abortion for human rights reasons. But the article does helpfully quote Home Office minister Mike Penning who affirms that “The police have adequate powers to prevent the harassment of women already.” And he repeats the police statement reported in a story posted by the BBC (“Calls for laws to stop anti-abortion protests outside clinics,” Nov. 28, 2014). The Association of Chief Police Officers said, “Police respect an individual or individuals right to peaceful protest,” and the group declined to call for a ban on abortion photos.

The *Independent* story also quotes BPAS calling their proposed restricted areas “safe zones,” but hiding the horror of abortion actually creates a danger zone! *National Review* magazine, June 2, 2014, ran a story in their “The Week” section, asserting that “Boko Haram, the killer Islamist cult of northern Nigeria ... correctly sees the education of young women as a threat to its political and religious agenda.” BPAS too is a death cult, obsessed with blocking efforts to educate young women about abortion.

But because of your crucially important financial support, and God’s anointing, BPAS is on the defensive. Our UK director recently emailed me to say, “I am constantly amazed at how far we’ve pushed the ball down the field with your help. We have a growing team because they are inspired by the strategy you have put in place and as a direct result of hearing you speak.” And our London project coordinator just emailed our UK director to say, “It was Gregg’s words/pleas that persuaded me to do this full time.” That’s the kind of progress your donations are producing.

Please, let us as Christians show the world that we care more about ending abortion than billionaires like Warren Buffett care about pushing abortion. **Host a fundraiser at which I can speak and consider writing CBR into your will** like Warren Buffett has written Planned Parenthood into his will. God will surely reward our combined efforts.

Lord bless,



Gregg Cunningham  
Executive Director