

Reforming Our Movement,
Reforming Our Culture:
How Canadian Pro-Lifers Can
Make Abortion Unthinkable
in the 21st Century

by the Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform



Table of Contents

- 1. Part I: Introduction**
- 2. Part II: The Problem: Widespread Acceptance of Abortion**
 - a. Abortion Statistics
 - b. Public Opinion Polls
 - c. Fence-Sitters
 - d. The Pro-Abortion Movement
- 3. Part III: An Analysis of Pro-Life Responses to Abortion**
 - a. The Pastoral Arm
 - b. The Political Arm
 - c. The Prophetic Arm
 - a. Reaching Our Target Audience
 - b. Providing Clear Reasons
 - c. Blending Moral Issues in a Campaign
 - d. The Frequency of Pro-Life Work
 - e. Being Proactive
 - f. Is Our Work Cost-Effective?
 - d. Summary
- 4. Part IV: CCBR & Modelling Successful Social Reform Movements**
 - a. Civil Rights Movement
 - b. British Abolitionist Movement
 - c. Child Labour
 - d. Canadian Seal Hunt
 - e. Victims of War
 - f. Drug Education
 - g. Car Accidents
 - h. Drinking & Driving
 - i. The Pro-Abortion Movement
 - j. Relating to CCBR
 - k. Persecution and Criticism
 - l. Summary
- 5. Part V: Conclusion**
- 6. Appendix I: A Debate about Educational Emphasis**
- 7. Appendix II: Taking Abortion Seriously**
- 8. Appendix III: Persecution from Within**
- 9. Appendix IV: Letter to a Post-Abortive Woman**
- 10. Appendix V: Frequently Asked Questions about the Genocide Awareness Project (GAP)**
- 11. Appendix VI: Frequently Asked Questions about the Reproductive “Choice” Campaign (RCC)**

Part I: Introduction

The day after Christmas in 2004, devastation struck the world.

The massive tsunami that overwhelmed southeast Asia killed over 186,000 people (with the fate of 42,000 more classified as “missing”).¹ As would be expected, there was an outpouring of assistance: relief agencies rushed overseas to provide medical aid, food, shelter, and moral support.

A similarly striking number of human beings, over 100,000, are killed *each year* by abortion in Canada. And almost the same number of human beings—126,000—is killed *each day* by abortion throughout the world.² It is as though, figuratively speaking, a tsunami hits the world each day or two. Society’s reaction, however, is as though nothing is happening at all.

How do we change that? How do we transform society so that people acknowledge abortion to be a moral wrong, not a right?

The heart of the Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform (CCBR) is to change people’s attitudes about abortion so that this human rights violation becomes *unthinkable*. We aim to change how people *feel* and *think* about abortion so that they will *act* differently towards it. That means converting the unconvinced, activating the converted, and training the active to work more effectively.

This document explains why CCBR exists and provides an analysis of the pro-life movement, identifying what needs to be accomplished in order to change minds on abortion. It examines the climate of widespread acceptance of abortion, the responses of the existing pro-life movement to this climate, and the history of successful social reform movements.

This analysis comes from a credible voice because CCBR has spent years interacting with the public at large. Its representatives have dialogued with people at street corners, high schools, post-secondary institutions, and churches across North America. They have interacted with leading abortion advocates. They have worked in various facets of the pro-life movement over a period of decades. They have studied the arguments both for and against abortion, as well as studied social change. They have experience with both the theoretical and the practical.

Before venturing into this analysis, it is important to know who the intended audience is: people who believe abortion is wrong. It is for the pro-lifer who clearly understands the evil nature of abortion, having previously viewed one or both of the films “Choice Blues” or “This Is Abortion.” Failure to first view one of these films will make this document much less useful. *Additionally*, this analysis is for the pro-lifer who fits one or more of the following criteria:

- wishes to understand why CCBR does what it does
- desires to learn about various approaches to fighting abortion
- seeks to implement strategic, effective activities to stop the killing
- yearns to regain hope that the abortion “battle” thought to be lost is in fact winnable

Furthermore, readers should be aware of the following that will provide context for this paper:

This document will look not only at problems facing the pro-life movement from outside forces (e.g., the pro-abortion movement) but also from inside forces (e.g., weaknesses within some pro-life activities). CCBR’s comments are not made to be gratuitously critical of its fellow pro-life workers. The views herein are not made to deprive people of hope, to drive them into despair. They are made so that the pro-life movement will become as effective as possible in reaching its goal of ending abortion. After all, our willingness to look for big solutions depends on whether we acknowledge the existence of big problems.

Speaker and author Matthew Kelly has made the following insight that is relevant to this document:

*Most people don't want to think about their weaknesses. We don't want to talk about them, and we certainly don't want anyone else to point them out. This is a classic sign of mediocrity. Great men and women want to know their weaknesses.*³

And great movements that desire to transform societies want to know their weaknesses. If we care about saving lives, we need to critically examine the success of our movement. Precisely because we care about unborn children and the ability of the movement to help those children, we need *constructive* criticism.

Let us not fear criticism more than we fear ineffectiveness. Let us not fear criticism more than we fear being made uncomfortable. Let us fear babies being killed, enabled by mediocrity.

CCBR has a plan for how it will help save babies. Its ideas are backed up with good reasons. Its insights inevitably involve reflecting on the work of the broad pro-life movement; discussing pro-life activities beyond simply those CCBR does is important because, in the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., "We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly."⁴

The pro-life movement has within it the power to change the course of history for the better. Let us learn how, with this honest analysis.

PART II: The Problem: Widespread Acceptance of Abortion

Consider the following scenario:

Imagine that instead of abortion being legal in Canada, “toddler termination” is.

For twenty years of your life, this has been a common practice. You are too young to remember what it was like before. Although you grew up in a culture that considered toddler termination to be appropriate, you yourself would never do it. Of course, you have several acquaintances that have, and although you’re uncomfortable with the idea, you do believe that people have a right to think and act in their own best interests.

Society does not consider toddler termination to be an unethical practice. In fact, most people classify it as merciful. If parents believe they cannot provide for their child, they opt for termination to spare him or her a life of misery. Others believe their lives are no longer compatible with a toddler and choose termination with plans to try again when the time is right.

There are 285 terminations a day across the country, but it is rarely discussed. You read the national newspaper that has stories about war, murders, sports, and business but no mention of toddler termination. You watch the evening news a few times a week and, as with the newspaper, learn about a whole range of topics including celebrity weddings and divorces, but you hear nothing of toddler termination.

Although toddler termination happens frequently, it’s never mentioned in everyday conversation. When you go grocery shopping, for example, you don’t discuss it with the cashier. You can recall, however, the trip a few weeks ago when you said to a grocery store clerk, “Did you hear the news? Twenty people were killed in a ten-car collision in London earlier this month. Several of the victims were toddlers, and the city held a public memorial that thousands attended.”

When you attended church the following Sunday, the pastor spoke about the incident and condemned the irresponsibility of reckless driving. Prayers and sympathy cards poured in for the family members who lost toddlers in the tragedy. In Sunday school, the young children wrote messages and drew pictures for the grieving families. You can’t recall a time when you heard about toddler termination at church, though. In fact, you don’t even know what your church thinks about it. You assume it thinks as you do: God gave us free will. If He respects our freedom, we should respect others’ freedom.

You did your undergraduate degree at a prestigious Canadian university, with an emphasis on crimes against humanity. You learned a lot about the mass destruction of human life, from the Holocaust to the Cambodian and Rwandan genocides. Although no country has a perfect past, yours came out looking pretty good in comparison. Toddler termination, of course, was never mentioned in class. Why would it be? It’s not the same thing.

Of course, there is a time and place to learn about toddler termination. That occurs in medical school, where future doctors and nurses receive instruction on the practice and can get “hands-on” experience by assisting with the procedure. Although it ends the lives of human offspring, society doesn’t consider it wrong because the toddlers are only potential people, and because the families have good reasons to choose toddler termination.

It is difficult to imagine that a society could react—or rather, not react—to the purposeful killing of toddlers, especially at a rate of over 2,000 each week. And yet, the scenario above is *precisely* how society is reacting to abortion.

Abortion Statistics

An examination of the number of abortions over the last ten years, for which statistics are available, reveals a relatively steady trend: the number of abortions from 1994 to 2005 was consistently around 100,000 per year, the highest being 111,709 in 1997⁵ and the lowest being 96,815 in 2005⁶. Although the overall number of abortions has decreased, generally so has the number of births. In fact, the percentage of total pregnancies ending in abortion has gotten *worse* since 1994. In that year, 20.7% of pregnancies ended in abortion. In 2004, 22.4% did.⁷ (Note: At the time of this printing, Statistics Canada's document "Pregnancy Outcomes 2005" was not yet available to show the total number of pregnancies (live births, induced abortions, and fetal loss) for the year the most recent abortion statistics are available, which is 2005.)

Although the percentage of total pregnancies to abortion is worse than it was ten years ago, in the past few years the percentage has been decreasing. Having said that, it is important to realize there are unborn babies being killed in Canada who aren't factored into those available statistics. This means the number of human beings being aborted is actually higher than it appears: First of all, the unborn can be killed by chemical abortifacients (some methods of birth control) but it is impossible to determine how many lives are lost this way. Second, some reproductive technologies result in human beings being created and then destroyed. Third, there is no legal requirement for collecting data on induced abortions performed in Canada. The Supreme Court struck down such a law in 1988. This has resulted in incomplete reporting with some clinics not reporting the abortions they perform. In fact, the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI) "has estimated that as of the 2000 data year the Therapeutic Abortion Survey database represents approximately 90% of all abortions performed in Canada on Canadian residents."⁸

It is therefore tragically accurate to say that the numbers indicate little to no change in behaviour towards abortion. "A woman's right to choose" continues to enjoy widespread acceptance.

Public Opinion Polls

Public opinion polls reveal, time and again, that a significant percentage of Canadians need their minds changed on this issue:

- According to a 2001 Gallup poll, a 52% majority believes abortion should be legal under certain circumstances. An additional 32% of Canadians believe abortions should be legal in all circumstances, while only 14% would make abortion illegal in all circumstances (2% have no opinion).⁹
- A year after the aforementioned Gallup poll, Leger Marketing Omnican and LifeCanada polled Canadians by asking, "In your opinion, at what point during human development should the law protect human life?" 30% of Canadians responded *from the point of birth* (practically matching the 32% who believe abortion should be legal in all circumstances), 6% said *after 6 months*, 13% said *after 3 months*, while 37% responded *from conception on* (14% don't know).¹⁰
- That same year, 2002, Leger Marketing revealed in a separate poll that 42% of Canadians defined abortion as immoral—as opposed to 89% who defined shoplifting as immoral.¹¹ In 2006 when Leger Marketing did another poll the percentage dropped: only 34% considered abortion immoral.¹² Therefore, one can deduce that a majority of Canadians, 66%, consider abortion moral to some degree or do not have an opinion.
- In 2005, LifeCanada commissioned Environics Research Group to poll Canadians' attitudes toward abortion. When Canadians were asked at what point in human development should the

law protect human life, 33% said from the point of birth, 11% said after six months of pregnancy, 19% said after three months of pregnancy, and 30% said from conception on (7% had no opinion on the question).¹³

- The following year, LifeCanada commissioned Environics Research Group to do yet another poll on Canadians' attitudes toward abortion. The results were virtually identical to the year before: 30% of Canadians supported legal protection for human life from birth onwards, 10% after six months, 23% after three months, and 31% from conception (6% had no opinion).¹⁴
- In 2007, LifeCanada commissioned another poll. Given the track record of previous years, Canadians' opinion about the point in human development that the law should protect human life was unsurprising: 33% said from the point of birth, 11% said after six months, 21% said after three months, and 30% said from conception on (5% had no opinion). These numbers show, in comparison to the previous year, that public opinion has actually worsened!¹⁵

It appears from these polls over the past several years that anywhere from 14% to 37% of Canadians hold an authentically "pro-life" view (that is, against abortion in all cases). That, of course, cannot be said with total assurance as the questions varied in each poll. What can be said with reasonably greater confidence, however, is that a *majority* of Canadians accept abortion to varying degrees.

Some pro-life advocates will interpret these polls as showing a majority of public support for protecting human life *at some point prior to birth*. These advocates are theoretically correct concerning support for legal protections during the second and third trimesters but they are misguided when they trumpet that as a public-opinion victory. Nothing in the poll would indicate majority support for protecting human life within the first three months of pregnancy, *when the overwhelming majority of abortions occur*.¹⁶ And so, based on the most recent poll, 70%—over two-thirds—of Canadians do not believe in protecting unborn human beings when the majority of them are killed. And so, when it comes to public opinion, the pro-life movement is winning where it matters least (later in pregnancy) and losing where it matters most (early in pregnancy). Having said that, it is even questionable whether we're "winning where it matters least" as there is no outcry by the Canadian public to make late-term abortions illegal.

Given that life begins at fertilization, it is essential that Canadians come to the conclusion that *any* abortion is immoral. That, however, is far from the reality.

Some pro-lifers may even be tempted to take comfort in the possibility that over 30% of Canadians are of the *opinion* that abortion is wrong, but a question remains: what are those Canadians actually *doing* to make abortion unthinkable?

Fence-Sitters

CCBR's experience is consistent with these various opinion polls. Since 2002, CCBR has travelled extensively throughout North America speaking to high school students, university students, professors, and church goers. CCBR has not only given formal presentations and debates, but it has had countless one-on-one interactions after presentations, on public streets, and on university campuses with people of all backgrounds, faiths, education levels and social standing.

While there are some people with strong convictions on both sides of the debate, many try to find "middle ground." They default to an identifiable "pro-choice" position because it seems more reasonable or less extreme. Some would never have an abortion themselves, but believe it should be available for others. They believe the wrongness of abortion should be decided on a case-by-case basis.

In a culture that preaches “tolerance” to the extreme (meaning that the importance of tolerating *people* has incorrectly given way to tolerating *bad behaviour*), they believe they cannot force their views on others. They consider abortion to be the “lesser of two evils.” They consider the unborn to be “not quite human yet” or “a potential person,” if they think about the unborn at all. And so they go on living their lives, leaving the morality of abortion up to personal preference. Because these people are relatively unconcerned about abortion, they have no desire to be educated. And so, any teaching methodology which requires such lukewarm individuals to go out of their way to receive the pro-life message will invariably not reach that target audience. Such individuals will ignore abortion as long as abortion ignores them. They do not actively fight for abortion rights nor do they oppose them. This is evidenced in audience turn-out at pro-life lectures. Such events—even debates where both sides are present—draw small crowds, and of those crowds most individuals are pro-life, some are staunch abortion advocates, but very few lukewarm individuals bother to show up.

It regrettably needs to be added that this attitude of indifference is rampant in churches. There are too many believers, including clergy, who remain silent on this most important of issues. Many of these individuals fear rocking the boat and making people upset, but what they don’t realize is that their actions show they fear those things *more* than they fear babies being killed. In most places of worship, it is rare to hear the “A” word mentioned during a weekend service.

The Pro-Abortion Movement

Promoters of abortion have successfully framed the debate in terms of “choice.” Rather than focussing on what the unborn are, abortion advocates talk about abortion as though it were a matter of personal preference. They argue that it is possible for someone to be personally opposed to abortion but still support it for others. In fact, many dispute that they are “pro” abortion. Instead, they say they are “pro” a woman’s right to choose: while no woman should be denied an abortion, neither should any woman be forced into an abortion.¹⁷ Abortion advocates have been so effective at their propaganda that most people believe that abortion is a woman’s right, even if it is undesirable.

Some individuals and groups within the pro-abortion movement have also succeeded by relying on false information: slandering pro-lifers, exaggerating statistics, hiding the adverse health effects abortion has on women, and misrepresenting who the unborn are and what abortion does to them.¹⁸

When pro-lifers try to present the truth in a public forum, many abortion advocates refuse to formally debate. More militant abortion advocates will go so far as to censor the discussion through bubble zones, tearing down posters, sabotaging pro-life presentations, banning pro-life student clubs, or blocking pro-life signs from view, etc.¹⁹ This makes it extremely difficult to change the public’s mind on abortion.

The societal situation favours abortion advocates; society is much closer to the pro-abortion ideal of *abortion on demand* than to the pro-life ideal of *abortion being unthinkable*. The onus, then, is on pro-lifers to change the status quo. But the unwillingness of the culture to deal with abortion combined with censorship by some abortion advocates effectively inhibits discussion. This creates an immense obstacle for the pro-life movement.

Compounding these problems is the institutional support for abortion from, for example, some labour unions, media, universities, political parties, religious groups, private corporations, medical bodies, legal bodies, and various levels of government.²⁰ A significant way in which governments support abortion is by funding it through Canadians’ tax dollars. And, not only is it common for provincial governments to pay for some or all of the abortions in *private* clinics, Canada has paid for some abortions obtained in the United States by Canadian women.²¹

Abortion advocates are also working in a lucrative industry. It is estimated that in one year notorious Canadian abortionist Henry Morgentaler brought in revenue of over \$11 million.²² (Contrast that with the fact that most pro-life activists are unpaid volunteers.) And in one year Warren Buffet's foundation gave \$21 million in grants to groups that work in abortion access and "reproductive health."²³ It is no wonder, then, that abortion advocates can work full-time to kill the unborn and otherwise maintain abortion on demand.

PART III: An Analysis of Pro-Life Responses to Abortion

Recognizing the climate of widespread acceptance of killing, the pro-life movement has developed a number of responses. Generally speaking, these can be divided into one of three categories:

1. A pastoral approach—providing aid to women in crisis,
2. A political approach—changing the law, and
3. A prophetic approach—educating the public.

All three approaches are necessary. And the success of the first two depends very much on the success of the third. In other words, if public opinion changes, there will be a corresponding shift in public policy. There will also be a corresponding shift in the behaviour of women in crisis pregnancy. But if public opinion *doesn't* change, then no matter how valiant one's efforts to provide alternatives to abortion or to introduce pro-life legislation, the status quo will remain unaltered.

These points can be illustrated by way of analogy: imagine there is a building on fire with people trapped inside. The most obvious need is for firefighters to put out the fire and rescue those in harm's way. But when their job ends, many other jobs are just beginning: paramedics need to provide on-scene care; physicians need to diagnose and treat the wounded; nurses need to implement the required care; law enforcement officers need to investigate the origins of the fire and respond to any foul play; parents and educators need to teach children the dangers of playing with fire. All approaches are necessary and no one would criticize firefighters, for example, for not being physicians. Yet, the success of one approach very much depends on the success of another: if firefighters do not rescue people, the medical care at a hospital's burn unit will go unused—no matter how impressive it is.

The following description of the three approaches in the pro-life movement further illustrates the need for these varied roles; however, it also highlights the weaknesses that exist where synergy and effectiveness are lacking.

The Pastoral Arm

Throughout North America, there are pro-life resource centres to help pregnant women who are overwhelmed by the burdens of an unplanned pregnancy, some of which include the following:

- Pressure (including threats of, or actual, violence or abandonment) by family members and partners
- An already abusive relationship the woman does not want to bring a child into
- Drug addiction and therefore the belief that it is in the child's best interest to be aborted
- A successful career that a child will impede
- The desire to finish school unhampered by motherhood
- Financial hardship

In the United States, there are over 2500 pro-life centres and in Canada there are over 135.²⁴ These centres, which are commonly known as *crisis pregnancy centres (CPCs)*, *pregnancy care centres (PCCs)*, or *pregnancy resource centres (PRCs)*, offer alternatives to abortion with the hope of sparing women and their unborn children from abortion. They provide a vital service, typically offering free pregnancy tests, pregnancy counselling, baby and maternity clothes, adoption information, and parenting resources. In contrast to places where women can *obtain* abortions, there are more PCCs than abortion providers in the United States, and slightly fewer PCCs than abortion providers in Canada.²⁵

According to the Canadian Association of Pregnancy Support Services (CAPSS), 57 of its centers across Canada helped 13,048 clients in 2002, with 6,452 of those being new to the centre.²⁶ They did

3,133 pregnancy tests and had 1,445 live births reported, compared to 8,192 clients relying on CAPSS centres for material support.²⁷ Several years later, in 2005, CAPSS saw an increase in known live births: 52 centres reported a total of 2,387 births.²⁸

It is certainly encouraging to see unborn human life protected and respected—that is what the pro-life movement wants! In particular, these centres offer a great service to women and to the movement because they build relationships that will last over time.

But an important question for the movement to ask is this: how many of those babies were born to mothers who seriously considered abortion? This question is vital because it is abortion-minded women whose babies are most vulnerable to being killed. PCCs hope that, through their existence, women will choose life—not abortion—for their babies. But what kind of women, in large numbers, go to PCCs? Women who are seriously considering abortion and change their minds because of the PCC? Or women who are unlikely to abort but want help with the pregnancy they are inclined to keep? After all, *large* numbers of abortion-minded women are going to go to the centre they believe will give them what's on their mind: abortion. And that centre is not a PCC; that centre is an abortion clinic.

In fact, in 2002, Focus on the Family's newsletter *HeartLink* reported that "less than 10 percent of the clients darkening the doors of pregnancy care centers [across the United States] were abortion-minded." That is, fewer than 1 in 10 women making use of their pregnancy-support services were seriously considering abortion. By their own admission, these PCCs reach very few of their target audience: women contemplating abortion. In most cases, *these* women aren't even coming through the door. Rather, these women—1.3 million every year in the U.S.—enter the doors of abortion providers.

In its 2004 Starfish Report, CAPSS provided a detailed description of its statistics: the "total number of ... expectant clients who were initially abortion-minded or vulnerable to proceed with an abortion" was 1,074.²⁹ They report 157 known saved lives, 99 known lives lost to abortion, and 361 cases with the outcome unknown or not reported.³⁰ The statistics are qualified with this statement: "Please note that some of the centres who report abortion-minded clients are unable at this point, in their reporting capabilities, to track all outcomes. Thus the numbers for a [saved lives]; b [lost to abortion]; c [unknown outcome]; do not total to all abortion-minded women."³¹

Even with the best possible interpretation of these statistics, only 1,074 abortion-minded or abortion-vulnerable women went to 52 of their centres while over 100,000 abortion-minded Canadian women went to abortion facilities that same year. Even if the PCC's figure was tripled or quadrupled there would still be a drastic divide between that and the abortion figure.

Of course, this analysis does not include data from PCCs unaffiliated with CAPSS or other Birthright centres. If these and other numbers are made available, they will be incorporated into a future edition of this analysis.

Also, some may consider it unfair to compare statistics from abortion clinics with PCCs, because the former receive government funding and greater promotion (e.g., from physicians) than the latter. While this imbalance certainly exists, an abortion-minded woman does not make her choice because of these: if she really doesn't want an abortion, she won't get one. And if she really wants an abortion, she *will* get one. In other words, the problem of large numbers of abortion-minded women choosing abortion clinics over PCCs is not due simply to an imbalance in support between the former and the latter. Here's why:

Most abortion-minded women do not choose the help of PCCs because the PCCs will help women *through* the pregnancies but abortion clinics will help them *out* of the pregnancies. PCCs are willing to provide whatever a woman needs (e.g., housing, baby supplies, moral support). The abortion clinic offers her what she *wants*.

An abortion-minded woman wants out of the pregnancy and all that would come with it. In the climate of fear and panic that characterizes a crisis pregnancy, the woman is desperately looking for immediate relief. PCCs, however, cannot necessarily give that; they cannot offer a “quick fix” or guarantee an easy life. The pro-life movement is offering an alternative that *in many women’s minds* does not even compete with what the abortion clinic offers by way of short-term solutions.

Our society, particularly through the mass media, promotes the primacy of oneself and of making decisions with expediency. People are implicitly taught to strive for whatever is the fastest, easiest, and simplest (in the short term). They are taught this in a culture where the medical and political institutions endorse abortion as a legitimate choice.

With all that in mind, it is no wonder that abortion-minded women in crisis pregnancy, by and large, are choosing abortion. This way, they don’t have to deal with any of the crises surrounding their pregnancies. No one in their social circles need know that they have been pregnant, or even sexually active for that matter. In one moment—that positive pregnancy test—their worlds come crashing down. And in one “simple” procedure—before they appear pregnant, feel their child’s presence, and bond—their crumbling worlds are (supposedly) put back together.

CCBR has seen this first hand over the years: women who have been offered all the help they need to continue with their pregnancies have turned it down and had abortions instead.

Offering help, while *necessary*, is not *sufficient* in ending abortion.

The point is not to be unfairly critical of help centres—they do vital work. Instead, it is to show that the pastoral approach needs the prophetic approach to change peoples’ minds on abortion. As CBR’s American director, Gregg Cunningham, has pointed out, *“The simple fact of the matter is that women who are not more horrified by abortion than they are terrified of the burdens of the pregnancy will kill their babies almost every time.”*

So while we most certainly need to help women in crisis pregnancy (pastoral approach), we must convince those women (prophetic approach) that the help we offer is what they should choose and that the alternative, abortion, is a horrifying choice to which they shouldn’t give a moment’s consideration. In other words, when the prophetic approach turns women *off* of abortion, the pastoral approach will be able to more effectively turn them *on* to the right choice.

The Political Arm

Abortion became legal in Canada in 1969. In the 1970s, therapeutic-abortion committees were set up at hospitals to approve or reject requests for abortions. Pro-life organizations helped pro-life individuals get elected to hospital boards; while this helped prevent many abortions, these elections had no impact on the legality of abortion.

Furthermore, in 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the 1969 abortion law that required these therapeutic-abortion committees to approve abortions. This law effectively allowed for abortions on demand and has remained the status quo ever since. In other words, while pro-lifers were having no impact on public policy, abortion advocates were: by eliminating the aforementioned committees and achieving their goal of abortion on demand, abortion advocates dismantled the shaky political framework pro-lifers were using to save lives.

Pro-lifers have lost court cases, elections, and legislative initiatives dealing with abortion on all governmental levels. Even a 1991 referendum that pro-lifers won in Saskatchewan to defund abortion

was never made into law.³² Defunding initiatives in other provinces have yet to even reach that level of “success.”

Because criminal law is a matter of federal jurisdiction, the only way for the unborn to be protected is for Parliament to pass legislation recognizing the unborn as human beings deserving of the right to life that *born* human beings already enjoy. The most prominent effort to provide any protection thus far failed in 1990 when the Senate rejected Bill C-43. This bill would not have even outlawed abortion, and its compromising nature satisfied neither the pro-abortion nor the pro-life movements. Other efforts have not even made it this far.

Moreover, it is virtually impossible for political lobbyists to amend the law on abortion (or on any law for that matter) if they cannot convince politicians that voters want change. As we’ve seen through public opinion polls, there is no determined public interest for changing the status quo to protect the unborn from fertilization onwards. And because Members of Parliament rely on being re-elected to maintain their jobs, they tend to focus on issues they believe will get them votes and stay away from issues they believe will cost them votes.

The fact that there haven’t been significant improvements politically does not negate the pro-life movement’s responsibility to work for political changes. This is essential. But what it does reveal is that convincing politicians to change the law first requires convincing voters to change their minds.

The Prophetic Arm

Convincing voters to change their minds and convincing pregnant women not to abort boils down to one thing: convincing them that abortion is not a “Charter right,” nor is it a “woman’s right.” It means convincing them that abortion is a terrible act of violence that kills an unborn baby and therefore that it should not be tolerated.

The task of changing public opinion on abortion is the mandate of the prophetic arm of the pro-life movement. Whether the *political* arm succeeds in changing the law, whether the *pastoral* arm succeeds in ministering to abortion-minded women hinges on whether the prophetic arm educates society by proclaiming the *full* truth of abortion in a manner that persuades the public to oppose abortion.

CCBR’s role falls into this third approach and because of that this next section will more deeply evaluate the existing prophetic arm of the pro-life movement. The conclusion CCBR draws is that while some prophetic activities are worthwhile, some are not. A return to the building-on-fire analogy from the beginning of Part III will illustrate this.

Within the specific task of firefighting, there are different ways to put out a fire. Some methods (firehoses) are more effective than others (ice cream buckets). In the same way, while it is important to respond to abortion from a number of ways (pastoral, political, prophetic), within each approach, there are more effective and less effective activities. Prophetic activists, just like firefighters, must choose ethical methods that will save the most lives.

CCBR will use a series of questions to evaluate various educational initiatives of the prophetic arm. There are two extremes to be avoided in such an examination—the first is to criticize everything (or everything except what one is doing) and the other is to criticize nothing. Some pro-lifers, in an effort to avoid being critical, have embraced all activities in which participants are motivated to end abortion. That makes sense if one’s goal is to avoid “ruffling feathers.”

But that is not our goal. Rather, it is to end abortion; therefore, a movement that wishes to succeed will constantly evaluate its work and seek ways to improve. After all, time and money spent on less

effective activities takes away from more effective activities. The following questions, then, will help this evaluation of the prophetic arm:

- Who is our target audience and are we reaching them with our method?
- Are we providing clear reasons for our claims so that the unconvinced will be converted?
- If we are blending a number of moral issues in our campaign, is that helping or hindering our ability to win converts?
- Does the frequency of our work reinforce the gravity of our message or contradict it?
- Are our activities proactive or reactive?
- Is our work cost-effective?

Reaching our Target Audience

Many educational groups should be targeting the fence-sitters in the culture (and in the church) in order to instill in them a concern for the unborn. That audience is reached in a limited manner through some high school classroom presentations or church service talks. It is common, however, for educational groups to host pro-life speakers “after hours,” in the evening or afternoon. This means very few of the target audience will actually go out of their way to receive the message since they have no interest in the topic.

Conferences are another example of events which generally have a low turn-out. If targeting the unconvinced, very few will attend. If targeting the converted, so as to further educate them, more will show up. But even then, numbers are generally less than desirable.

Having said that, conferences and other such presentations can serve an important purpose: they bring some people together to be equipped and energized, as well as to network. Educational pro-life groups need not eliminate such activities, but they should become more reflective about them. Rather than doing an annual conference because that is what they’ve always done, they should evaluate whether such a conference is the best use of their resources (time, talent, and money) to help end abortion. Furthermore, if it is decided that conferences and other private presentations serve an important purpose, they should be a springboard to more visible activities that reach the general public.

Providing Clear Reasons

Once pro-lifers recognize the need to bring the pro-life message to the culture, they need to decide how to best get that message out and maximize the number of minds changed. In other words, is the pro-life message communicated in a way that provides good reasons?

With some approaches the answer certainly is yes. Abortion is wrong because it takes away the life of a human being. And with advancing technologies (such as 3-D ultrasound), people are able to show, visually, that a human being exists before birth. Furthermore, research developments have enabled groups to communicate the negative effects abortion has on women, such as the link between abortion and breast cancer, and advertise this to the public via billboards.

Some groups take their message to the culture even further via walks, hikes, marches, and protests with signs (such as Life Chain). While these activities bring together a large body of people, they generally do not show evidence, seen by the public, for why the group is gathered, for why the group opposes abortion.

Often participants have colourful balloons and perhaps a sign that reads, “Choose life.” Those do not convey evidence for the pro-life message, namely that the unborn are human and abortion kills those humans. So the general public will see people gathered but will either conclude they do not know *why*

the people are gathered, or, if they do, conclude that there are no compelling reasons for *agreeing* with the people who are gathered. Even Life Chain, which clearly states why pro-lifers oppose abortion (“Abortion kills children”), does not give *reasons* for how pro-lifers have come to that *conclusion*. Without compelling evidence, it is unlikely that large numbers of passersby will move from indifference (or even support for abortion) to sudden agreement with the pro-life message.

“But,” someone may respond, “in history social movements often did walks and marches to confront the culture about an injustice and those were effective.” There is a key difference between those social movements and the pro-life movement: in history, the people who were victimized *participated* in public protest. By their presence and attitude of peace and respect, they conveyed to the public that they were human like everyone else. Often they were victimized during their marches and images of this further injustice, communicated via the media, turned the public against the injustice. But with abortion, the *very people being victimized*—the unborn—cannot participate. Therefore, those who participate in their place (born pro-lifers) need to convey *whom* they’re standing for and *what* they’re standing against.

Educational pro-life groups should continue doing public demonstrations but simply *improve* them. They should train participants to defend the pro-life view, equip participants with compelling resources (e.g., evidence-based, visual signs) and then take the message to the public. Here is what this could look like: image-based signs that show 3-D ultrasound imagery of the unborn held alongside imagery of abortion, interspersed with appropriate text messages (e.g., “A person’s a person no matter how small” (Dr. Seuss) or “It is a poverty to decide a child must die so that you may live as you wish” (Mother Teresa) or “Do big people have a right to kill small people?”).

When taking the pro-life message to the public, it is essential that the message be persuasive. That, however, is not always the case as the following demonstrates. Several years ago a pro-life leader described an anti-abortion television commercial as follows:

The ad shows a split screen where two seeds are planted. On one side the seed is dug up, and thus destroyed; on the other side the seed grows into a flower, with pictures of babies and children and the simple words, ‘Choose life’ at the end.³³

She later says that this image ad “shows the truth about abortion.”³⁴

The ad maker and its promoters undoubtedly have good intentions. But the question is not “Do pro-lifers have good intentions?” The question is “Will the pro-life message convince people?” And in answering that question one wonders how preventing a seed from growing into a flower conveys “the truth about abortion.” The concept of creating an analogy is a good one. Using the familiar to prove a point is a tactic of effective teachers. The problem is in the analogy used.

Removing a seed from soil doesn’t even come close to conveying abortion’s destructiveness. And one can understand that by using an analogy. If we were trying to convey to an indifferent public that butchering Tutsis in Rwanda was wrong, would we show pictures of smiling Tutsis on one side of a screen while on the other a seed was removed from soil? Or what if we lived during the time of the Holocaust? If we wanted to show the truth about the Holocaust would we show people a seed removed from soil or a Jew killed by Nazis? To use one final analogy, Health Canada’s anti-smoking campaign does not show images of beautiful women with great teeth (although tobacco companies do this); instead the campaign shows horribly diseased and disfigured teeth, gums, and internal organs. Showing the truth about smoking is conveyed in the reality of what smoking does, not in the possibility of what *not* smoking will do.

Furthermore, rather than showing “the truth about abortion,” removing a seed from soil may actually reinforce the *lie* about abortion, namely that it is mere “removal.” If a seed is removed from the soil, it can always be replanted. But an unborn human being that is killed in the womb can never be replaced.

Comparing people to plants is not a helpful analogy for this situation—comparing people to other people is (e.g., showing a two-year-old who never becomes an adult because she was killed is more analogous to an unborn child who never becomes a 1-year-old because she was killed).³⁵

Blending Moral Issues in a Campaign

Although it is not necessary for one organization to take on a number of causes, it certainly is possible. One such example of a group that effectively combines issues is “Healing the Culture,” based out of Washington state. Because their message is about the dignity of human life, the meaning of suffering, and the definitions of happiness, they are able to show how a variety of actions, such as abortion and euthanasia, are guided by misunderstandings of happiness, confusion about suffering, and an improper definition of the value of human beings. In other words, they argue that if people change their understanding of those concepts, they won’t resort to things such as abortion and euthanasia.

Contrast that with Life Chain. As mentioned in a prior section, pro-life people stand in public holding signs that state, for example, “Abortion kills children,” or “Abortion hurts women.” According to National Life Chain’s 2006 press release, “the event is devoted to repentance, peaceful public witness, and ultimately to ending legalized abortion.”³⁶ Even with this specific purpose, their press release raises a host of other controversial issues:

Today our culture is sinking beneath abortion’s bond with aggressive homosexual demands, with unabated pornography and sexual addiction, with illegitimacy now producing one-third of U.S. births, with STDs at epidemic level, and with cohabitation and divorce’s assault on traditional marriage and family.³⁷

Life Chain raises other issues but does not enter into a discussion about them. Their purpose is to talk about abortion (which society disagrees with them on), but in doing so they mention other causes (which society also disagrees with them on). Abortion and, for example, cohabitation are wrong for different reasons. It is entirely possible for someone to support cohabitation yet not support abortion. That does not make cohabitation morally acceptable, it simply shows that it is not necessary to be opposed to one in order to be opposed to the other. Not only does Life Chain not stay focussed on the issue of its campaign (abortion) but it provides no reasons for the other claims it makes. Again, these comments are not meant to be unfairly critical of Life Chain. In fact, they were shared with a leader of National Life Chain, who sought out CCBR’s opinion, and who said they were “interesting and useful.” As mentioned, Life Chain’s concept of a public witness is excellent. And no doubt its organizers are well-meaning in the approach taken. CCBR is simply trying to offer insight for improvement just as people should feel free to do with CCBR.

The Frequency of Pro-Life Work

A lot of pro-life activities happen on an annual basis. When evaluating whether that is problematic or not, one needs to examine what that group does on the other 364 days of the year. In other words, are they doing other effective activities with the rest of their time? Or are they doing nothing?

Here’s why this is important: the culture at large will take the pro-life movement’s message as seriously as the pro-life movement itself does. In other words, if we claim that abortion kills colossal numbers of human beings, that it is one of the greatest evils (if not *the* greatest) in the world today, then we are faced with a daunting question: do our lives reflect that we believe our own claims?

If the most visible pro-life response to the supposed massive, *daily* slaughter of unborn children is a *yearly* protest, the culture would be quite justified to infer that pro-lifers are internally inconsistent with their own beliefs, that we do not believe what we claim to believe. Who in their right mind would respond to the killing of babies so weakly?

This is why it is essential for organizations to be constantly active in their public efforts to end abortion.

Being Proactive

There's a saying that the pro-life movement would do well to be guided by: "Act. Don't react!" When we react, we stop following our plan. When we react, we allow whatever (or whoever) we're responding to set the terms for debate. When we react, we get distracted from the bigger picture. On the other hand, when we are pro-active, we are focused. When we are pro-active, we are in control. When we are pro-active, we make our vision a reality.

Consider this perspective from motivational speaker Craig Harper:

I've learned that most people, most of the time are **reactive** not **proactive** (when it comes to the big-picture stuff).

That is, many of us are not particularly good at taking charge of our future, our health, our relationships, our career, our finances, our destiny... our life.

We tend to spend our life reacting to events, situations and circumstances, rather than creating and shaping them.

We get sick (and scared)... we make a decision to start an exercise program and to 'get healthy' (reactive).

Our partner leaves us (we get scared)... we decide to be a better partner and do **anything** to make it work (reactive).

We have a nervous breakdown (get scared) ... we decide to manage our stress and cut back on work (reactive).

We crash our car and nearly kill five people (and get scared) ... we decide to drive slower and be more responsible (reactive).

Yes, they are all good decisions... but they all should have been made **before** reality beat us over the head and punched us in the face.

A life based on reactive decisions, made out of fear and limited options, is never going to be our path to our best life... but that's what many of us do.

React.
Cope.
Struggle.

If we want **amazing** then we need to do, decide and create (be proactive).³⁸

Likewise, if the pro-life movement wants amazing progress, it too needs to be pro-active. However, much activity in the pro-life movement is reactive to pro-abortion activities. If abortion advocates hold a rally or conference, pro-lifers will protest it. If abortion advocates advance pro-abortion legislation, pro-lifers write letters of opposition. If the Governor General awards abortionist Henry Morgentaler with the Order of Canada, pro-lifers will mobilize, objecting to the award through letter-writing, phone calls, petitions, and protests.

Certainly there is merit to responding to such injustices. Pro-lifers should strategically take advantage of the public discussion of abortion. Moreover, sometimes it takes major events to shake the indifferent out of their apathy or to mobilize pro-lifers. But the injustice of baby-killing continues to happen, independent of what new activity abortion supporters come up with.

The pro-life movement must make exposing this continued killing its priority and we cannot succeed in exposing this evil if all we do is react to one-time events. Pro-life activity must be sustained over the long haul, and not just in fits and starts based on the direction of the pro-abortion movement. By having a clear plan, pro-life organizations are vision-driven instead of crisis-driven. By having a clear plan, pro-lifers can frame the debate and map out a winning strategy to make abortion unthinkable. By having a clear plan, pro-life organizations are able to properly evaluate how certain activities fit into that bigger picture

Furthermore, this plan should be formed so that abortion supporters are reacting to pro-lifers, rather than the other way around. Pro-lifers need to set the terms for the debate it knows it can win.

A clear plan must also involve targeting those who are persuadable. Too many times, when pro-lifers are reacting to abortion advocates' events, we end up engaging those whose minds are already difficult to change. They are closed-minded to the pro-life message and pro-lifers end up wasting time that could be used to reach others. Whereas a pro-active approach would reach who are moderately "pro-choice," people whose minds can be changed. By focusing on this group, we are able to move more people towards the pro-life position and recruit more people to help us make abortion unthinkable.

Is Our Work Cost-Effective?

There is no question that the fight to make abortion unthinkable will require significant sums of money simply because making abortion acceptable has involved a lot of money. The pro-life movement now has to overcome decades of pro-abortion propaganda. So the issue is not, *is the approach a costly one?* The issue is, *is the approach a cost-effective one?*

Pro-life organizations need to evaluate how to best use their often-limited resources. For example, newsletters are an important method of communication to one's pro-life supporters but many groups could be more cost-effective in this regard. Many of them routinely mail out *multi-page* newsletters at significant cost. These mainly consist of reprinted news items that can be found elsewhere—sometimes in the newsletters of *other* pro-life organizations and/or on the Internet for free. These newsletters generally do not highlight any major impact that pro-life organization is having on its community, but instead report on how bad the abortion situation is, whether locally, nationally, or even internationally. This, again, is why it is so important to be reflective about one's activities:

- What is the purpose of newsletters?
- If it is to encourage our donors about the effectiveness of the work they are supporting, do our newsletters accomplish that?
- If it is to educate our donors to better defend the pro-life cause, do our newsletters accomplish that?
- If it is to inform our donors about what's happening in the world regarding abortion, do our newsletters accomplish that?
- Are our newsletters unique? In other words, are people unable to receive elsewhere the information we are offering? If another group is communicating what we communicate, why is there overlap? Does there need to be?
- Do we have the right purpose for our newsletters? In other words, we may be achieving our goal, but should that be our goal? Does that goal make us more effective or less effective in ending abortion?

Another area of cost that requires review is the rental of office space. Like newsletters, this can be very important. To run an organization requires a place from which to work. But some pro-life organizations have no full-time staff and only a handful of volunteers who rarely frequent the office space. And yet, these groups incur great monthly expenses (or receive someone's significant donation of office space) for little to no use. Where this is the case, groups should start putting the space to good use.

Another area where groups can incur significant cost is with memorials. These involve erecting such things as tombstones on church properties and can cost thousands of dollars. These are commonly erected for at least one of two purposes. The first is to act as a memorial, simply designed to commemorate the victims of abortion. The second is *theoretically* educational, designed to symbolically teach or remind passers-by of the number of victims and of the ongoing injustice, and to encourage prayer.

It is important to emphasize that women and men grieving from past abortions can most certainly benefit from erecting memorials to their children. That is not what is at issue here. Instead, *costly* memorials erected by organizations is being examined.

A pro-life organization once told CCBP that its sculpture project may deplete all of its funds. But did it consider whether the activity it was prepared to go broke over is actually going to help the organization change what *really* burdens its heart, which is the killing of babies? Even if it were a wealthy organization, could it justify the expense?

After all, imagine if someone died because there wasn't enough money at a hospital to provide him life-saving treatment: would you want huge sums of money going to a statue to remember that person? Or would you prefer those same huge sums of money go to the hospital so that the life-saving machine unavailable to him could be purchased in order to save someone else?

Furthermore, memorials, by their nature, are properly erected *after* an injustice has passed, when there is widespread acknowledgement of it. A memorial doesn't help end an injustice, it helps remember it. Said another way, memorials aren't about changing the present, but recalling the past. Therefore, to direct funds towards costly memorials could be analogized to this: people are trapped on the upper floors of a burning building. Instead of responding with attempts to *save* those lives, the people on the ground begin erecting massive stone structures that cost a fortune. Now, granted, if some people have *already* died in the fire it makes sense that family and friends, even churches, would want to memorialize them. But as said above, that's not under scrutiny here. It *wouldn't* be appropriate to the situation to devote unreasonable amounts of resources to general memorials when those same resources could help people inside who may die.

There is another kind of memorial sometimes used by educational pro-life groups, and that is to display rows of crosses in a public field to remind passers-by of the many lives killed by abortion. The weakness here is that the display relies on the often false assumption that those who see the crosses already recognize the unborn as human beings and acknowledge abortion as a tragedy. Were that the case with the majority in society, abortion wouldn't be happening. So here we see time and money put into a campaign that lacks the evidence needed to convince the public. Should this kind of campaign be thrown out entirely? Not necessarily. If the *evidence* of abortion were shown *with* rows of crosses, a powerful message could be conveyed: a) how wrong abortion is and b) in the context of *just how often* that wrong action has occurred.

One final point: in discussing cost-effectiveness, one should be careful not to misinterpret CCBP's message. Saving babies costs money—a lot of it. CCBP is not opposed to raising and spending huge sums of money; after all, society got to the point of permitting abortion precisely because abortion advocates raised and spent large amounts of funds. All CCBP is trying to point out is that *how* those funds are used must be guided by efficiency.

Summary

The pro-life movement has no shortage of courageous, self-sacrificing, compassionate activists. These people who have come from all walks of life often recognize that *how* we say and do things is just as important as *what* we do. And here is where a fundamental principle must be kept in mind: the attitudes of pro-lifers speak volumes to society. Therefore, it is essential that pro-lifers remain hopeful, kind, and courteous to those they interact with.

Besides having proper character, reversing the widespread acceptance of killing also involves a serious, planned, strategic response. Pastoral, political, and prophetic work are all important. But the effectiveness of the former two relies heavily on the effectiveness of the latter. And while some existing prophetic/educational initiatives are worthwhile, a desire to actually *end* abortion demands that other initiatives be improved while others be replaced.

Pro-life organizations should be guided by a goal of being as effective and efficient as possible in order to save the most number of lives. Almost any pro-life activity will have *some* impact. *Some* people will change their minds. *Some* lives will be saved. But if people had to choose between saving a few or saving many, between being good or being great, between minimal impact or maximum impact, the answer should be clear.

Finally, the above analysis sets the stage for introducing CCBR's role in the pro-life movement. Only in understanding "the lay of the land" can one appreciate the necessary part CCBR plays.

Part IV: CCBR & Modelling Successful Social Reform Movements

CCBR's role is to work in the prophetic arm of the pro-life movement by aiding some existing educational approaches and replacing others. It is important to understand that CCBR does not work in the pastoral arm nor in the political arm and that its work, therefore, should be interpreted as an important complement to these other facets as well as to the other activities within the prophetic arm.

CCBR's goal is to make abortion unthinkable. "Unthinkable" means that people should have the same visceral reaction to abortion as they currently do to, say, child sexual abuse: they should be revolted and repulsed that anyone would do such a thing. While we will never be entirely rid of this injustice because there will always be a thin slice of the population that commits depraved actions, the vast majority of the culture can be convinced to revile abortion.

Understanding CCBR's goal is important because there are other subjects which people often claim should also be addressed. These include matters like euthanasia, sexual promiscuity, contraception, and a lack of religious beliefs. While there certainly are other issues that need to be addressed, it does not follow that the same organization needs—or should—address them. As Frederick the Great said, "He who defends everything defends nothing." CCBR is a specialist in its field, focussing solely on acts which kill unborn human beings. As other organizations who are specialists in their fields address issues, such as sexual promiscuity, broader cultural transformation will take place.

CCBR's work is grounded in lessons learned from successful social reform movements. It simply models the concepts from these organizations in its fight against abortion. Groups that have been historically effective in changing society's perspective and behaviour towards an injustice typically had three characteristics in common.³⁹

1. They unveiled an injustice using shocking images.
2. They confronted the culture.
3. They were willing to endure persecution.

Many movements have resorted to images, especially *graphic* images, to convey a message to the culture. Certainly that is not the *only* thing which occurred, but it was often central and is therefore the focus of this next section. Images have long been a useful and essential tool to teach things which words alone cannot convey. In particular, injustice that is not seen is rarely understood. One such movement that has successfully demonstrated a keen understanding of this principle is the Civil Rights Movement.

Civil Rights Movement

In 1955, Emmett Till, a 14-year-old African-American from Chicago, was visiting family in Money, Mississippi. While there, he went to a corner store and allegedly said, "Bye, Baby,"⁴⁰ and whistled at the white woman behind the counter.⁴¹ A few days later, relatives of that woman kidnapped Emmett from his uncle's home. They brutally beat him, shot him in the head, and disposed of his body in the Tallahatchie River. They were never convicted of their crime, but later confessed their guilt.⁴²

When Emmett's body was recovered, it was sent to a funeral home in Chicago. Upon seeing Emmett's mutilated body, his mother declared that she wanted an open casket at the funeral, saying, "Let the people see what I've seen."⁴³

Dr. Clenora Hudson-Weems, Ph.D., wrote a book about this incident entitled, Emmett Till: The Sacrificial Lamb of the Civil Rights Movement. In it, she argues that Till's beating and death was *the*

catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement. Hudson-Weems interviewed civil rights activists who testified that Till's murder motivated them to fight for the equality of African-Americans.⁴⁴

In the month following Till's murder, five out of six black radio preachers aired sermons about what had happened to the young boy. There was also nationwide television coverage of the trial of the suspected murderers.⁴⁵

What is interesting is that today most people credit Rosa Parks, the African-American woman who refused to surrender her bus seat to a white man, as being the catalyst for the Civil Rights Movement. Hudson-Weems' research shows otherwise and she provides a compelling quote from Emmett's second-cousin to provide insight into this situation:

Historians will talk about the good and the bad, but they don't want to deal with the ugly... The ugliness of racism is not a White man's telling a Black woman to give him her bus seat—bad as that is—but the confident home-invasion, kidnapping and murder of a fourteen-year old Black youth and the exoneration by jury of the youth's apparent killers.⁴⁶

In 2005, Rosa Parks died. At her funeral, Reverend Jesse Jackson said that he had asked Parks why she didn't give her bus seat to the white man in 1955 and quoted Parks as having said, "I thought about Emmett Till, and I couldn't go back."⁴⁷

Civil rights activists courageously exposed the injustice of racial segregation and made sure that Americans could see its brutality. Whether it was the shocking pictures of Till or the disturbing images of peaceful civil rights activists being attacked by racist bullies, they strived to effect change.

Opening the casket on injustice was a controversial step, but an important one for the Civil Rights Movement. They knew it required leaving the comfort of their churches and confronting the culture at whites-only lunch counters, on segregated buses, and in other public areas. When they did this, they were persecuted brutally:

Look back to the civil-rights-era images: Fire hoses. Lunging dogs. Citizens hammered for the audacity of attempting to vote, to ride a bus or sit at a lunch counter.

'People talked about justice for years and years, but suddenly you could see a graphic illustration of injustice,' says Jim McNay, who teaches visual journalism at Brooks Institute of Photography in Santa Barbara, Calif.

* * *

When 900 students marched for freedom in Birmingham, Ala., on May 3, 1963, police attacked with dogs and fire hoses. Dramatic photos... dominated the news. Demonstrations erupted in 186 cities. President John F. Kennedy called for the Civil Rights Act. The nation faced up to injustice 'because the pictures backed up the words,' one senator said.⁴⁸

These direct-action campaigns were bold and were even criticized by prominent people who opposed segregation. In defending these tactics, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote the following in his *Letter from Birmingham Jail*:

Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.⁴⁹

History, both pre and post the era of the Civil Rights Movement, shows that the exposition of images was a powerful tool to convict people:

British Abolitionist Movement

In an age before photography, social reformers in Great Britain knew that in order to end the slave trade they would have to expose the slave trade. They used first-hand testimonies from people who conveyed the deplorable conditions of the slave ships. They showed chains and other equipment used to abuse Africans. In 1788, they began using one of their most powerful tools: a drawing of the inside of the slave ship “Brookes.”

[The diagram] gave measurements in feet and inches while showing the slaves closely lined up in rows, lying flat, bodies touching one another or the ship's hull... The diagram began appearing in newspapers, magazines, books, and pamphlets; realizing what a powerful new weapon it had, the [abolitionist] committee also promptly printed up more than seven thousand copies as posters, which were hung on the walls of homes and pubs throughout the country.⁵⁰

Adam Hochschild, in his book “Bury the Chains,” provides an in-depth study of the history of the abolitionist movement and the key players of the cause. He ends his book with this insightful passage:

To the British abolitionists, the challenge of ending slavery in a world that considered it fully normal was as daunting as it seems today when we consider challenging the entrenched wrongs of our own age: the vast gap between rich and poor nations, the relentless spread of nuclear weapons, the multiple assaults on the earth, air, and water that must support future generations, the habit of war. None of these problems will be solved overnight, or perhaps even in the fifty years it took to end British slavery. But they will not be solved at all unless people see them as both outrageous and solvable, just as slavery was felt to be by the twelve men who gathered in James Phillips's printing shop in George Yard on May 22, 1787.

All of the twelve were deeply religious, and the twenty-seven-year-old Clarkson wore black clerical garb. But they also shared a newer kind of faith. They believed that because human beings had a capacity to care about the suffering of others, exposing the truth would move people to action. ‘We are clearly of opinion,’ Granville Sharp wrote to a friend later that year [1787], ‘that the nature of the slave-trade needs only to be known to be detested.’ Clarkson, writing of this ‘enormous evil,’ said that he ‘was sure that it was only necessary for the inhabitants of this favoured island to know it, to feel a just indignation against it.’ It was this faith that led him to buy handcuffs, shackles, and thumbscrews to display to the people he met on his travels. And that led him to mount his horse again and again to scour the country for witnesses who could tell Parliament what life was like on the slave ships and the plantations. The riveting parade of firsthand testimony he and his colleagues put together in the *Abstract of the Evidence* and countless other documents is one of the first great flowerings of a very modern belief: that the way to stir men and women to action is not by biblical argument, but through vivid, unforgettable description of acts of great injustice done to their fellow human beings. The abolitionists placed their hope not in sacred texts, but in human empathy.⁵¹

Child Labour

In 1908, an American photographer, Lewis Hine, was hired by the U.S. National Child Labour Committee to photograph images of children working long hours, often in dangerous conditions, being robbed of their childhood.⁵² When speaking to an audience, Hine once remarked, “Perhaps you are weary of child labor pictures. Well, so are the rest of us, but we propose to make you and the whole country so sick and tired of the whole business that when the time for action comes, child labor pictures will be records of the past.”⁵³

Canadian Seal Hunt

In 1969, a picture was taken in the Northumberland Strait. It depicted a seal hunter about to club a baby seal as the mother seal watched in the background. This picture was widely distributed and resulted in public outrage. Two significant behaviour changes resulted: many members of the public chose not to buy fur and seal-fur imports from Canada were banned by some countries.⁵⁴

Victims of War

A young boy, Ali Abbas, was living in a village near Baghdad in 2003. His home was hit by two U.S. missiles at the start of the Iraq war, killing many members of his family. Ali was severely wounded: his mangled arms were amputated, and he had third-degree burns over 35% of his body.⁵⁵

He was taken to a Baghdad hospital that had limited resources to help him and his uncle described Ali as “dying and rotting before my eyes.”⁵⁶ A Reuters photographer took a picture of the boy as he lay in excruciating pain and it was this image that compelled the people of Great Britain to respond with an outpouring of sympathy. With donations from the public and pressure from Prime Minister Tony Blair, Ali was flown to a hospital in Kuwait where he was given proper medical attention, including receiving painkillers for the first time in 18 days. Ali now lives in London as a member of Britain’s Limbless Association.⁵⁷

Drug Education

“Through a Blue Lens” is a graphic film made by police officers who work in the Downtown Eastside of Vancouver, British Columbia, an infamous area known for drug abuse. The film’s graphic message is communicated to high school students across the country and makes a huge impact.

Television program *60 Minutes Australia* did a documentary of the officers and their project. Here is a portion of the transcript:

Ray Martin: “...It’s a shock tactic that has made a real impact with the kids.”

Teenage Boy One: “It’s unbelievable the stuff that’s captured on film is actually what happens in Vancouver.”

Teenage Boy Two: “More than half of our school totally got turned off by [*sic*] drugs by the film.”

* * *

Police Officer One: “What do you think grabbed the kids the most?”

Teenage Boy Two: “Actually them doing [it] and seeing the side effects that they get from it.”

* * *

Ray Martin: “Deputy Chief Gary Greer is convinced that these police shock tactics are the way to go.”

Deputy Chief Gary Greer: “Oh, absolutely. It’s the way to go in terms of bringing the issue to the attention of people. They have raised the awareness here. They have raised the awareness of youth in our schools and they had a spin-off video that is now shown in the schools.”

Ray Martin: "Over the past two years, these campaigning cops have taken their videos to schools across Canada. They don't preach. They let the pictures tell the true story."⁵⁸

Along similar lines as "Through a Blue Lens", "Death by Jib" is another graphic drug-education video. It is designed to expose young people to the dangers of crystal meth. The film's target audience is grades 7 to 12, and as one grade 8 student said, "The music, the images, the message is unforgettable!"⁵⁹

The accompanying resource guide says the following:

The rationale for producing this video is to expose the audience to the negative or horrific consequences, including death, often associated with Crystal Meth use. The message is conveyed through stark images, stories and music. The prevention hope is that viewers will develop such a strong negative association with the use of Crystal Meth that they will turn away from the drug if they are ever offered it. If they have used the drug the hope is that they will seek help.⁶⁰

Car Accidents

In 1997, a community newspaper in British Columbia, *The Chilliwack Progress*, showed a front-page photograph of a fatal car-pedestrian accident. Some people complained; consequently, reporter Mark Falkenberg responded with an article, "Recording the truth is our chosen profession."

* * *

It's not our job to hide terrible things and pretend they didn't happen.

It's our job to show people things that happen in real life, whether they're upsetting or not.

It's not just a job; it's a responsibility.

Some of the most important images in history have been very disturbing: children burned by napalm, the bodies of Nazi death camp victims, babies horribly deformed by thalidomide.

Those famous pictures are unquestionably horrible. But no one with any common sense questions their importance.

As for Tuesday's fatal accident photograph, this newspaper, like thousands of others, has in the past showed people the bad truth about automobile accidents.

And it will continue to.

Drinking & Driving

The Texas Department of Transportation uses the story and image of a woman named Jacqueline Saburido to convey the dangers of drinking and driving. In 1999, a drunk driver collided with the vehicle she was in. A fire broke out when Jacqueline was pinned in the front seat of the car. She was inflicted with burns on over 60% of her body. She lost her hair, ears, nose, left eyelid, much of her vision, and her fingers had to be amputated.⁶¹ Her story is a disturbing one, but it conveys an important lesson: some people's "choices" have a devastating effect on other people's lives.

The Pro-Abortion Movement

It is worth noting that the pro-abortion movement also achieved social reform, in part, through the use of graphic depictions of what they were fighting against. One doesn't have to agree with their conclusion in order to agree that their methodology worked. Canadian abortionist Garson Romalis conveys the power of graphics in his 2008 National Post article, "Why I am an abortion doctor." He wrote, "Abortion was illegal when I trained, so I did not learn how to do abortions in my residency, although I had more than my share of experience looking after illegal abortion complications."⁶² Indeed, he did. He began his obstetrics and gynecology residency in 1962 and "will never forget the 17-year-old girl lying on a stretcher with 6 feet of small bowel protruding from her vagina."⁶³

The graphic image Romalis saw in-person was something abortion advocates knew would help sway public opinion, and policy, in their favour. In 1964, an American woman, Gerri Twerdy Santoro, was found dead as a result of a self-induced illegal abortion. She was only 28 years old and had two other children. Fearing her abusive estranged husband would kill her if he discovered she was pregnant by another man, she and her boyfriend aborted their unborn child. In the process, she herself died and was found lying face down in a pool of blood. The photograph of this horrific site first appeared in MS Magazine in April 1973.⁶⁴ It has since been used by the pro-abortion movement as a tool to make their case for why abortion should remain legal.

The tactic of conveying the devastation of illegal abortion was also used by Canadian abortion-rights. In April 1970, a group of Vancouver activists set out to Ottawa. Their numbers swelled (from over a dozen to hundreds) as the trip's participants drew close to their destination. When the Minister of Justice refused to attend a scheduled meeting with the activists, they protested at Prime Minister Trudeau's residence. They wanted to draw attention to the deaths of women who perished from illegal abortion so they displayed a coffin on Trudeau's lawn, piling objects in it that women used to perform illegal abortions, such as knitting needles, a Lysol container, and a vacuum cleaner hose.⁶⁵

Relating to CCBR

These are but a few examples of the use—and persuasive nature—of graphic images. There are, however, many others, from television advertisements promoting sponsorship of Third World children, to anti-smoking campaigns, to memorials of the Holocaust. This history of the effectiveness of images is what compels CCBR to follow suit in its abortion-awareness programs.

CCBR's own experience, as well as that of other pro-life organizations that use graphic visuals, shows that graphic images change minds and save lives. All of its projects prove this:

- Presentations where people are taught the pro-life view scientifically and philosophically have produced changed minds:

"Well, at first I was thinking if my girlfriend got pregnant we would abort it. After this presentation I was thinking, and I would just go with it and have the baby because [otherwise] you're killing an innocent child."

—16-year-old male, Vancouver, BC

- Presentations where Christians are implored to heed the Biblical call to love the unborn child, the "least of these" have also convicted people of the wrongness of abortion:

"I can't THANK YOU ENOUGH...for your support! I keep going back to that day when you were here, and how I even thought 'THAT THOUGHT'...and I can't fathom what I would have done if I had gone through with it. I look at him now... and he's PERFECT. I'm so HAPPY seeing his face, his hands, his feet. I can't understand God's plan for us, for this child. But I'm very grateful for this life."

–Christian woman who heard a CCBR presentation at her church, and watched an abortion video, and firmed her resolve not to abort

- The Genocide Awareness Project (GAP), which involves visually comparing aborted unborn human beings to killed *born* human beings from past atrocities, provokes debate and is instrumental in conversions:

“...after listening for an hour to various debates [it became clear] that the pro-choice front is riddled with fallacy. ...The fallacies that were so evident in their arguments are indicative of a very narrow and underdeveloped stance, which is therefore a symptom of an individual's selfish feelings being hastily and carelessly rationalized. This, I think, is a very good indicator that pro-life is morally, emotionally and rationally superior to the pro-choice stance...”

–A pro-choice student who turned pro-life at the University of Calgary after listening to discussions between GAP volunteers and students passing by the exhibit

- The Reproductive “Choice” Campaign (RCC) where “choice” is exposed by displaying aborted embryo and fetus photos on panels of large box-bodied trucks convinces women not to abort:

A post-abortive woman in Columbus, Ohio, was considering having a second abortion and saw CCBR's RCC truck while riding the bus. When she got off at her stop and began walking, she saw the truck again. The truck solidified in her mind that she could not go ahead with the abortion.

These testimonies are not isolated. Each month CCBR shares positive feedback from people exposed to its projects. The same is true from its international affiliates and associates in the United States, Europe, and Africa. These can be read online at www.unmaskingchoice.ca and www.abortionNO.org.

Persecution and Criticism

CCBR recognizes that there are some who see the images and react with anger and disapproval. Could this be a sign of ineffectiveness? It all depends on *why* people are angry. If they are angry because pro-lifers are mean, then that is grounds for pro-lifers to change their behaviour. But if they are angry because they don't like a particular truth message, then that is grounds for pro-lifers to persist. After all, the history of successful social reform movements reveals societies getting angry at peaceful but persistent activists who communicated what was right, albeit unpopular.

Parents will understand this concept. Children generally respond to discipline with resistance. Does this mean parents should not instill standards in their children? To answer that, parents must first ask *why* their children are upset when disciplined. And if the answer is that the discipline is more like abuse, that the children are being beaten black and blue, that is grounds to stop. But if the answer is that the children want everything “free and easy,” parents would be wise to stay strong or they'll soon have spoiled children for offspring.

It is important for those attempting to achieve social change to realize that the very nature of their goal involves resistance. It is human nature to avoid the uncomfortable, the painful. Therefore, if a group raises something most people wish to avoid, people will reject it at first. In fact, typically when human rights violations occur, *the only thing hated more than the injustice is the people who remind society of that injustice*. But if the message is true, then when exposed, many will eventually embrace it because the truth has a way of convicting people.

The history of social reform movements affirms this reject-then-accept behavior of the public. Martin Luther King, Jr., was assaulted, arrested, and eventually assassinated. Mahatma Gandhi was also assaulted, arrested, and assassinated. Other social reformers may not have been killed for their

causes, but nonetheless they faced persecution; William Wilberforce and Thomas Clarkson, who fought slavery in the British empire, are but two more examples.

These people and their causes show the irony of social change: *effective reformers are rarely popular and popular reformers are rarely effective*. How can this be? First, as mentioned above, truth has a way of convicting people. Second, the behavior of effective social reformers both intrigues and attracts. One can't help but be impressed by someone who peacefully proclaims his message in the face of criticism. One can't help but be impressed by someone who will face all kinds of ridicule and accept it because he believes so strongly in his cause. That forces people to ask questions, such as, "Am I as convicted in my own views that I would suffer for them?" or, "If he is willing to endure persecution for what he believes, what, exactly, *does* he believe? *Why* does he believe it? Is he a lunatic, or could he possibly be motivated by logic?" Whenever people are compelled to ask questions, they are intrigued to find answers—and when a just cause hangs in the balance, it is always a good thing for people to seek answers, thus opening up opportunities to find truth.

Society will take the pro-life movement's message as seriously as the pro-life movement does. This concept is so vital to pro-life activism because there is a tendency to become reactive in the face of criticism; there is a tendency to conclude, "If I'm not liked, if I'm not popular, then I have to change." And that's exactly what bullies and brutes want their opponents to say. They intimidate in order to scare people to communicate a less-offensive message. But truth *is* offensive in the face of lies—it should be. And it is vital that those proclaiming the truth do not let their guard down. It is vital that those proclaiming the truth influence society rather than let society influence them.

When the opposite happens, problems occur. One can see this with the "seeker-sensitive" model that is the fad amongst many Evangelical churches. Consider this perspective by Tom McMahon:

The 'seeker-friendly,' or 'seeker-sensitive,' movement currently taking a host of evangelical churches by storm is an approach to evangelizing through application of the latest marketing techniques. Typically, it begins with a survey of the lost (referred to by a leading church in this trend as the 'unchurched,' or 'unchurched Harry and Mary'). This survey questions the unchurched about the things their nearby place of worship might offer that would motivate them to attend. Results of the questionnaire indicate areas of potential changes in the church's operations and services that would be effective in order to attract the unchurched, keep them attending, and win them to Christ. Those who have developed this marketing approach guarantee the growth of the churches that conscientiously follow their proven methods.

Mega-churches across the country have added bowling alleys, NBA regulation basketball courts with bleachers, exercise gyms and spas, locker rooms, auditoriums for concerts and dramatic productions, and Starbucks and McDonald's franchises—all for the furtherance of the gospel. Or so it is claimed. Although it's true that such churches are packing them in, that's not the whole story in evaluating the success of this latest trend in 'doing church.'

The stated goal of seeker-friendly churches is reaching the lost. Though biblical and praiseworthy, the same cannot be said for the methods used in attempting to achieve that goal. Let's begin with marketing as a tactic for reaching the lost.

Fundamentally, marketing has to do with profiling consumers, ascertaining what their 'felt needs' are, and then fashioning one's product (or its image) to appeal to the targeted customer's desires. The hoped-for result is that the consumer buys or 'buys into' the product. George Barna, whom Christianity Today calls 'the church's guru of growth,' claims that such an approach is essential for the church in our market-driven society. Evangelical church-growth

leaders are adamant that the marketing approach can be applied—and they have employed it—without compromising the gospel. Really?

First of all, the gospel and, more significantly, the person of Jesus Christ do not fit into any marketing strategy. They are not ‘products’ to be ‘sold.’ They cannot be refashioned or image-adjusted to appeal to the felt needs of our consumer-happy culture. Any attempt to do so compromises to some degree the truth of who Christ is and what He has done for us. For example, if the lost are considered consumers and a basic marketing ‘commandment’ says that the customer must reign supreme, then whatever may be offensive to the lost must be discarded, revamped, or downplayed. Scripture tells us clearly that the message of the Cross is ‘foolishness to them that are perishing’ and that Christ himself is a ‘rock of offense’ (1 Cor 1:18; 1 Pt 2:8). Some seeker-friendly churches, therefore, seek to avoid this ‘negative aspect’ by making the temporal benefits of becoming a Christian their chief selling point. Although that appeals to our gratification-oriented generation, it is neither the gospel nor the goal of a believer’s life in Christ.⁶⁶

McMahon continues with his concerns, writing about how attracting “the lost on the basis of what might interest them will... [appeal to and accommodate] their flesh.”⁶⁷ He further points out that the majority of weekend attendees of seeker sensitive churches are not the unchurched. Instead, they are people from smaller churches who are attracted to the “worldly allurements [that their own, smaller churches do not have] that were meant to entice the unbelievers.”⁶⁸ Concerned that these people are not being properly fed, he concludes, “Certainly a church can grow numerically on that basis, but *not* spiritually.”⁶⁹

The same can be said when desire for popularity and fear of persecution rule pro-life activity. If one applies a marketing model to pro-life activism like is taken to some churches, there will inevitably be the avoidance of the difficult, uncomfortable (graphic) message that the “consumer” (abortion supporter) simply doesn’t want. With abortion, the “consumer” is guided by self-interest, ease, and expediency. The pro-life message cannot be packaged to feed that, but instead the very philosophy of the consumer must be challenged at its core. By confronting society with a message it will likely persecute the messengers for, is about keeping the bar high and challenging others to rise to the challenge, rather than lowering the bar to meet their felt needs (i.e., wants).

Having said that, don’t misunderstand: the point is not that people should do and say things for the *purpose* of being persecuted. The point is that people should communicate truth that will make others change and those people should be willing to accept the *effect* of persecution. If persecution does come (and it doesn’t always), it typically is a short-term reaction that will, in the long-term, be traded in for conviction.

It is worth considering the observation of Fr. Frank Pavone of Priests for Life:

Our success will depend more on whether we are respected than liked. Respect flows not from doing what the other finds pleasing, but from what is seen as consistent with principle, courageous, and immune from the temptation to change with the wind.⁷⁰

Besides questions about persecution, others raise the concern that it could be wrong to show graphic imagery because it is negative and that instead pro-lifers should emphasize the positive.

First, CCBP’s method is not the only one. There is a place to convey the beauty of human development.

Second, the source of the negativity is in the action of abortion—which indeed is a horrible thing! St. Augustine of Hippo once said, “Light, even though it passes through pollution, is not polluted.” Similarly,

shining light on the injustice of abortion is not wrong even though abortion itself is wrong. To use another analogy, you don't blame a mirror when *you* don't look nice.

Third, the degree to which people are bothered is the degree to which they will change. For example, only when a nagging pain gets worse will an individual go to the doctor. Likewise, society will only respond to the "pain" of abortion if it feels its nagging presence. (After all, the hidden nature of abortion got us to where we are today: widespread acceptance.)

Finally, knowing what's wrong can help us discover what's right. How many people have observed that dating Mr. (or Miss) Wrong helped them more easily identify Mr. (or Miss) Right! Or take the website webpagesthatsuck.com. Its premise is that you learn how to build a good website by identifying mistakes on bad websites. And so, in identifying the negative of abortion, people are motivated to respect the unborn—and that's a positive thing.

What about the post-abortive woman or man? CCBR greatly desires their healing. If one examines the nature of physical healing it inevitably requires pain prior to improvement. Wounds require stinging antiseptic. Cancer requires nauseous chemotherapy. Why would we expect the laws of nature to be any different with emotional healing than they are with physical healing? Coming to terms with what one did, and taking ownership of it, is painful but necessary for healing. Pictures can be the tool that moves people from denial into acknowledgement.

Summary

Successful social reform movements recognize they need to take their message to the courtroom of public opinion. And, like any good trial lawyer, they know they need to provide the most compelling evidence to back up their case. This is why CCBR uses imagery to do its part in helping the pro-life movement succeed, and that's why CCBR encourages others to do likewise.

Having said all of that, how can CCBR and other pro-life organizations work in cooperation with each other? Here is an example:

The GAP display is set up at a university campus. In the days and weeks preceding and following it, the local pregnancy care centre and post-abortion ministries advertise their services. During GAP-days, these same groups have a visible presence on campus by setting up an information table/exhibit either near the display or in another high-pedestrian traffic location. Post-abortion ministries like Silent No More Awareness can share the testimonies of women who regret their abortions.

Thanks to GAP, a new climate of debate is created and other pro-life groups can organize presentations and debates that draw a larger crowd. Groups that are equipped to defend the pro-life perspective on abortion, and those who are equipped to probe deeper, such as regarding the meaning of life, can make their messages more visible.

With this kind of coordination expanding from a campus into the general public, a greater impact will occur and political initiatives, such as campaigns to defund abortion, will be positively impacted.

Part V: Conclusion

Why did people respond to news of the 2004 southeast Asian tsunami yet they do not to abortion? The victims of the tsunami were *real* to society. This natural disaster was *devastating*. In contrast, the victims of abortion don't appear real to society. They are hidden in the womb. They are tiny, even microscopic, initially. They cannot think and interact as we do. They rely on someone else for survival to a greater extent than we do. Their presence is not felt by their mothers until the second trimester. Abortion is not viewed as devastating or destructive, but instead is perceived as a right and as a helpful medical procedure.

To convince society to respond, we must change its understanding of the facts about who the unborn child is and what abortion does to him. But society will not easily change its perceptions. Cultural transformation requires hard work on the part of those who know better. As Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., once observed, "Injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent, and determined action."⁷¹

People in society, even some who claim to be pro-life, are simply not as upset about the killing of the unborn as they should be, as they *need* to be, if they are going to put a stop to it. People need to be more worried about what *will* happen to the unborn instead of what *might* happen to them. Gregg Cunningham once put it best as follows:

The bottom line here, really, is each of you has to decide, at some level, whether you care more about your career than you care about these babies, whether you care more about your lifestyle than you care about these babies, whether you care more about the avoidance of persecution than you care about these babies, because that's really what this comes down to in the final analysis.

We need to animate people to activism, and the reason that's not happening in the church today is because there's no sense of outrage about what's going on concerning abortion and there will be no sense of outrage unless we create it.⁷²

Why CCBR's approach then? Because people will only respond to the plight of the unborn if they are convinced that indeed, there is an astronomical crisis going on. Images, especially those used on a large scale, create the sense of outrage needed for an adequate response to the killing of the most innocent and defenseless human beings. That sense of outrage then needs to be directed into moral (non-violent) and wise (strategic) activities.

CCBR's work is very much a catalyst for debate in society, debate that will cause people to reconsider how they feel, think, and act towards abortion. Granted, CCBR's work must not be viewed in isolation. Pastoral and political work are essential. And some (certainly not all) activities in the prophetic arm have their place as well. But the movement must become more discerning, more analytical, about its activity choices. Only then will it be able to determine the effectiveness of its activities and therefore whether they should be carried on, altered in some way, or discontinued.

Pro-life work is not for the faint of heart; it is not for the timid; it is not for the minimalist. It is for the individual who has courage—someone willing to acknowledge the existence of his or her fears and act anyway. It is for the individual who is prepared to do what most needs to be done. It is for the individual who can make wise decisions about what is effective, efficient, and strategic. It is for the individual who embraces sacrifice and persecution as part of the price which comes with establishing social reform. In fact, this is the true spirit of what it means to be pro-life: to recognize the inherent dignity of the other and to put the needs of the other before oneself. The more the movement lives out that attitude of love, the more it will catch on in society.

There is good news and this is it: the pro-life movement *can* win. We have the truth. We have the strategy. We have the people. We have the money. There is only one need: the will—the will to put forth all that we have.

Appendix I: A Debate about Educational Emphasis

The pro-life message has consisted of two main points: abortion kills children and abortion hurts women. While there is certainly a need to communicate both perspectives, there is a debate about which one should be emphasized. Some argue for a *primary* emphasis on the unborn while others argue for a *primary* emphasis on women.

CCBR wades into this debate below, but we encourage readers to also review Paul Swope's position (www.firstthings.com/article.php3?id_article=3502) on this matter and Frank Beckwith's response (homepage.mac.com/francis.beckwith/EM.pdf).

Is the Culture Really Convinced the Unborn Are Human?

Focussing on the unborn—specifically on whether they are human—is the key to the pro-life movement's success. That is the airtight case that cannot be refuted by abortion supporters, as the scientific evidence for life beginning at fertilization is clear. Because people's moral intuition already dictates that it is wrong to intentionally kill innocent human beings (e.g., Jews during the Holocaust), pro-lifers simply need to prove the unborn are human beings like the born.

To understand how fundamental this point is, think about all the circumstances often used to justify abortion: rape, poverty, "unwantedness", abuse, etc. And with each situation ask yourself: *would we ever kill born people for those reasons?*

For example, imagine a woman is raped a day after having sex with her husband. She gets pregnant and doesn't know who the father of the child is. After the baby is born a paternity test is conducted. If the baby's father is revealed to be the rapist, may the baby be killed then? Or, may we kill poor people in Africa to eliminate the existence of poverty? May we kill born children who are unwanted and abused?

In each situation the answer is always no. If we *won't* kill born human beings for those reasons and we *would* kill unborn human beings for those reasons, that means the unborn aren't considered human as are the born. So *that's* the issue: are they?

Some pro-lifers argue that the public already knows that the unborn are human beings. But their actions show otherwise. Large numbers of born children aren't being killed for the same reasons large numbers of unborn children are. People may *claim* they believe the unborn are human but they don't *really* believe it, as the questions in the aforementioned paragraph reveal.

To use another example, CCBR frequently compares abortion to the Holocaust, but abortion supporters routinely object to that comparison, stating, "They're not comparable!" When prompted as to why, they respond, "Because they're not the same thing! You can't compare mass destruction of human life with a woman's right to choose." They do not consider abortion to be "mass destruction of human life," so that's what pro-lifers need to prove.

Or consider adoption: many abortion supporters consider that to be the worst option, compared to abortion or parenting an unplanned child. How is it possible to truly believe that the unborn are human beings (and therefore that abortion kills those humans) while at the same time to consider killing them to be better than giving to another for care? That sort of insanity would be analogous to a Jewish mother who, during the Holocaust, would deem hiding her child with a stranger to be *worse* than the child's being sent to a concentration camp.

Clearly, our culture has yet to be convinced the unborn are valuable human beings as are the born.

Some abortion advocates, recognizing that they cannot refute the humanity of the unborn, attempt to justify abortion by advancing the claim that while the unborn are human they can be killed regardless. Typically, the abortion advocate frames this argument by saying that the unborn is using his mother's body against her will, thereby characterizing abortion as an act of self-defense. By doing so, the abortion advocate reveals he *still* does not place the same moral value on unborn life as he does on most born life. In other words, he is arguing that just as certain born people are guilty of injustices that demand a response of self-defense, so are the unborn guilty of this. The issue, then, is to show that the unborn have done nothing to warrant a death sentence. In other words, the issue still is still firmly rooted in the status of the unborn.

The Drawback of Relying Primarily on Subjective Experiences

When pro-lifers put too much emphasis on the risks women face from abortion, they lose ground. As an abortion advocate could point out, there are risks inherent to many medical procedures (or medication for that matter), so why not take the risk for the greater benefit one will likely achieve? In other words, someone could think, "Well, I *could* be negatively affected by an abortion, but how much *more* could I be negatively affected by having a child I don't want, when I'm not ready, when I'm unable to care for him, etc.?"

But more to the point, if pro-lifers claim that abortion is wrong because it hurts women, what happens if it doesn't hurt women? Or, what happens if the benefits appear to outweigh the hurt? Would this mean abortion becomes morally acceptable?

If pro-lifers allow themselves to be distracted by arguments focussing primarily on why abortion is not in a *woman's* self-interest, then we are implicitly reinforcing the pro-abortion position and not our own. We are legitimizing the pro-abortion principle that the woman's interests take precedence over the child's life.

Canadian society is steeped in a focus on the self to the detriment of the well-being of others. To paraphrase Gregg Cunningham, people today are reluctant in the extreme to subordinate their own interests to the needs of others. This is why the abortion-rights movement is so successful: it relies heavily upon self-interest as justification for abortion. This mentality, therefore, should be rejected, not reinforced.

Abortion is *not* wrong because it hurts women. Abortion is wrong because it intentionally kills an innocent human being. *That* is why it hurts women. Because abortion involves killing one's children, it hurts women psychologically. Because abortion involves killing one's children, it hurts women physically.

The pro-life message communicated to the culture must not confuse the *reason* abortion is wrong with the *effects* abortion has on women.

In CCBP's wide experience interacting with people across North America on the subject of abortion, time and again, conversation after conversation, presentation after presentation, there is a common theme: people justify abortion because of difficult life circumstances facing a woman in crisis pregnancy: "*Every woman's situation is different. Every woman's situation is unique,*" abortion advocates cry out. "Let her decide what's best for herself!"

Let's examine how two conversations with such an abortion advocate could proceed—the first with a pro-lifer who emphasizes the negative effects abortion has on women and the second with a pro-lifer who emphasizes the impact of abortion on the unborn:

Conversation #1: Emphasizing the effects abortion has on women

Abortion Advocate (AA): "I'm pro-choice. No woman should be forced to have an abortion. And some women shouldn't have abortions—it's not best for *them* in *their* situation. But for some women it is best and the choice must be theirs. If you don't like abortion, don't have one, but don't force your views on me."

Pro-Lifer (PL): "But don't you care about how abortion hurts women?"

AA: "Don't you care about how carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term and raising a child in bad circumstances hurts both women and their children?"

PL: "But if a woman feels unfit to raise her child she could give him up for adoption."

AA: "And risk her child being raised in an abusive home? Or risk the child returning to find her 18 years later when she's moved on and is married and doesn't want a part of her past haunting her?"

PL: "But what about the abortion haunting her? A woman can be haunted by memories of the abortion and can experience negative physical consequences, like breast cancer."

AA: "That's not true. I have studies that prove there is no connection between abortion and breast cancer."

PL: "Well, I have studies to prove there *is* a connection."

AA: "Why should I believe your studies?"

PL: "Why should I believe yours?"

AA: "Mine aren't biased."

PL: "Sure they are; they have a pro-abortion bias."

AA: "I'm not pro-abortion, I'm pro-choice."

PL: "What's the difference?"

AA: "No woman should be forced to have an abortion. And some women shouldn't have abortions—it's not best for *them* in *their* situation. But for some women it is best and the choice must be theirs. If you don't like abortion, don't have one."

PL: "But I know a woman who thought abortion would be a good thing and now she regrets it."

AA: "Well, I am a woman who thought abortion would be a good thing and I don't regret mine."

PL: "But would you agree some women regret it?"

AA: "Sure, and they probably shouldn't have another one. But they shouldn't let their bad experience ruin it for the rest of us."

PL: "But she wasn't told she could have a bad experience with abortion. Don't you think women should be told of the various risks?"

AA: “Yes, but any medical procedure has risks. You take the risks because of the benefits.”

PL: “What are the benefits?”

AA: “No more unwanted children, raising kids when you’re ready to be a parent, etc.”

PL: “You would risk emotional turmoil and physical problems for that?”

AA: “Hell, yeah. Just imagine the emotional turmoil to you and your kid to bring a kid into the world who you don’t want, won’t care for, don’t have the resources for, etc. Now *that’s* emotional turmoil.”

PL: “Well, would you at least agree that abortion isn’t a great thing and perhaps we should try to decrease its frequency?”

AA: “Sure, I’m all for reducing the abortion rate.”

PL: “Can’t we work together then, in providing alternatives to abortion?”

AA: “Yes, as long as you don’t take away a woman’s right to choose. No matter how much we reduce the need for abortion, even if one woman needs it then that’s her right.”

Analysis: When studies are debated, it is always a matter of “my studies versus yours.” Whether abortion increases the risk of breast cancer or doesn’t, whether a study is accurate or not, that has no bearing on whether abortion is morally right or morally wrong.

Furthermore, PL makes no headway in this discussion by focussing on her friend’s subjectively bad abortion experience. After all, AA retorts back about her own subjectively good abortion experience. It becomes one study against another, one testimony against another.

Even in the conclusion, when PL and AA agree to “work together,” AA is unwilling to concede that abortion is morally wrong; AA has been given no reasons why she should concede that. And any such work will ultimately support the pro-abortion perspective and not the pro-life perspective. In the final outcome, AA took a more principled stand than did PL.

Conversation # 2: Emphasizing the status of the unborn

Abortion Advocate (AA): “I’m pro-choice. No woman should be forced to have an abortion. And some women shouldn’t have abortions—it’s not best for *them* in *their* situation. But for some women it is best and the choice must be theirs. If you don’t like abortion, don’t have one, but don’t force your views on me.”

Pro-Lifer (PL): “Would you ever say, ‘If you don’t like rape, don’t rape a woman, but don’t force your views on another man’?”

AA: “Huh?! That makes no sense. Of course I wouldn’t say that.”

PL: “So, sometimes you think it’s okay to force your views on others, like in the case of rape.”

AA: “Sure, but what does that have to do with abortion?”

PL: “Well, you told me not to force my views on you. But you agree that sometimes we can, and should, force our views on others. So, why not with abortion?”

AA: "Because it's a woman's right to choose."

PL: "To choose *what*?"

AA: "To choose to do with her body what she wants."

PL: "Whose body is being removed from the woman in an abortion—hers or the unborn's?"

AA: "The fetus'. But it's not a human yet."

PL: "What is it?"

AA: "A potential person."

PL: "When does it become an actual person?"

AA: "We don't know."

PL: "Do you believe human beings should not be killed after birth?"

AA: "Yes."

PL: "Well, it sounds like you *do* know when it becomes a person—when you protect it. So, tell me, how is the unborn not a person before birth?"

AA: "It can't think."

PL: "How do you know it can't think? And even if you did know that conclusively, why would it matter? A newborn baby can't think as you and I are thinking right now. May we kill newborns?"

AA: "Of course not, but again that's not the same thing. Look, the point is, do you know what kind of turmoil a woman goes through when she doesn't want to be pregnant?"

PL: "Do you know what kind of turmoil the unborn goes through when his body is ripped limb by limb?"

AA: "Look, abortion isn't the ideal but it's necessary. I'm all for reducing the need for abortions."

PL: "Wait a minute, why reduce the need for abortions?"

AA: "Well <pause> I mean <long pause> no one *likes* abortion."

PL: "Why not? What's not to like? After all, if it's a woman's right, why shouldn't we celebrate it and do it as often as possible?"

AA: "Um, well, um, uh, you know, it's an invasive medical procedure, so if you don't need it, all the better."

PL: "If you think that procedure is invasive to women, and that *that* should be avoided, how much more invasive is it to the unborn? How much more should we avoid it for the sake of the unborn whose very life is at stake?"

Analysis: Each time PL brings the discussion to focussing on the status of the unborn, AA says that's not the same thing and focusses back on women. AA speaks about what she wants to speak about, what she knows she can win on: the subjective experiences of a woman facing an unplanned pregnancy. PL redirects the conversation to the single issue the abortion advocate isn't examining (the status of the unborn) but *should* be examining.

To understand just how flawed a strategy is that *centres* its arguments on women's experiences imagine that those same conversations were about slavery instead of abortion. Would we speak against slavery on the grounds that it isn't in a white person's best interest, or would we argue that the black person is a valuable human being and, as an equal to whites, deserves equal treatment?

What Abortion Advocates Are Saying

Abortion advocates speak about women and "choice" because they know they can win on that. Instead of exposing what the "choice" of abortion involves, instead of pointing out that women do not have a "right" to kill their offspring, some pro-lifers have let the other side dictate the direction of the debate. In doing so, they lose the upper hand.

To provide a case in point, the fall 2006 issue of *Ms.* magazine had a "pro-choice" cover story saying,

In its 1972 debut issue, *Ms. Magazine* ran a bold petition in which 53 well-known U.S. women declared that they had undergone abortions—despite state laws rendering the procedure illegal. These women were following the example of a 1971 manifesto signed by 343 prominent French women, who also had declared they had abortions.⁷³

With attempts such as those of pro-lifers in South Dakota to ban abortions, the story was encouraging women to, yet again, make a public declaration in support of their abortions. Their petition says, "I have had an abortion. I publicly join the millions of women in the United States who have had an abortion in demanding a repeal of laws that restrict women's reproductive freedom."⁷⁴ In January 2007, *Ms.* magazine issued a press release regarding the submission of its petition, with thousands of signatures, to United States' president George W. Bush among other politicians: "Women who have had abortions are speaking out once again to remind everyone of the need for legal abortion for real women, their families, and their lives," said Eleanor Smeal, publisher of *Ms.* magazine."⁷⁵ The press release went on to report,

Thousands of women have publicly declared that they have had abortions, and thousands more have stood with their "sisters" in support of full reproductive rights. The signatories come from all 50 states, from big cities and small, and cover a wide range of ages and walks of life. What unites them is gratitude for having been able to make the choice to have an abortion, and a desire to preserve that legal right for coming generations.⁷⁶

Lifesite News reported that,

The [*Ms.*] magazine's attempt to swell abortion support attempts to counter a growing movement among women who regret their abortions, witnessing to the devastating effect of their decision to end the life of their unborn child through the Silent No More Awareness Campaign, Christian Newswire reported yesterday.⁷⁷

The moment a pro-lifer's *main* argument is personal experience, an abortion advocate needs only "cancel that out" with her own personal experience. This is not to say that campaigns such as "Silent No More" are futile. On the contrary, they offer a very important contribution to the pro-life message. Women and men who have been intimately involved with abortions, and who regret them, bring unique

messages of mercy, hope, and empathy to the groups and individuals they share their stories with. So the issue here is not with the message that abortion hurts women; it is with the idea that the message “abortion hurts women” should *replace* or *supersede* the claim “abortion kills children.”

After all, abortion advocates are ready to admit that they have a better chance of winning this debate if pro-lifers don't talk about the unborn. At a National Abortion Federation meeting in 1996, spokesperson Kathryn Kohlbert cautioned delegates that if the debate over partial-birth abortion is on what happens to the unborn, their side will get “creamed.” She urged those attending to focus exclusively on the woman:

If the debate is whether or not the fetus feels pain, we lose. If the debate in the public arena is what's the effect of anesthesia [on the fetus], we'll lose. If the debate is on whether or not women ought to be entitled to late abortion, we will probably lose.

But if the debate is on the circumstances of individual women... and [how] the government shouldn't be making those decisions, then I think we can win these fights.⁷⁸

Having said that, the issue is not *should we ever appeal to a woman's interests or concerns?* As previously mentioned, there is a place to talk about the effects of abortion. The issue is *should we primarily appeal to a woman's interests or concerns?* Advertising pregnancy care centres and their willingness to help women, as well as the dangers of abortion to women, is a noble and important act. But a problem occurs when we do that at the expense of de-emphasizing who the unborn are and what abortion does to them. More fundamentally, a problem occurs when we believe society will become more pro-life if we drop the emphasis on the reason abortion is wrong and focus more on the effects of abortion on the born.

Appendix II: Taking Abortion Seriously

Full-Time Workers

Internationally known pro-life speakers Gregg Cunningham and Scott Klusendorf once noted, “There are more people working full time to kill babies than there are working full time to save them. That’s because killing babies is very profitable while saving them is very costly.”⁷⁹

Full-time abortion advocates are well-paid professionals in their fields: doctors, nurses, lawyers, politicians, etc. In stark contrast, it is not uncommon for pro-lifers to expect pro-life activism to be done as volunteer work. After all, volunteer efforts have constituted the bulk of the pro-life movement since its inception. Volunteer work, by its nature, involves contributing what *little* time people have *left, after* their other, more pressing, commitments are met.

A full-time employee of a company would quickly lose his job if he did not work 40 hours per week or if he decided not to show up when he didn’t feel like it, or if something else came up. Volunteers don’t generally get fired. Organizations that rely on volunteers have to rely on people giving very few hours and often not meeting commitments because of other responsibilities that arise. This is not to say volunteers are unimportant or necessarily irresponsible. It simply acknowledges that the nature of volunteer work means less of a commitment. Therefore, for the pro-life movement to succeed it needs a team of people giving full-time hours, with a full-time commitment level, to the cause of saving babies. We need to match the energy and determination of the people killing babies.

As Gregg Cunningham said at Trinity Baptist Church in Santa Barbara, California,

There’s a lot of very noble rhetoric that I hear in the church about how terrible this is and how the culture is going to hell in a hand-basket, but very, very few of us are willing to dedicate our lives to stopping the killing.

And, truth be known, and I don’t say this to disparage or demean your chosen professions and occupations—the world is awash in lawyers and doctors and accountants and teachers and plumbers and electricians and whatever else it is that you do. The world is awash in people who are willing to do those kinds of things.

But when I considered God’s will for my life, I didn’t wait to hear his audible voice in the night; I didn’t wait to see him appear in bodily form at the foot of my bed handing me some sort of a written charter. I asked myself two questions: ‘What are the problems that God cares most about?’ Question number one. Then question number two: ‘Almost nobody is doing almost anything to solve?’...And I believe that if we as Christians go to the problem, a big problem, that really grieves God’s heart and it’s a problem that almost nobody is doing almost anything to solve, we will never have to lose a moment’s sleep agonizing over the question of whether we’re in God’s will for our lives.

I think a calling is as simple as that. I think we often over-spiritualize it, and we wait for ‘moves of the spirit’ and we put fleeces out and we go through all of this stuff when I think it’s as simple as: blood is flowing all around us [and] almost nobody is doing almost anything to stop it. If we’re willing to intervene on behalf of these innocent unborn children, how in the world could God, at the end of our lives, look at us and say anything but, ‘Well done, thou good and faithful servant’?

We’re to be different. Our Lord said be different, and really we aren’t very different; we’re sort-of the same. We sort-of want to go to the same schools to which everybody else wants to go. We

take the same majors in which everybody else majors. We compete for the same jobs everybody else wants...

We have no hope of turning this thing around unless more of us are willing to live differently, because if we're not willing to live differently, we can't *give* differently. And if we keep giving at the current levels of philanthropy, by which I mean time and money, nothing is going to change. This whole thing is just a big exercise in hot air.

Sacrificial Financial Giving

Having said that, not every pro-lifer is in a position to do full-time work, but virtually all pro-lifers can sacrifice financially to support that work. How people spend their money is a reflection of their priorities. When people place their money in one direction, it implicitly means they consider that to be a better use of their resources than if they placed it in another direction. The question people are faced with is this: "Is it?"

Full-time staff and high-impact projects cannot succeed without serious financial backing. Abortion advocates have the support of millionaires and pro-lifers are often scraping the bottom of the barrel. Of course, it's not that one must be rich before contributing to the pro-life cause. Most people can give something. When we give until it hurts, we show the depth of our love and our concern.

Professionalism

If pro-life organizations want to be treated seriously by other groups, they need to act seriously and convey a professional attitude. This means that from letterhead, to websites, to newsletters and educational material, pro-life organizations should make their appearance neat, eye-catching, and intelligent. Their projects should be well thought through with specific goals and aims that fit into a wider vision. Their personnel should reflect a high standard of professionalism. They should be respectful in all interactions with others. Knowing when to speak and when to be silent, being committed to following through on promises, and maintaining composure in hostile situations are important qualities.

Appendix III: Persecution from Within

by Stephanie Gray with Brendan Huang

March 2007

“Stand on the line if you’ve lost a friend to gang violence. ... Stay on the line if you’ve lost more than one friend. ... Three. ... Four or more.”

Those were the instructions from a teacher being *taught*, from a woman getting a glimpse into the life of students considered “unteachables.” Her name is Erin Gruwell, and her true story is dramatized in the inspiring film Freedom Writers that I watched a few weeks ago.

As a first-year teacher at an inner city school in Long Beach, California, Gruwell inspired a group of students—many of whom were involved with gangs, drugs, and other criminal activity—to abandon racism, to respect their fellow human beings, and to embrace education; in short, to transform their lives for the better.

It is a remarkable film and while many aspects struck me, one in particular stood out as it relates to recent CCBR experiences: Gruwell was having a positive impact on her students’ lives, yet received resistance from some fellow educators who had never given the troubled students the attention they deserved.

Gruwell took the time to understand the plight of these students: where they were coming from, what they had experienced. She got to *know* them. The educators critical of Gruwell, on the contrary, did no such thing. They did not understand the students’ experiences and thus failed to address the students’ needs; beyond that, they even worked *against* Gruwell’s laudable—and effective—efforts.

CCBR also encounters opposition, in our case from some pro-life and religious leaders. Recently, individuals have not only been critical of our well-researched strategy, particularly our use of graphic visuals, but at least one has gone so far as to make and spread the erroneous claim that what we are doing is wrong.

As I reflect on the persecution we’re experiencing from those who *should be* supportive, I realize that none of this is new. It is a cross that must be borne by all who would fight the good fight against injustice. The most obvious example is that of Jesus Christ who was opposed by the religious leaders of His day, by scribes and Pharisees who should have recognized the truth of His teachings. Instead, the Pharisees plotted how they might kill Jesus when He cured a man’s withered hand on the Sabbath.⁸⁰ They even considered Him guilty of blasphemy,⁸¹ a charge reiterated by the high priest Caiaphas at the trial prior to Christ’s crucifixion.⁸²

Jesus made it clear that those who choose to follow Him will also face persecution: “‘A servant is not greater than his master.’ If they persecuted me, they will persecute you.”⁸³

And indeed they do. In April 1963, a group of clergymen, including Catholic and Methodist bishops, criticized Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s peaceful civil rights demonstrations as being not only “unwise and untimely” but even “extreme.” Although today Dr. King is credited as playing a significant role in transforming the culture for the better, these religious leaders of the time argued that the local black community should not support his demonstrations nor press their cause in the streets.

Not only did Dr. King eloquently defend his tactics in his “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” he also expressed his heartfelt disappointments:

I have almost reached the regrettable conclusion that the Negro’s great stumbling block in his stride toward freedom is not the White Citizen’s Counciler or the Ku Klux Klanner, but the white

moderate, who is more devoted to 'order' than to justice; who prefers a negative peace which is the absence of tension to a positive peace which is the presence of justice; who constantly says: 'I agree with you in the goal you seek, but I cannot agree with your methods of direct action'; ...Shallow understanding from people of good will is more frustrating than absolute misunderstanding from people of ill will. Lukewarm acceptance is much more bewildering than outright rejection.

...I must honestly reiterate that I have been disappointed with the church. I do not say this as one of those negative critics who can always find something wrong with the church. I say this as a minister of the gospel, who loves the church, who was nurtured in its bosom; who has been sustained by its spiritual blessings and who will remain true to it as long as the cord of life shall lengthen.

When I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery, Alabama, a few years ago, I felt we would be supported by the white church. I felt that the white ministers, priests and rabbis of the South would be among our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many others have been more cautious than courageous and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of stained-glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see the justice of our cause and, with deep moral concern, would serve as the channel through which our just grievances could reach the power structure. I had hoped that each of you would understand. But again I have been disappointed.

...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...

I have traveled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi, and all the other southern states. On sweltering summer days and crisp autumn mornings I have looked at the South's beautiful churches with their lofty spires pointing heavenward. I have beheld the impressive outlines of her massive religious-education buildings. Over and over I have found myself asking: 'What kind of people worship here? Who is their God?'...

...In deep disappointment I have wept over the laxity of the church. But be assured that my tears have been tears of love. There can be no deep disappointment where there is not deep love. Yes, I love the church...⁸⁴

We at CCBP share Dr. King's concerns about the indifference and even persecution from within. That is not to say a religious belief should be abandoned because of some of its leadership. Nor is it to say that if a strategy is being criticized that the critics are always wrong; there are certainly *inappropriate* methods and approaches just as there are appropriate ones. The point is this: when individuals endorse or oppose a strategy, people must carefully examine the *reasons* behind that position and then test its merits by examining the other side of the argument. This is the due diligence which CCBP takes in adopting the use of graphic images.

We know that what we are doing is effective (www.unmaskingchoice.ca/evidence.html); furthermore, we have well-reasoned responses to our detractors' claims (www.unmaskingchoice.ca/gap-faq.html). We find it bewildering, then, that our critics continue to object to CCBP's use of graphic visuals.

But, once more, Dr. King's response to the clergymen who opposed him provides insight we can apply to our present-day struggle:

Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, 'Wait.' But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick and even kill your black brothers and sisters; ...when you have to concoct an answer for a five-year-old son who is asking: 'Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?'; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; ...when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tiptoe stance, never quite knowing what to expect next...—then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.

...I suppose I should have realized that few members of the oppressor race can understand the deep groans and passionate yearnings of the oppressed race, and still fewer have the vision to see that injustice must be rooted out by strong, persistent and determined action.⁸⁵

As I grieved over the opposition we have faced from within, I realized that perhaps there is another reason for grieving: could it be that our detractors don't really understand abortion, don't really comprehend the oppression of the unborn? Just as it is possible for someone to hear but not listen, it is possible for someone to know yet not understand.

Perhaps it is easy for those who have never been aborted to say graphic abortion photos should not be shown. Perhaps it is easy when you are not the one being dismissed as a "blob of tissue" and disdainfully viewed as a "clump of cells"; it is easy when you are not subjected to dismemberment, disembowelment, and decapitation; it is easy when you aren't the one to endure poisoning by saline that will burn your skin; it is easy when potassium chloride isn't injected into your heart to induce cardiac arrest.

But when you imagine that baby being attacked but unable to escape; when you comprehend a baby being in a safe place only to have it invaded by a stranger who will kill her; when that baby cannot defend herself; when you catch a glimpse of her body parts being ripped off piece by piece; when you realize that what you know about this baby's plight, most people do not—then you will understand why we use pictures.

This is the story of the aborted unborn. This is the story that must be told. Their cries cannot be heard—their screams are silent. But their victimization *can* be seen. It is the images of their terrible suffering that give voice to their cries and pierce the heart of anyone with a functioning conscience.

The story of the unborn, while unique in many respects, is a story that bears far deeper similarities to that of any group that has suffered brutality and mistreatment:

[t]he real story is the universal one of men who destroy the souls and bodies of other men... It is the story of the persecuted, the defrauded, the feared and detested.⁸⁶

These words were penned in 1960 by John Howard Griffin not regarding abortion but describing the evil of segregation in the United States. But, for those with eyes to see, his words readily apply to the story of the unborn.

Recognizing that it is now the unborn who are the persecuted and defrauded, we at CCBR carefully study historical injustices and learn from the brave men and women who responded to them.

The aforementioned writer, Griffin, authored a compelling book, Black Like Me, which recounts first-hand how he underwent treatments in 1959 to darken his white skin and experience “what it is like to be a Negro in a land where we keep the Negro down.”⁸⁷ Through his subsequent experience, he gained critical insight into the universality of persecution and oppression: “The Negro. The South. These are details. ... I could have been a Jew in Germany, a Mexican in a number of states, or a member of any ‘inferior’ group. Only the details would have differed. The story would be the same.”

We are moved by The White Rose, a book about university students who were killed for resisting the Nazis and for encouraging others to do the same. One of the students perceptively asked the following:

...Isn't it preposterous that we sit in our rooms and study how to heal mankind when on the outside the state every day sends countless young people to their death? What in the world are we waiting for? Until one day the war is over and all nations point to us and say that we accepted this government without resisting?⁸⁸

The book also reports about the cover-up of injustice by German newspapers:

They made no mention of the fact that day after day not one but dozens of executions took place. God knows the newsreel cameras never got inside the prisons which were crowded to bursting, though the inmates resembled ghosts and skeletons rather than human bodies. They did not film the pale, drawn faces behind the bars...⁸⁹

One of the students, Christl, had conviction and insight that all people of good will should heed:

Then it is our duty by our behavior and by our dedication to demonstrate that man's freedom still exists. Sooner or later the cause of humanity must be upheld, and then one day it will again prevail. We must gamble our 'No' against this power which has arrogantly placed itself above the essential human values and which is determined to root out all protest. We must do it for the sake of life itself—no one can absolve us of this responsibility.⁹⁰

We are inspired by the film Hotel Rwanda, which tells the story of one man who risked his life many times to save over a thousand refugees from the Rwandan genocide. We are emboldened by the efforts of Oskar Schindler, who saved more than twelve hundred Jews from the Holocaust, and by the example of Mahatma Gandhi, leader of the Indian Independence movement who confronted British colonialists regarding their mistreatment of Indians. We draw strength from the determination of those who fought to free the slaves of the British Empire and from the courageousness of Lewis Hine, who photographically exposed the plight of child labourers in the beginning of the twentieth century.

Our studies have taught us unmistakably clear lessons: victims *always* want their sufferings to be known. And the people who respond to their plight do so because they have become intimately aware of the injustice. They know about good and they know about evil. Their knowledge of evil convicts them; their knowledge of good motivates them. Having seen both life *and* death,⁹¹ they fight for the lives of the oppressed. It is through the exposure of injustice that they and others are convicted to respond. Dr. King expressed this very point as well:

...we who engage in nonviolent direct action are not the creators of tension. We merely bring to the surface the hidden tension that is already alive. We bring it out in the open, where it can be seen and dealt with. Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed,

with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.⁹²

Today there is no debate about the use of graphic imagery to convey *injustices from the past*; it is a “no-brainer.” People pore through history textbooks that contain graphic images; they flock to museums that show images of yesterday’s injustices; they line up to watch movies that convey the mistreatment of peoples by previous generations.

Why, then, is there a debate today about the use of *abortion* imagery? For the simple reason that such imagery shows a *present* atrocity not a *past* one. The guilt of historical crimes lies with our ancestors, not us. The guilt of present-day crimes lies with no one *but* ourselves. It is easy to say, “Shame on them.” It is difficult to admit, “Shame on us.”

It has been eleven years since I was in grade 10, yet I remember a poignant story one of my teachers told: when he himself was in high school, an outcast student was grabbed by a group of bullies. They stripped him naked, put him in a net, and hoisted him up the school’s flag pole. Another student, outraged at the injustice, stood up in defense of the frightened, victimized teen, only to have the same degradation inflicted upon him. A crowd of other students watched this evil play out; my teacher was one of them.

As he told us this story, he asked, “Looking back, if I could have taken the place of anyone there, who do you think I wish I would have been?” He answered himself, “The student who was mistreated for standing in defense of the victimized boy.”

Whenever an injustice occurs, we have one of four roles to play: the victim, the persecutor, the bystander, or the defender. We may not have a choice about the first role, but we certainly do about the latter three. We can be guaranteed that if we follow our consciences and become defenders of the weak and vulnerable, we too will face mistreatment, not only from persecutors but even from bystanders who are being put to shame. Enduring this we must contemplate, “Am I now seeking the favour of men, or of God?”⁹³

Appendix IV: Letter to a Post-Abortive Woman

In January 2007, CCBR received an e-mail from a post-abortive woman who strongly disagreed with CCBR's use of graphic visuals and who CC-ed her message to several pro-life and religious leaders.

Because the concerns the writer brings up may be raised by others, CCBR's response is provided below as a teaching tool. The writer is addressed by the pseudonym "Kate" and personal references have been removed to maintain confidentiality.

Dear Kate,

I write you as a sister in Christ. Thank you for sharing your experience of redemption. I found it particularly beautiful that your daughter was the impetus for your conversion to the Catholic faith. God is indeed abounding in wisdom and mercy.

Before I address your concerns, I'd like to provide some background:

Post-abortion grief is something I encounter everywhere. In my ministry of working full-time for the pro-life cause, I frequently travel across North America speaking to people of all ages and backgrounds. I have met many, many post-abortive women on university campuses, public streets, and churches, to name a few. I have worked with post-abortive women. I have been billeted in the homes of post-abortive women. I have spoken with them, listened to them, hugged them, and both offered and received messages of hope.

Some post-abortive women have approached me after hearing my presentations to share their stories. In fact, just last week I was in Alaska and a woman approached me after a presentation in which I showed graphic visuals. She shared the stories of her abortions, of how she has had post-abortion healing, and how she wants to help and get involved. Others have confided their experience over private discussions. Some have greeted me with anger and hostility. Others have welcomed my message and shared their regret. Each woman's experience is unique yet they all have one thing in common: pain.

I have observed that some are in pain because their abortion is a sin they have not yet repented of; they are in denial. Others are in pain because they are experiencing conviction of sin. Still others are in pain because, while forgiven, they are not yet healed. Women who are graced with both forgiveness *and* healing no longer experience such a sharp pain although the memory will always remain.

As for crisis pregnancies, I certainly acknowledge that the burdens and complications can be many. As a young child I frequented pregnancy care centres (PCCs) because my mom was a volunteer counsellor. Furthermore, I worked in a PCC and saw first-hand women's difficulties. Finally, I am routinely consulted about women in crisis pregnancy—requests for both prayers for conversion and for advice when interacting with such women.

I want you to know, therefore, that my comments below come from a deep awareness of and love for "the walking wounded." And while I don't pretend to know *exactly* what it's like, I do share in their grief as a sister and as a fellow sinner. Furthermore, I don't *need* to know exactly what it's like, in the same way a drug counsellor does not *need* to have been addicted to drugs to form positions on drug use and to help drug addicts.

It is my love for both the unborn and for the born that compels me to expose the injustice of abortion visually. "What kind of love compels someone to show graphic pictures that make people feel bad?" some may ask. Genuine love, for you cannot have love without truth.

If you were about to drink a glass of water with poison in it, to love you would be to inform you of that. It doesn't matter how parched you are; I need to tell you. With that knowledge you'll act differently. Alternatively, if you have *already* drunk a glass of water that I know has poison in it, again—to love you would be to tell you. For with that knowledge you would know to go to poison control.

There are many, many women who choose abortion because they are not more horrified of the abortion than they are terrified of the burdens of the crisis pregnancy. No matter how much help is offered, they believe abortion is the lesser of two “evils.” We cannot convey that abortion is the greatest evil by covering up the best evidence we have to prove that.

We cannot convey the evil of abortion by showing “pretty” pictures of unborn babies just as we cannot convey the evil of the Holocaust by showing “happy” pictures of Jewish boys at their Bar Mitzvahs. Can we convey the beauty of the life lost through such injustices? Certainly, and there is a place for that. But such images do not capture the other half of the message—the nature of the injustice itself, the very problem people's consciences need to be pricked about in order to be inspired to solve.

Contrary to your reference to images of victims car accidents not being appropriate, I encourage you to read the story of Jacqueline Saburido (<http://texasdwi.org/jacqui.html>). She survived a brutal car accident that was inflicted upon her by a drunk driver. She is now the “poster child” for an anti-drinking-and-driving campaign in Texas. The image of her beautiful face pre-accident is contrasted with her burned, distorted, and deformed face post-accident. Jacqui's story resonates with young people precisely because they see what one person's “choice” did to another person's *life*.

Does the young man who ruined Jacqueline's life regret his decision? Does he feel badly each time he sees her poster or another campaign against drunk driving? Quite possibly. But bad feelings do not excuse, nor should they cover up, bad behaviour. In fact, bad feelings *follow* from bad behaviour for those with functioning consciences—and that's a healthy response.

In order for the young man to be healed of his sin, he needs to be forgiven. In order for him to be forgiven, he needs to repent. In order for him to repent he needs to be convicted that there is a need to repent. Conviction follows recognition of wrongdoing.

You think conviction will follow from pictures of children “missing” from a playground or “missing” from a family photograph. Perhaps in some cases. But the bulk of the history and the present of the pro-life movement involves vague, innocuous approaches like that and abortion is still going strong.

People need to feel bad in order to change and currently they don't feel bad enough—and that's why the pro-life movement is losing. The interesting thing is that people feel bad about abortion to a degree, so that they don't want to see it; and yet, they don't feel bad enough about it to *not* commit it, to *not* permit it, to, in large numbers, seek forgiveness and healing regarding it.

The history of social reform movements (a point I discuss in my presentations) shows the important role that *graphic* pictures play in making people respond differently to injustice, including making them feel bad. Don't get me wrong—I'm not arguing for *replacing* rational arguments with a sole appeal to feelings (after all, abortion advocates base their arguments on feelings). I'm arguing that the imagery is the evidence that supports verbal argumentation for the moral wrongness of abortion. It just so happens that the imagery also has an effect on feelings which helps people come to the correct conclusion about abortion, namely, that it is morally wrong.

Furthermore, the experience of our organization shows the important role of graphic imagery. Every time we speak to high school students the audience members fill out surveys, explaining their position on abortion before and after the presentation. Time and again, people change their minds on abortion

and often credit the role images played in that conversion. Here is a powerful example from a teenager who attended a CCBR presentation to a Catholic youth group:

Actually, I thought that I might be pregnant and I was going to get an abortion. After the video, it showed me what I would have done to my child.

More testimonies can be read here: www.unmaskingchoice.ca/evidence.html

Our American affiliate receives over 50,000 unique hits to its website, www.abortioNNO.org, each month (a site which shows abortions). They receive a constant stream of e-mails from women all over the world who say they decided *not* to abort their babies because they saw graphic imagery. Here is a testimony from a 17-year-old in West Virginia:

Well, things have been very depressing lately and my mind and body seemed like they were telling me to get an abortion, but after seeing this my heart lead my mind and body in the right direction!!! I AM TWO MONTHS PREGNANT AND I AM KEEPING MY BABY!

An 18-year-old in New York wrote this:

I was 16 when I found out I was pregnant and I considered having an abortion [until] I saw pictures of how wrong it is. Now I have a beautiful baby girl and I wonder how people can murder an innocent child.

Read more testimonies here: www.abortioNNO.org/AbortioNNO/web_response.html

Conversely, we have also received heartbreaking e-mails from women who *wish* they had known several years ago what they encountered now (graphic images). Had they seen the brutality of abortion, they would not have killed their babies. A 51-year-old woman wrote the following:

Unfortunately these pictures are 30 years too late for me, and I'll never know what it's like to have a child. I wish you were present with these pictures in 1976.

Read more testimonies like that here: www.abortioNNO.org/AbortioNNO/hurt.html

So the question we are left with is this: "If we don't like abortion and we don't want people to experience abortion, why not use an approach that we *know* will convince people not to abort?"

If we avoid saving lives in order to save feelings, that calls into question our very determination to save lives.

Beyond that, I would argue that avoiding graphic imagery to "save feelings" doesn't save feelings at all. It often leaves women in a state of denial, where they aren't given strong enough motivation to seek the healing that's available for them. And beyond *that*, many women who abort have subsequent abortions. So we spare women the pain from multiple abortions when they "hurt" from realizing what the first (and after conviction, only) abortion did.

One post-abortive woman told me that when she had her abortion she *immediately* felt bad. "But," she said, "The world told me I had no reason to feel bad. So I felt *worse*." She explained that she had an inner struggle going on: "I feel bad, but I shouldn't feel bad. I feel bad, but I shouldn't feel bad." She said that it wasn't until she acknowledged those bad feelings as legitimate that she was able to move through the healing process.

Graphic pictures help many women move out of denial. Will that process hurt? Absolutely. But not because of the images; instead, it hurts because of the recognition of the injustice of abortion. Denial of sin is short-term gain at the cost of long-term pain. Acknowledgement of sin is short-term pain endured for long-term gain:

When I declared not my sin, my body wasted away through my groaning all day long. For day and night thy hand was heavy upon me; my strength was dried up as by the heat of summer. [Then] I acknowledged my sin to thee, and I did not hide my iniquity; I said, 'I will confess my transgressions to the Lord'; then thou didst forgive the guilt of my sin.⁹⁴

It is not a sin to show pictures of injustice. Quite the contrary, we are *commanded* to expose injustice by St. Paul who said, "Take no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, but instead expose them."⁹⁵ Graphic images save lives. Graphic images move people to repent of their sin.

Exposing wrongdoing to move people to repentance is biblical. In fact, in Paul's Letter to the Corinthians he wrote this:

For even if I made you sorry with my letter, I do not regret it (though I did regret it), for I see that that letter grieved you, though only for a while. As it is, I rejoice, not because you were grieved, but because you were grieved into repenting; for you felt a godly grief, so that you suffered no loss through us. For godly grief produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret....⁹⁶

Post-abortive women, like everyone in society, need to understand the full measure of abortion's evilness, so that they can accept the full measure of their guilt, and thereby receive the full measure of God's forgiveness and mercy that He greatly desires to pour out.

Showing images of aborted babies shows no disrespect in the same way that showing images of starving children in Africa shows no disrespect, or showing Jesus Christ on the crucifix shows no disrespect, or showing images of the brutalization of Blacks from the civil rights movement shows no disrespect. What *is* disrespectful are the acts themselves: killing the unborn, starving the born, crucifying an innocent man, or beating up peaceful people simply because they're black.

Disrespect for human life continues when it is kept secret. As my colleague Gregg Cunningham has pointed out, "Injustice that is invisible inevitably becomes tolerable." But as people of good will, we are called to be a light in the darkness. Light exposes things for all to see.

Would I want to be remembered as a dismembered aborted fetus, you ask? If I was killed at a time where my peers were also being killed, I certainly would want the evidence of the crime, through my dismembered body, shown. My concern would not be, "I don't want dismembered pictures." My concern would be, "I don't want dismemberment."

Anyone who is a victim of injustice desires that the evidence of the crime be made public, if not for themselves (it may be too late) but for other people and generations. I regularly spend time studying history and social movements and it is very evident that those who inflict injustice are desperate to cover it up; conversely, people who face injustice are desperate to expose it. Even forgiven and healed post-abortive women recognize the need to expose—not cover up—injustice by sharing their testimonies, the facts of their stories, so that others will not do the same (e.g., the movement of post-abortive women called "Silent No More" does this).

In the same way, the born must share the testimonies of the aborted unborn (since they themselves cannot). Graphic pictures are a powerful tool for this.

The pro-abortion movement has succeeded by trumpeting feelings over lives. In other words, the feelings, concerns, and burdens that may come with the crisis pregnancy are given more importance than the unborn child's life. And so, unborn babies are killed as a result. The last thing the pro-life movement needs to do is to follow the same pattern of putting feelings over lives, of hiding the horror of abortion because exposing it makes us feel bad. All the while, babies get killed precisely because the horror of abortion is not known. In understanding God's grace and finding true healing, we should realize that the pain of one's own loss should not prevent others from being saved.

In 1955, a 14-year-old black boy, Emmett Till, was brutally beaten and killed by white racists in Mississippi. When his mutilated body was recovered, his mother held an open casket funeral saying, "Let the people see what I've seen."⁹⁷ Through this story and image, Emmett is credited as being *the* catalyst for the civil rights movement (see research by Dr. Clenora Hudson-Weems who wrote the book, Emmett Till: The Sacrificial Lamb of the Civil Rights Movement). Was Emmett's mother, Mamie, heartbroken? Most certainly. But not because of the image of his dead body. But instead because he was dead, because he was killed. She didn't want any more children to suffer the same fate as her own child.

With regards to the civil rights movement, Dr. Alveda King is a post-abortive woman who is the niece of civil rights leader Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. She is a pastoral associate with Priests for Life in New York. In her essay "Visual Learning and the Culture of Life" she writes the following:

For many years, I have been an outspoken advocate for the unborn child, because in a culture of abortion, the child is like a slave. The new civil rights movement of our time is the pro-life movement, and as I seek to preserve the dream of my uncle, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and of my father, Rev. A.D. King (Martin's brother), I ask the question, 'How can the dream survive if we murder the children?' I grew up seeing these two great men fight for the equal rights of their people.

But equality is not something you can see. What you can see are people. My uncle knew that the ugly reality of segregation had to be seen visually by the American public. He therefore organized events at which the eyes of the media could broadcast the way our people were treated when water hoses and dogs were unleashed on their peaceful marches. People responded to those images, not simply to abstract concepts of 'segregation' and 'equality.'

Likewise, people—and especially African Americans—respond to the disturbing images of aborted children. Sure, some people get angry when we show them. But everyone who fights injustice has to be ready to pay a price. My uncle did, and so did my Dad. So does everyone who has the courage to show the ugly reality of abortion. Don't be afraid to do so. Many people are grateful. As a woman who has had two abortions, I am grateful that the truth is being shown, so that others can avoid this pain in the first place.⁹⁸

I sincerely pray my message is received well by you, Kate. I mean only good will. I pray that you will be able to offer up your suffering of being reminded of your abortions in the interest of saving babies. While it is too late for [your two children], it is not too late for others.

I certainly recognize that there are many things to be done to rid the Culture of Death and to build a Culture of Life. I applaud the essential work of post-abortion ministries. In fact, it is my plan for CCBR to meet with such ministries in the Calgary area. I know [name of pro-life leader who was CC-ed on both the original e-mail and this response] and this plan will involve us meeting with her and [said pro-life leader's post-abortion ministry]. So while I thank you for the invitation to attend [said post-abortion ministry] with you, we will begin such networking via [said pro-life leader].

Far from CCBP's approach counteracting other pro-life activities, such as post-abortion ministries, it is a fundamental base. Like the story of Emmett Till, graphic abortion images act as a catalyst for change and healing. To understand our role in the broader pro-life movement requires much more writing or a whole presentation. Thankfully, I am doing the latter at your parish. I pray you will attend.

Most sincerely and with prayers,

Stephanie Gray
Executive Director

P.S., As for your offer of coffee, yes, I would be happy to meet with you and hear about your journey of reconciliation. Please provide some dates and times that work for you.

Appendix V: Frequently Asked Questions about the Genocide Awareness Project (GAP)

Q1. What is the connection between the Holocaust against the Jews, the lynching of blacks, and abortion?

A1. At the time the Holocaust happened, were the Jews considered to be valuable human beings equal to Aryans? At the time blacks were lynched, were they considered deserving of the same rights as whites? Today, as abortion occurs, the unborn are considered inferior to the born. In each of these cases then, there is a vulnerable class of people targeted for killing.

Societies that commit and permit genocide begin the atrocities by dehumanizing the victim class, calling them non-persons, parasites, cockroaches, sub-human, animals, etc. In Germany, the Nazis made it lawful to kill Jews. In the United States, slave owners and racists made it lawful to enslave and even kill black people. In Canada, the Supreme Court has permitted the killing of the unborn throughout all nine months of pregnancy.

Although the atrocities are not identical, there is a strong similarity: huge numbers of dead victims who have been denied their personhood on the basis that they are a burden and/or have something that is useful to the rest of society.⁹⁹ Jews were considered responsible for the social ills in Germany, and yet the Nazis also considered this “burden” to be a “benefit”: the Jews had bodies that the Nazis used for medical experiments. Whites considered blacks useful for slave labour yet when they became a “nuisance” they would lynch them. And today in Canada, the unborn are often deemed a problem (“unwanted, unplanned pregnancies”) and yet society is now finding a supposed “benefit” from the burdensome group through embryonic stem cell research.

Q2. How can you be so insensitive to people of Jewish and African ancestry? These signs offend them.

A2. Are *all* Jewish and African-Americans offended? Of the ones that actually are offended, are they offended by atrocities being compared to one another generally, or specifically that abortion is compared to historical atrocities?

At the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C., there is an exhibit that shows images of recent atrocities including pictures from Rwanda’s 1994 genocide. A quote in that section by Holocaust-survivor Elie Wiesel says the following: “A memorial unresponsive to the future would violate the memory of the past.”

If it is legitimate to compare what happened during World War II to what happened in Rwanda, why not also to what happens in Canada? Are people offended by the comparison of abortion to the Holocaust because they don’t believe the unborn are humans? Do they believe, as Paul Spiegel, the head of Germany’s Central Council of Jews, says, “there is an enormous difference between mass genocide and what women do to their bodies”?¹⁰⁰ That perspective is precisely *why* the comparison is being made: many in society today do not acknowledge the humanity of the unborn just as societies of the past did not acknowledge the humanity of *their* victims. The pictures themselves are offensive because injustice is offensive. The *comparisons* are offensive to those who are guilty of committing or permitting a less-acknowledged injustice that is conceptually similar to a more recognized one.

In the fall of 2000, the Jewish Association at the University of British Columbia, Hillel, set up their annual exhibit entitled, “Holocaust Awareness Week.” They displayed disturbing images of the horrendous slaughter of Jews and others during (and preceding) WWII. Also that week, they hosted several presentations, one of which drew attention to the recent genocide in Rwanda. One of the presenters said, to paraphrase, “‘Never again’ doesn’t *just* mean ‘never my people.’ It means never again for all people, for all of humanity.”

Q3. How are these pictures the same? The Holocaust involved murdering human beings who had lives and families. Abortion is a matter of “choice.”

A3. Actually, the parallels are great. No form of genocide exactly mirrors another, but in the Holocaust against the Jews, it was the “choice” of the Nazis to kill Jews; it was also legal. Now it is a legal “choice” to kill innocent unborn babies. These babies *do* have lives and families, but their families are taking away their lives.

Q4. How dare you compare women to Nazis?

A4. Where on the posters do you see a picture of a woman next to a picture of a Nazi? The posters are a comparison of the victims of historical atrocities and victims of present atrocities. Comparisons, by their nature, have similarities as well as differences (otherwise they would be categorized as *identical* rather than merely *comparable*). We recognize there are differences between abortion and the Holocaust just as there are differences between the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide. However, there are also significant similarities, one of them being that the victims are denied their personhood status. The victims of abortion, like the victims of the Holocaust and the Rwandan genocide, are stripped of their value and viewed as sub-human, even animalistic. Jews were considered to be “vermin” and “parasites” and Tutsis were called “cockroaches.” Today that dehumanizing sentiment remains, only it is directed towards a different group: the unborn.

Q5. Why are you calling this the Genocide Awareness Project? Abortion isn’t genocide.

A5. Webster’s New World Encyclopedia defines genocide as “The deliberate and systematic destruction of a national, racial, religious, political, cultural, ethnic, or other group defined by the exterminators as undesirable.”¹⁰¹

Abortion is most definitely deliberate, with the intent and action directly targeting the unborn for death, as well as the killing machines (e.g., suction machines) being designed for that purpose.

Abortion is also systematic: one in four unborn babies’ lives is ended by abortion in Canada.¹⁰² Since its legalization, almost three million babies have been killed. In a country where private health clinics are not allowed, exceptions are made for abortions which are performed in clinics across the country, as well as at certain hospitals. In fact, according to the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League’s website on September 30th, 2004, there were 196 locations in Canada that provided abortions.¹⁰³ Furthermore, the people doing the killing are trained medical professionals: doctors and nurses. Finally, the cost of the killing is paid for by Canadians’ tax dollars. You can’t get more systematic than that.

Imagine that abortion, however, is not the issue. Society once considered women to be non-persons (who could not vote, for example), so let’s imagine society is once again in that situation, but where men can beat and kill their wives if they want to. Imagine such behaviour is permitted by the government. Imagine the government is paying for men to kill their wives. Imagine that “Men’s Rights” groups are established all over the country, where they proclaim, “Every wife a wanted wife.” But if you don’t want your wife anymore, you can “terminate” the marriage by taking her to a hospital or clinic and have a doctor kill her (after all, if *you* don’t want her, you want to be sure no one else gets her either). Imagine that this isn’t the outcome for all women (although it *could* be because no law states otherwise), but that it happens to “only” 1 in 4 women and that the other 3 are just lucky enough to be married to fine men. Would you not consider this organized mass-killing to be genocide?

Q6. Why are you here? How dare you bring these ugly signs to my campus!

A6. The university campus is a marketplace of ideas. Our point of view is held by millions of people, but it is not being taught in the classroom. We are here to expose the truth about abortion. We want to spare unborn children from extermination and we want to spare women from the grief that follows abortion. The academic institutions and the media aren’t showing people what abortion is and does, so we are here on tax-funded property exercising our freedom of expression rights on behalf of defenseless unborn children.

Q7. Your signs just make people angry. How is that going to achieve your goal?

A7. Arthur Schopenhauer once said, “All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.” We know that some students are intellectually honest enough to examine the issue and change their minds as result of seeing these pictures and talking with us. Furthermore, if people are angry they need to ask themselves: “why?”

In 1908, an American photographer, Lewis Hine, was hired by the U.S. National Child Labor Committee to photograph images of children working long hours, often in dangerous conditions, being robbed of their childhood.¹⁰⁴ When speaking to an audience Hine once remarked, “Perhaps you are weary of child labor pictures. Well, so are the rest of us, but we propose to make you and the whole country so sick and tired of the whole business that when the time for action comes, child labor pictures will be records of the past.”¹⁰⁵ We echo that sentiment when it comes to exposing the reality of abortion.

TIME Photographer James Nachtwey documents images he took in the 1990s in his book Inferno. Nachtwey traveled to many dangerous parts of the world and photographed disturbing scenes in places like Rwanda, Sudan, and Bosnia. He said, “I am trying to upset people. I am trying to interrupt their day.”¹⁰⁶

In the same way, the fact that people get angry is not a deterrent to our exposing these images. People *should* be angry about injustice; they *should* be moved out of their complacency.

Q8. Don't you think it's disgusting to show these pictures?

A8. Is it more disgusting to visually educate people about abortion than for abortionists to perform abortions? What's really disgusting is that abortion is happening and that people are more concerned about their comfortable lives being bothered than they are concerned about the babies' lives that are being violently ended.

Q9. Don't you care about women who have had abortions? Don't you think your pictures cause them pain?

A9. Abortion hurts women *because* abortion kills children. 48% of women who have abortions have already had at least one previous abortion.¹⁰⁷ We want to spare them and their children more suffering.

Furthermore, if abortion is a good action then why would a picture of it cause pain? If people feel bad upon viewing the images, doesn't that mean their consciences are convicting them about the *action* and not about the image? Many women are in denial about the wrongness of abortion and that denial is maintained by a culture that tells them their actions were okay. Although many women instinctively feel the opposite of what society tells them, they often do not address those feelings because it would hurt too much to acknowledge that. This tension is then buried, making the situation worse. As painful as it can be to come to terms with the truth, that recognition can move women out of denial and into healing, through post-abortion counselling.

To choose maintaining a lie over telling the truth is to choose short-term gain for long-term pain. Showing the truth is evidence that we do, in fact, care about women and their long-term happiness.

Q10. What right do you have to judge anyone?

A10. Was killing Jews right? Was killing Tutsis right? If you say no, then you're being judgmental too. You're being judgmental about some forms of genocide; we'd like you to join us in being judgmental about *all* forms of genocide.

Q11. Who gave you permission to do this? What right do you have to be here?

A11. Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms states that
Everyone has the following fundamental freedoms:

- a) freedom of conscience and religion;
- b) freedom of thought, belief, opinion and expression, including freedom of the press and other media of communication;
- c) freedom of peaceful assembly; and
- d) freedom of association.

Furthermore, universities across the country have academic freedom policies that outline students' rights to express their views. McMaster University has a policy which states, "Behaviour which obstructs free and full discussion, not only of ideas which are safe and accepted but of those which may be unpopular or even abhorrent, vitally threatens the integrity of the University, and cannot be tolerated."¹⁰⁸ The University of British Columbia has a similar quote in its policy.

Q12. Who sponsors (or pays for) this exhibit?

A12. This exhibit is run by the local campus pro-life club. The project was created by the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (CBR) in the United States; its affiliate, the Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform (CCBR), assists pro-life clubs in the planning of the activity. The campus pro-life club raises funds to purchase their own set of project materials.

Q13. Do you shoot abortionists and bomb clinics?

A13. Absolutely not. CCBR condemns all forms of abortion-related violence and will not collaborate with groups or individuals who fail to condemn such violence.

Questions about graphic abortion images (such as in the GAP display) are not only raised by abortion advocates, but also by some pro-lifers. Questions 14 through 18 below are directed to a religious, pro-life audience who agrees with the premise that abortion is wrong but who questions the validity of graphic abortion imagery for strategic reasons:

Q14. I'm concerned about your use of graphic abortion visuals because I think the images of aborted children violates the unborn's dignity, reduces the unborn to things, as well as denies human remains the respect they deserve, such as a proper burial.

A14. There is a critical difference between committing evil and exposing evil. It is the former that reduces the unborn to things, not the latter.

What violates the human dignity of unborn human beings is the *act of abortion* which dismembers their tiny bodies. What denies human remains the respect accorded them are the *abortion advocates* who dispose of the precious human body as though it were "medical waste." What reduces human life to things is the *Culture of Death*—a culture in which women place their bodies on the altar of convenience to sacrifice their own children to gods of selfishness, a culture in which boyfriends and husbands abandon their girlfriends, wives, and offspring, creating countless "orphans and widows," a culture in which parents pressure their children to kill their own grandchildren to spare shame on their family, a culture in which those who should know better "[pass] by on the other side"¹⁰⁹ in order to avoid personal responsibility for stopping the shedding of innocent blood.

We who peacefully fight these injustices by bringing what is in darkness into the light (Ephesians 5:11) are fulfilling our God-ordained duty to "rescue those who are being taken away to death; [to] hold back those who are stumbling to the slaughter."¹¹⁰

Graphic images are routinely used to communicate the reality of injustices and to compel people of good will to intervene: newspapers and magazines showed images of people killed by the 2004 tsunami in southeast Asia; television stations show footage of bombed civilians in war-torn countries; campaigns against starvation show images of malnourished children with distended stomachs living in

deplorable conditions; the Holocaust Memorial Museum in Washington, D.C., displays pictures of the bodies of Jews killed during World War II.

Far from violating human dignity or reducing human beings to things, such graphic imagery compels people with functioning consciences to funnel their money, their time, and their talent towards ending these crises.

When there are mass atrocities taking place, the greatest respect one can show for the dead is to prevent *future* deaths like theirs. After all, insisting upon a respect for the dead (while certainly laudable) should at least be matched with a determination to achieve respect for the living. It is cold comfort to victims of injustice to be given a “proper burial” by those who, at best, murmured weakly in opposition to their slaughter in the first place.

Moreover, *showing* images of victims, not hiding them, reveres their memory. It creates deeper awareness of injustice so that, with a better informed societal conscience, mindful of the victims of the past, generations current and future will be more vigilant against attacks on human rights and on human dignity.

Q15. But the end does not justify the means!

A15. You are certainly correct that the end does not justify the means, but that principle refers to employing *immoral* means to produce a *good* end. We aren't using immoral means to save babies from being killed.

Quite to the contrary, the *authority of common sense* compels people to expose injustice whenever it occurs. Victimizers want their deeds hidden. (“For everyone who does wicked things hates the light and does not come toward the light, so that his works might not be exposed.”¹¹¹) But victims want their plight revealed, both for themselves and any who are victimized after them. Amidst this “contest of wills,” the ABCs of human morality and decency are this: an act of violence is occurring. It is hidden. Those who know this are obligated to expose it in an effort to bring its end. It is that basic and simple.

Q16. But your visual projects do not provide counselling to women and men who are suffering from post-abortion grief.

A16. It is important to see our visual projects as an integral part of a greater whole rather than in isolation from the rest of the pro-life movement. Various post-abortion ministries already exist (e.g., Project Rachel, Rachel's Vineyard, and post-abortion bible studies). One of the aims of GAP and the Reproductive Choice Campaign (RCC) is to channel the wounded to such help centres.

The following scripture verse provides insight into the philosophy of working in tandem with other approaches:

*Now the body is not a single part, but many. ...if an ear should say, 'Because I am not an eye I do not belong to the body,' it does not for this reason belong any less to the body. If the whole body were an eye, where would the hearing be? If the whole body were hearing, where would the sense of smell be? But as it is, God placed the parts, each one of them, in the body as he intended. ...The eye cannot say to the hand, 'I do not need you.'*¹¹²

Many women and men are in denial and tragically are not pursuing the help of post-abortion ministries. By exposing the evil of abortion, GAP and RCC make denial much more difficult and lead some to admit personal responsibility for their wrongdoing and to repent; in turn, they experience forgiveness and find healing with the aid of help centres.

In May 2001, our American affiliate, CBR, reported the following from a sponsor of GAP at the University of North Carolina: “Our parish priest stopped me on the way into mass and told me a woman who had seen GAP... spent several hours with him—she had had an abortion, now realized what she had done and was even looking to convert to Catholicism.”

In 1998, CBR took GAP signs to a Christian women’s event in Nashville, Tennessee. They met a woman who had had an abortion before she came to Christ and she said, “God used your pictures to set me free!”

Q17. Don’t you think your images could produce post-traumatic stress?

A17. Abortion—the killing of a baby—is probably one of the most unnatural, most evil acts in which a human being could participate. It is not only lethal to the baby, but psychologically traumatizing and spiritually damaging to everyone involved, particularly to the degree that one consents to or is complicit in the act (although complicity is not the *only* exacerbating factor).

Many stimuli can remind a woman of her past abortion experience: everyday sounds reminiscent of the abortion procedure or facility, the cry of a baby, even seeing another pregnant woman, etc. It is only natural that if such stimuli could remind a woman of a past abortion, then factual images of abortion certainly will as well.

Carrying forward this line of thinking, theoretically *any* denunciation of abortion as wrong could be a distressing reminder of one’s abortion experience. If we concede, for the sake of argument, that such verbal criticism of abortion could produce post-traumatic stress and if we want to avoid causing any such stress, then the pro-life movement would be handicapped from even *stating* opposition to abortion—the pro-life movement would censor itself out of existence.

However, just because a woman has been reminded of her abortion does not mean that the reminders are at fault. If such a woman does develop post-traumatic stress, it is produced by her having *participated* in the act of abortion, by her having made a choice that goes against the natural law, not by her having merely *seen* images of abortion days, months, or years later.

Many women are burdened, for example, with distress on the anniversary of their abortions, or with flashbacks to the procedure, or with nightmares of the same. These are tragic indicators that such women need healing. But the difficulty for such women is to seek healing while living in a culture that implicitly and explicitly affirms that abortion was their *right*, and that they did *nothing* wrong. If, however, pro-lifers convey a message that affirms the intuitive feelings of these women, namely that they *did* do something wrong, and if that message is complemented by offers of help, namely by advertising post-abortion ministries, more women will get the help they so desperately need.

The reality is that the only way to ensure that a woman will not somehow experience post-traumatic stress is for her to be healed from the abortion itself. Conversely, what will ensure her susceptibility to distress is remaining *unhealed* from the abortion, and what will prolong her lack of healing is maintaining her denial of the evil of that act and her participation therein.

So, understanding that it is the abortion experience itself that causes stress and pain and trauma, in no way should those who use graphic abortion images be blamed for causing stress in post-abortive men or women. Let us understand this point by way of some analogies: a soldier returns from war and experiences post-traumatic stress. If he sees images of armed conflict on television or in newspapers, is the media responsible for inducing post-traumatic stress?

If a drunk driver hits and kills a pedestrian and later feels great distress upon viewing a graphic campaign exposing the harm caused by drinking and driving, are those who produced the campaign to

be blamed? Are they being irresponsible by attempting to educate society about this particular evil? Should their efforts to save lives be curtailed because the cost in sorrowful feelings is too high?

Fr. Frank Pavone of Priests for Life sits on the board of the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform. He is also the pastoral director and chairman of the Board of Rachel's Vineyard, an international retreat program for post-abortion healing. In 1997, he was asked by the Vatican to help co-ordinate and promote post-abortion healing throughout the world as an official of the Pontifical Council for the Family.¹¹³ As an authority on post-abortion matters, Fr. Pavone supports graphic abortion visuals: "I have used graphic images and have watched their effect. I am convinced they should be used."¹¹⁴

This perspective is even more compellingly expressed by post-abortive women themselves:

"I myself have had an abortion and seeing images and reading more about these killings make[s] me want more and more to fight for my child and all the other unborn. (It also) gives me the courage to stand up for them and the mothers that are thinking of killing their children. Thank you!" –25-year-old woman¹¹⁵

"I have had an abortion and if I had seen these pictures before, there would have been no decision to be made. I would never have gone through with it. I never knew and nobody told me." –23-year-old woman¹¹⁶

To read CCBR's letter to a post-abortive woman, go here: www.unmaskingchoice.ca/letter.html

Q18. I just feel like the approach does more harm than good.

A18. Feelings aren't enough. You need to provide evidence for making that bold claim, especially in light of the evidence of changed minds, babies saved, and men and women brought to repentance all as a result of graphic images. And whatever evidence you have, it should be weighed against the following information:

Graphic abortion pictures are worth a thousand words.

Graphic abortion images change minds and save lives:

"The video of all the aborted embryos was very moving and was very visual. It was very important to change my opinion." –15-year-old female, Stratford, ON (Further testimonies here: www.unmaskingchoice.ca/evidence.html)

"My younger sister has had one. And I was going to have one. But I definitely change[d] my mind." –15-year-old female, Renton, WA (Further testimonies here: www.abortionno.org/AbortionNO/web_response.html)

CCBR regularly publishes newsletters which frequently convey similar reports and testimonies: www.unmaskingchoice.ca/newsletters.html

It is a recognized principle that injustices should be exposed. In fact, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote his wonderfully insightful *Letter from Birmingham Jail* in response to clergymen who were critical of his approach to fighting segregation. In it he said the following:

Like a boil that can never be cured so long as it is covered up but must be opened with all its ugliness to the natural medicines of air and light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.¹¹⁷

The history of social reform movements (e.g., the Civil Rights Movement and anti-child labour movement) testifies to the power of imagery.

Certainly, exposing abortion in all its ugliness will be met with anger and resistance, but that is nothing new. (CCBR addresses the matter of angry responses to its work here: www.unmaskingchoice.ca/angry.html) From the early church martyrs to Mahatma Gandhi to Catholic Archbishop Oscar Romero, one observes that individuals will face resistance who challenge the culture with a message it *needs* to know but does not *want* to know. But as Christ himself said, “If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you... ‘A servant is not greater than his master.’ If they persecuted me, they will persecute you.”¹¹⁸

Acknowledgement: This FAQ was revised for CCBR based on the original **Frequently Asked Questions** provided by the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform (www.abortionno.org). Special thanks to Gregg Cunningham.

Appendix VI: Frequently Asked Questions about the Reproductive “Choice” Campaign (RCC)

Q1. What is the Reproductive “Choice” Campaign?

A1. The Reproductive “Choice” Campaign is a project designed to both educate and stimulate public dialogue about abortion. This mobile-billboard campaign involves placing factual images of aborted embryos and fetuses on the sides and rear of box-bodied trucks which are then driven through populated areas.

Q2. Why are you running this campaign?

A2. We are conducting this campaign for a number of reasons. First, abortion is rampant in our country. Statistics Canada reports that there are over 100,000 abortions every year, but few Canadians are aware of this ongoing slaughter.

Also, abortion advocates have for years misled Canadians regarding abortion. Using carefully crafted language such as “reproductive freedom”, abortion advocates have created a climate of confusion in which the general public is unclear about who the unborn child is and what abortion does to her.

As an example of this confusion, many people mistakenly imagine that abortion, especially when done in the first trimester of pregnancy, is a benign procedure that merely removes a small mass of tissue. Our images dispell that confusion because they reveal a very different reality: first-trimester abortion is a brutal act of violence which kills a baby.

There are babies alive today because pregnant women considering abortion saw these kinds of images and changed their minds about killing their babies. Also, these images have helped other women acknowledge the trauma of a past abortion experience, which in turn has allowed them to seek counselling and healing.

More broadly, the history of social reform is characterized by examples of graphic images being used to dramatize injustice and shock the conscience of the culture. Campaigns to end slavery, child labour, civil rights abuses, and other systematic oppression involved showing the public the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of his victimization.

Q3. Where can I find help for a friend who’s facing an unplanned pregnancy or who’s struggling with the trauma from a previous abortion?

A3. Please refer your friend to the toll-free number 1-800-395-HELP (4357). This is a 24-hour helpline run by an organization which is unrelated to the Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform and which has no involvement with our Reproductive “Choice” Campaign. Please also review our document “If Someone You Know is Considering Abortion.”

Q4. What about children who see the horrible images on the trucks?

A4. You may be relieved to know that we aren’t directly targeting children with our campaign—they aren’t the ones perpetrating this injustice nor the ones complicit in it. Therefore, we won’t knowingly go to an area where only children are present, such as a preschool or an elementary school. The reality, however, is that it is impossible to reach the masses in society where no children will ever be present.

If parents with young children see the images, they can practice parental discretion and distract their children as they would if there were a dead deer on the side of the road, or they can seize it as a teaching opportunity. They can gently explain to their children that some people hurt babies but that the people driving the trucks are trying to stop that. Furthermore, parents can reassure their children that they will never be hurt like the babies have been hurt because “Mommy and Daddy love you and will keep you safe.”

Sadly, parents sometimes use their children as an excuse for why the images shouldn't be shown. The reality is that they don't want to see the images. They may have guilt from past abortions and they don't want to come to terms with their mistake. After all, children have consciences and they love babies. When children see the images they see a hurt baby and they want to know, "Who hurt the baby?"

It's worth observing that the parent's reaction will often determine the child's reaction. An irate, swearing guilty parent will have a frustrated and confused child. But a calm, rational parent will have a calm child. Such was the case with a 5-year-old who saw graphic abortion images. Her teenage sister gently explained the situation and although the little girl cried, she was moved to pray during family prayer time "...that the doctors will stop killing babies." Another child, a 9-year-old, who saw a graphic abortion photo went directly to his mother and said, "Mom, I want to stop abortion."

In 2006, the Calgary Herald newspaper wrote about a 10-year-old homeless advocate who was inspired—at an even *younger* age—to form a charity to help the homeless. The paper reported that it was her *seeing* injustice that convicted her to act:

When Hannah Taylor was *five* years old, she was struck by the unfairness of something she saw that makes most others turn their heads. [Emphasis added.]

As she watched a homeless man dig for food in a trash can in Winnipeg, she decided no person should ever have to go without food or a home.¹¹⁹

Notice that people are not complaining that young Hannah was victimized by seeing such an injustice. On the contrary, people are inspired by her willingness to do what she can to help the less fortunate and by her refusal to make excuses for their plight. But where is that same attitude towards other children's seeing the injustice inflicted upon the unborn?

Children have functioning consciences. The question is: do we? If we think we care so much about children, where is our care and concern for the lives of the over 100,000 unborn children who are killed each year in our country?

If you were walking down the street with a 2-year-old and saw a 5-year-old being killed in front of you, would you complain about your 2-year-old merely *seeing* the injustice, or would you intervene to stop the injustice itself?

Q5. Why should I have to see this while driving in my car?

A5. Is there any place where you *wouldn't* object to viewing these images? We have found that in many cases when people complain about seeing the images in public, they don't want to see them in private either. Many people would prefer that these images be "out of sight" because then they would be "out of mind." And that's the problem: precisely because the horrible truth of abortion is out of most people's minds is this injustice happening. The reality is that while people drive in their cars, babies are being killed. We intend to make sure that as long as society tolerates this injustice, society will see what it looks like.

Please don't make the mistake of thinking that we like these images—we don't. But human rights abuses don't end on their own, no matter how much we turn a blind eye. They end only when a society stands up and demands change. And our society will only stand up and demand change on abortion when it is convinced that abortion is a terrible injustice. What better way to convince our visual culture of this fact than to show them what abortion does? After all, a picture is worth a thousand words.

Q6. How dare you force your views on me?!

A6. Where on the trucks is any "view" being forced? It shows a picture of an aborted baby next to the word many associate with abortion: "choice." If you look at that and conclude that our view is that

abortion is wrong, what's really happening is that, upon viewing the evidence of what abortion does to an innocent person, your *conscience* is telling you that abortion is wrong. As Gregg Cunningham says, "If something is so horrifying we can't stand to look at it, perhaps we shouldn't be tolerating it."¹²⁰

Q7. Why don't you hold presentations and debates in a hall where people can *choose* to receive the message?

A7. A society in the midst of committing and permitting an injustice does not willingly or easily admit its own wrongdoing. People rarely acknowledge evidence of their own complicity in injustice; even fewer *seek out* such evidence. The people who need to see this message simply will not go out of their way to view it in large enough numbers to stop this injustice. So we must go out of *our* way to bring it to them—we must make abortion impossible to ignore or trivialize.

Such is the case with any social reform movement. As the great civil rights leader Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, "...freedom is never voluntarily given by the oppressor; it must be demanded by the oppressed."¹²¹ But because unborn children cannot speak for themselves, we will demand their freedom on their behalf.

Q8. Why don't you show positive pictures of babies, both in and out of the womb?

A8. There is definitely a place for fetal development imagery in educating the public about who the unborn are. In fact, new technologies, such as 3D and 4D ultrasound, are a benefit to the pro-life movement.

Pictures of babies after birth, however, are not nearly as powerful a tool because people see babies all the time, whether in person or in images. They can rationalize killing the unborn, even with exposure to the beauty of born children, because they do not consider the two to be equal. In fact, they may look at a born child and think, "I need to have an abortion before it becomes *that*, because then there's nothing I can, or would, do."

And although fetal development imagery helps *humanize* the unborn child, such photographs do not *dehumanize* the act of abortion. International pro-life speaker Scott Klusendorf expands on this idea:

When it comes to moral persuasion, many times images of death work better than images of life.

To cite a parallel example, the modern environmental movement got its start with graphic pictures in the late 1960's. As activist Jerry Mander points out in his book *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television*, initial attempts to mobilize public support for preservation of the giant redwoods produced a giant public yawn. Breathtaking photographs of majestic trees, though inspiring, did little to incite public anger at the timber industry. So, activists took a lesson from the Vietnam War. Instead of showing pictures of pre-cut trees in all their glory, environmentalists began circulating before and after photos. "We started carrying around photos of acres of stumps where hundreds of redwoods had been cut down. I don't know if you have ever seen a field of tree stumps, but it is a horrific sight, not unlike a battlefield."

The public outcry was immediate. "At that moment," Mander concludes, "I realized that death is a much better subject for television than life. Images of life—whether of trees themselves or the finely-tuned Vietnamese culture—accomplished nothing. They only put people to sleep."¹²²

The same can be said of abortion. The use of graphic pictures is not manipulative, but consistent with other mainstream campaigns of social reform. Shocking pictures have traditionally been used by social reformers to dramatize the injustices of child labor, racial violence against African-Americans, U.S. military involvement in Vietnam, etc. What has

changed is that for the first time in recent history, political conservatives are using this tactic in an effort to reform an abortion-tolerating public.¹²³

This tactic is appropriate, given we live in a culture that thinks and learns visually. As Neil Postman points out in *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, with the advent of television, America shifted from a *word-based* culture—with an emphasis on coherent linear thought—to an *image-based* one where thinking is dominated by feeling, intuition, and images.¹²⁴

Postman's point (and mine) is that visual learners have short attention spans. They make decisions based on intuition, feeling, and images. That doesn't rule out the presentation of facts and arguments, but it does change *how* they are communicated. It means we must change how people *feel* as a predicate to changing how they *think*.¹²⁵ Disturbing images change feelings in ways that words cannot.¹²⁶

Q9. What if a woman who has had an abortion commits suicide upon seeing your trucks?

A9. In the seventeen years CBR has been using graphic abortion photos in the public square and in the five years CCBR has, we are not aware of one incident where a woman has committed suicide after viewing graphic images.

But for the sake of argument, let's suppose a woman does kill herself. That would be utterly tragic, but it would *not* mean the exposure of the truth was in any way invalid. The image isn't what made the woman feel guilty, it was the act that she committed in her past. The image simply brought that pain to the surface, just as any number of things could have: a pro-life billboard or bumper sticker, a friend's miscarriage, or the familiar sound of a suction machine, etc.

When people are convicted of their mistakes they can do one of three things: deny their responsibility, acknowledge their mistake and resolve to change, or despair. Obviously, one hopes that no one chooses the first and third options. If, however, someone falls into denial or despair, those who are proclaiming the truth are not responsible for that.

The same could be said about a drunk driver who kills an innocent pedestrian and is able to avoid criminal punishment. Should he later be convicted that he made a mistake—and is filled with so much grief that he kills himself—would Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD) be responsible for his suicide with their many advertisements condemning drinking and driving?

Q10. Do you shoot abortionists and bomb clinics?

A10. Absolutely not. CCBR condemns all forms of abortion-related violence and will not collaborate with groups or individuals who fail to condemn such violence.

For more information:

Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform (CCBR)

Box 123

5 – 8720 Macleod Trail SE

Calgary, AB, T2H 0M4

Office: 403-668-0485

Fax: 403-539-2227

email@unmaskingchoice.ca

www.unmaskingchoice.ca

Copyright © 2007–2008. Canadian Centre for Bio-Ethical Reform. Second edition. All Rights Reserved.

¹ UN Office of the Special Envoy for Tsunami Recovery, “The Human Toll,” Country Fact Sheets, available from www.tsunamispecialenvoy.org/country/humantoll.asp, viewed January 16, 2007.

² “Facts in Brief: Induced Abortion Worldwide,” Guttmacher Institute, Viewed online August 1, 2006 at www.guttmacher.org/pubs/fb_0599.html#8

³ Matthew Kelly, *Rediscovering Catholicism* (Ohio: Beacon Publishing, 2002), 159–160.

⁴ Martin Luther King, “Letter from Birmingham Jail,” *Ideals and Ideologies: A Reader*, T. Ball and R. Dagger, 1999, 361.

⁵ “Pregnancy outcomes 2003,” Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 82-224-XIE, 9 and “Pregnancy outcomes 2004,” Statistics Canada, Catalogue no. 82-224, 9. N.B. In the 2004 document a footnote reads, “In 2004, information on induced abortions performed in clinics in Manitoba was not submitted to the Therapeutic Abortion Survey.”

⁶ “Induced Abortions,” *The Daily*, Statistics Canada, Wednesday, March 21, 2008.

⁷ “Pregnancy outcomes 2003” and “Pregnancy outcomes 2004.” The percentage of abortions amongst total pregnancies was calculated by dividing the number of induced abortions by the total number of pregnancies. It is important to note that the Statistics Canada document also counts “fetal loss” when referring to total pregnancies and defines “fetal loss” as “the sum of stillbirth registrations in the Stillbirth Database and cases of miscarriages, *illegal abortions* [emphasis added] and unspecified abortions reported in the Hospital Morbidity Database.”

⁸ “Pregnancy outcomes 2003,” p. 56 with the source given as “Canadian Institute for Health Information. Privacy impact assessment of the Therapeutic Abortion Database. June 2003. Page 4.” P. 56 of “Pregnancy outcomes 2003” also states the following: “Caution should be taken when comparing data for 1999 and later with data from earlier years. As of 1999, the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-term Care no longer maintain a system for the collection of detailed information on abortions performed in clinics in Ontario. Ontario now uses the billing system of the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) to provide counts of clinic abortions to the Therapeutic Abortion Survey. As a result, information is no longer available for clinic abortions performed on non-residents of Ontario or on Ontario residents who do not submit a claim to OHIP. A comparison of the data collected using both sources for the years 1995 to 1998 shows that the new data source underestimated clinic abortions performed on Ontario residents by an average of 5.4% (950 cases) per year, or approximately 1% of all abortions performed in Canada. The new source does not include abortions performed on non-residents that averaged 70 cases per year or .4% of total clinic abortions performed in Ontario.”

It also states, “In January 1988, the Supreme Court of Canada struck down the 1969 abortion law which had contained a clause requiring the collection of data on all induced abortions performed in Canada. Some hospital and provincial ministry respondents interpreted this action as the basis for no longer having to report to the Therapeutic Abortion Survey. While Statistics Canada surveys (including the Therapeutic Abortion Survey) are mandatory unless otherwise specified, Statistics Canada chose to treat the Therapeutic Abortion Survey as ‘voluntary’ but encouraged respondents to continue to supply data for health-related purposes. Over the years, with the absence of any legal requirement to provide data to provincial ministries of health on induced abortions, some respondents began to submit only counts of abortions rather than detailed records on each abortion.”

It is worth pointing out that Statistics Canada’s document, “Therapeutic Abortion Survey,” record number 3209, “Detailed information for 2005,” under “Data accuracy” says “There is a possibility of some over-coverage in the

Therapeutic Abortions Database. It is not possible to track a patient once they have been discharged. As such, if a patient is released but later requires another procedure as a result of complications, for example an incomplete abortion, it is possible that she would be counted twice in the database. This issue is particularly relevant with the growing popularity of medical abortions in Canada, which have a higher rate of incomplete abortions than do surgical abortions. If a woman seeks treatment in a clinic and then requires further intervention elsewhere, that case will be counted twice in the database.”

⁹ “Fewer Canadians Favour Legalized Abortion Under Any Circumstance,” by Dr. Thomas Hartley and Dr. Josephine Mazzuca, Volume No. 61, No. 85, December 12, 2001.

¹⁰ “Canadians’ Opinion on Abortion,” Omnican Report LifeCanada, October 2002. www.legermarketing.com.

¹¹ “Canadians and Immorality,” Leger Marketing Report, 2002. www.legermarketing.com.

¹² “Pedophilia, adultery top immorality poll,” by Dene Moore, Toronto Star, June 11, 2006, Viewed online July 26, 2006 at www.christianity.ca/news/.

¹³ “Canadians’ Attitudes Toward Abortion,” Environics Research Group, October 2005, 3.

¹⁴ “Canadians’ Attitudes Toward Abortion,” Environics Research Group, October 2006, 3.

¹⁵ “Canadians’ Attitudes Toward Abortion,” Environics Research Group, October 2007, 4.

¹⁶ It is difficult to obtain detailed Canadian abortion statistics that identify the number of abortions performed in each trimester. However, Alberta does provide detailed records of its abortion statistics. In its report, “Alberta Reproductive Health: Pregnancies & Births,” Alberta Health & Wellness 2006, p. 44, it says, “In 2004, 85.8% of induced abortions occurred before 13 weeks gestation, and 13.4% occurred between 13 and 20 weeks gestation.” Childbirth by Choice Trust reports that “In 1993, 92% of abortion [*sic*] in Canada took place in the first trimester of pregnancy” (“Abortion: The Medical Procedure,” viewed online February 12, 2007, available at www.cbctrust.com/medical_proc.php).

¹⁷ The Students for Choice club at the University of British Columbia produced a flyer in which they wrote that they are a group “that promotes reproductive choice for all women.”

Abortion advocates at the University of Maryland handed out an information sheet on November 16, 2004, in which they wrote, “Women should be *trusted* and *respected* to make decisions that are best suited to their unique circumstances. *Honoring women* means *honoring their choices*, including the choice whether and when to have children.”

In the Spring 1997 “Pro-Choice News,” produced by the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League (CARAL), information is given for how “pro-choice” candidates can handle the abortion issue: “I believe the decision to have or to not have an abortion is a personal one. I oppose any government interference that takes that decision away from the individual. I would not support any laws that force any woman to have an abortion. But neither would I support laws forcing any woman to have an unwanted child. I think that is the only democratic position... A woman reaches the decision to have and [*sic*] abortion under difficult circumstances and often anguish. It is a decision of last resort.”

¹⁸ Students for Choice (SFC) at the University of British Columbia (UBC) handed out a flyer on October 10, 2002, that stated, “Beware Birthright and Crisis Pregnancy Centres—they will lie to you!” They also write, “Lie #1 abortion greatly increases the risk of breast cancer. Most scientific studies show no such link. The anti-choice rely on one or two flawed studies to make their claim, and deliberately ignore evidence contrary to their position. Many independent experts, including the Canadian Cancer Society, have concluded that a link between abortion and breast cancer has not been established.”

On another flyer from SFC at UBC, it says the following defamation, “Why g.a.p. is ANTI-SEMITIC,” and “Why g.a.p. is Sexist Hate Literature.”

In a Pro-Choice Action Network information sheet, “Misconceptions About Abortion,” it says, “There is no scientific consensus as to when human life begins.”

Dr. Bernard Nathanson, a former abortionist, wrote in his book *Aborting America* (Doubleday, 1979) p. 193, “How many deaths were we talking about when abortion was illegal? In N.A.R.A.L. we generally emphasized the drama of the individual case, not the mass statistics, but when we spoke of the latter it was always ‘5,000 to 10,000 deaths a year.’ I confess that I knew the figures were totally false, and I suppose the others did too if they stopped to think of it. But in the ‘morality’ of our revolution, it was a *useful* figure, widely accepted, so why go out of our way to correct it with honest statistics?”

¹⁹ On March 16, 2006, Dr. Janice Kinch, a nursing professor at the University of Calgary, declined participation in an abortion debate stating, “I have decided not to participate in this debate. Please withdraw my name from your agenda. I am certainly willing to discuss the issue of choice for women, but do not think that any ground can be gained from a debate on abortion. We do not have abortion laws in Canada, so for me, it is a non issue.”

On March 4, 2006, Dr. Jim Silverthorne, a philosophy professor at Fanshawe College, backed out of a scheduled debate with CCBP’s executive director Stephanie Gray. He cited multiple reasons: potential college strike, a lot of

marking, misunderstanding about the date of the debate, not being a professional debater, and “Finally, and probably most importantly, I do not wish to participate in any event which would give Ms. Gray an opportunity to provide what I consider to be obscene materials...”

On October 25, 2000, Students for Choice at the University of British Columbia (UBC) produced a “Code of Conduct” flyer in which they write that they will not “Engage in debate with Lifeline Club members or other anti-choice students except to explain our actions.” That same flyer refers to sheets that SFC routinely erects at GAP displays: “...We assert our rights to give our fellow students the option not to view hate literature...The buffer zone consists of sheets upon which are painted the message ‘It’s Your Choice.’ It allows students to avoid looking at these hateful images if they wish to do so. Students who wish to view the display will not be obstructed in any way... Interested women and men can take shifts throughout the day to keep the sheets held up.”

In Vancouver, BC, there are bubble zones, for example, around Everywoman’s Abortion Clinic and the Elizabeth Bagshaw Abortion Clinic which prevent people from expressing opposition to abortion within a certain perimeter of the offices.

In the spring of 2001, international pro-life speaker Scott Klusendorf gave a presentation about abortion at Ottawa University. Rosanne Lepine from the university’s Women’s Resource Centre pulled the plug on the machine Klusendorf was going to use to run a 4-minute video clip about abortion. After the university administration, campus security, and Ottawa police showed up, the presentation and audience were moved to a smaller room where the video was shown. More information about that incident can be read online here:

www.lifesite.net/ldn/2001/mar/01030201.html.

On November 23, 1999, three student leaders from UBC’s Alma Mater Society, the student government, attacked a pro-life Genocide Awareness Project (GAP) exhibit on that campus.

On March 22, 2005, two men in Calgary attacked GAP signs that pro-life students from the University of Calgary were exhibiting near the public transit station.

²⁰ In the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League (CARAL) April 1994 report, “Freedom of Choice,” they provide an extensive list of “member groups” which include the Canadian AirLine Flight Attendants’ Association, Islington, Ont.; Ontario New Democratic Party Women’s Committee, Toronto, Ont.; Simon Fraser University, Burnaby Women’s Centre, B.C.; Toronto Business & Professional Women’s Club, Toronto, Ont.; United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of Canada, Don Mills, Ont.; YWCA of Metro Toronto, Toronto, Ont.; Montreal Health Press Inc., Montreal, P.Q.; B’nai Brith Women of Canada, Downsview, Ont.; Canadian Association of Schools of Social Work; Canadian Unitarian Council, Toronto, Ont.; Humanist Association of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.; Labour Council of Metropolitan Toronto, Don Mills, Ont.; National Association of Women and the Law, University of Victoria, B.C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Downsview, Ont.; The Women’s Centre/Carleton University, Ottawa, Ont.

An article in the *BC Report* magazine, July 26, 1999, said that a group “called the Abortion Services Working Group ... was established in February 1995.” Among the groups listed are “the Pro-Choice Action Network..., the police services division of the AG’s ministry; the Registered Nurses Association of B.C.; the B.C. Nurses’ Union; the Health Association of B.C.; the College of Physicians and Surgeons; the College of Family Practice; the Vancouver/Richmond Health Board; the University of B.C.; the Vancouver City Police; the B.C. Medical Association; the Canadian Abortion Rights Action League (CARAL); and the Hospital Employees Union (HEU).”

²¹ “Canada Sending Women to Kansas for Late Term Abortions by Controversial Abortionist ‘Tiller the Killer’,” September 10, 2004, available from www.lifesite.net/ldn/2004/sep/04091001.html, viewed on December 5, 2006.

²² NB Telegraph-Journal, Readers’ Forum, November 8, 2002, A7.

²³ “Reproductive rights get Buffett Foundation help,” by Matt Kelley, Omaha World Herald, July 23, 2003.

²⁴ Heartbeat International, which has a pregnancy centre network, reports online that they have over 1000 affiliates in the United States: www.heartbeatinternational.org/about_us.htm, viewed December 13, 2006. Care Net reports on its website that it has over 1000 evangelical pregnancy centres across North America: www.care-net.org/aboutus/, viewed December 13, 2006. On December 13, 2006, Stephanie Gray of CCBP spoke on the phone with representatives from both Care Net and Heartbeat. The former said it had 1050 centres in the U.S. and the latter said it had just under 1000 centres in the U.S. Both centres said there was overlap between organizations with regards to affiliation status (in other words, some centres are affiliated with both Care Net and Heartbeat). Both centres said that there are an estimated 2500 pro-life pregnancy care centres in the United States. That is only an estimate, however, as there are other pregnancy care centres that are not affiliated with Care Net or Heartbeat. On December 1, 2006, Gray spoke on the phone with a representative from another association of pregnancy centres, Birthright, who said they have 380–400 centres in the U.S. and 50 centres in Canada. In August 2008, Gray spoke with a representative of Birthright (416-469-4789 and info@birthright.org) in Toronto, ON, and was informed that they have 43 chapters in Canada. On December 6, 2006, Deborah Woelders, director of operations for the Christian Association of Pregnancy Support Services (CAPSS), e-mailed

Gray to say she had 93 affiliated and non-affiliated Canadian pregnancy care centres in her database which did not include Birthright centres.

²⁵ As of the year 2000, there were 1,819 abortion providers in the United States. This statistic is according to the Guttmacher Institute (GI), "Facts on Induced Abortion in the United States," May 2006, available from www.guttmacher.org/pubs/fb_induced_abortion.html, viewed on January 8, 2007. According to an e-mail (January 5, 2007) from Lauren Elizabeth Alexander, communications assistant with GI, to Stephanie Gray of CCBR, "when you see 'abortion providers' [in the aforementioned source] that is referring to what you were looking for—the number of locations where abortions are performed. And the numbers do include hospitals." According to "Abortion in Canada Today: The Situation Province-by-Province," from the Childbirth by Choice Trust (available from www.cbctrust.com/provincebyprovince.php, viewed February 15, 2007), there are 121 Canadian hospitals that perform abortions. On February 15, 2007, Gray called Canadians for Choice (613-789-9958) and inquired of a representative about the number of abortion clinics in Canada. The representative did not have the exact number but stated that there were fewer than 25 clinics in the whole country. She also noted that the number of hospitals in Canada that provide abortions has gone down and that in March 2007 they would be publicizing a report which indicates that even fewer than 121 hospitals do abortions.

²⁶ CAPSS Statistical Report Summary, available from www.capss.com/reports.php, viewed on August 25, 2006.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ "Sanctity of Life Report, available from www.capss.com/reports.php, viewed online February 12, 2007.

²⁹ Starfish Report, taken from 2004 CAPSS National Statistical Report—52 Reporting Centres, available from www.capss.com/reports.php, viewed online August 25, 2006.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Joyce Arthur, "Why Abortion Won't be Defunded in Canada," available from www.prochoicereactionnetwork-canada.org/articles/defunding.shtml, viewed on March 10, 2006.

³³ Michele Smillie, "TV ads offer 'a breath of fresh air,'" *The B.C. Catholic newspaper*, February 3, 2003, 10.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ When one reviewer of this document's draft read the above analysis, she said CCBR was too "nitpicky." But the above critique was given so that the pro-life movement can be more effective at achieving its goal of saving babies. CCBR makes these comments backed up with *reasons*. Those who disagree shouldn't simply dismiss the analysis but instead provide counter-reasons. Where compelling reasons to the contrary do not exist, sincere people would offer their gratitude for information that will make them more effective.

³⁶ National Life Chain Sunday, October 1, 2006, press release, contact: Royce Dunn, Director of Life Chain.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Craig Harper, "Learning to be Proactive not Reactive," April 22, 2007, available from www.craigharper.com.au/2007/04/learning-to-be-proactive-not-reactive.html, viewed on July 23, 2008.

³⁹ Based on research by Gregg Cunningham and the Center for Bio-Ethical Reform.

⁴⁰ Douglas Brinkley, *Rosa Parks* (New York: Penguin Group, 2000), 100.

⁴¹ "Timeline: The Murder of Emmett Till," 1955-2003, PBS online documentary information available from www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/till/timeline/timeline2.html, viewed on February 14, 2007.

⁴² "The Murder of Emmett Till," PBS online documentary information available from www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/till/sfeature/sf_look.html, viewed on April 4, 2006.

⁴³ "The Murder of Emmett Till," PBS documentary, 2003.

⁴⁴ Clenora Hudson-Weems, "Resurrecting Emmett Till," *Journal of Black Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, November 1998, 179-188.

⁴⁵ Brinkley, 102.

⁴⁶ "Resurrecting Emmett Till," quote taken from *Emmett Till: The Sacrificial Lamb of the Civil Rights Movement*, by Clenora Hudson-Weems, 1994, 75.

⁴⁷ "Mourners pay tribute to Rosa Parks," CNN.com, November 3, 2005. Viewed online at www.cnn.com/2005/US/11/02/rosa.parks/index.html on July 26, 2006. In Douglas Brinkley's book, *Rosa Parks*, it says, on p. 101, "Rosa Parks wept when she saw a grisly photograph of Till's body in *Jet* magazine, his face so bruised and distorted that the sight of it made her physically ill." Then, on p. 109, "A lifetime's education in injustice—from her grandfather's nightly vigils to the murder of Emmett Till—had strengthened her resolve to act when the time came."

⁴⁸ "Photos bring our agony into focus," *USA Today*, May 10, 2004, 5D.

⁴⁹ "Letter from Birmingham Jail," 365.

⁵⁰ Adam Hochschild, *Bury the Chains: Prophets and Rebels in the Fight to Free an Empire's Slaves* (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2006), 155-6.

-
- ⁵¹ Ibid., 365-6.
- ⁵² "The History Place: Child Labor in America 1908–1912: Photography of Lewis W. Hine," available from www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/childlabor/about.htm, viewed November 29, 2005.
- ⁵³ www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/IRhine.htm, viewed November 29, 2005.
- ⁵⁴ "100 Photographs that Changed the World," *Life Magazine*, Vol. 3, No. 5, August 25, 2003, p. 80.
- ⁵⁵ "Ali Gets Better," *People Magazine*, November 10, 2003, 113-4.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid.
- ⁵⁷ Ibid.
- ⁵⁸ "Through a Blue Lens," *60 Minutes Australia*, September 30, 2001, Viewed online December 4, 2006 at sixtyminutes.ninemsn.com.au/sixtyminutes/stories/2001_09_30/story_437.asp
- ⁵⁹ "Death by Jib," Kinetic Video, Viewed online January 4, 2007 at www.kineticvideo.com/links.asp?pid=8712&pc=canada
- ⁶⁰ "Death by Jib," Resource Guide, Kinetic Video, 2005.
- ⁶¹ "Jacqui's Story," available from texasdwi.org/jacqui.html, viewed online February 8, 2007.
- ⁶² Garson Romalis, "Why I am an abortion doctor," *The National Post*, February 4, 2008.
- ⁶³ Ibid.
- ⁶⁴ "Gerry Twerdy Santoro," lifeandlibertyforwomen.org/gerri_twerdy_santoro.html.
- ⁶⁵ Joyce Arthur, "Winning Choice on Abortion: A Book Review," Pro-Choice Press, Spring 2005, www.prochoiceactionnetwork-canada.org/prochoicepress/05spring.shtml.
- ⁶⁶ T.A. McMahon, "The Seeker-Friendly Way of Doing Church," *The Berean Call*, March 1, 2004, available from www.thebereancall.org/node/2587, viewed July 25, 2008.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.
- ⁷⁰ Fr. Frank Pavone, "Photos in the dynamics of social reform," www.priestsforlife.org.
- ⁷¹ "Letter from Birmingham Jail," 367.
- ⁷² Spoken at Trinity Baptist Church, Santa Barbara, California.
- ⁷³ "We Had Abortions," *Ms. Magazine* feature story, fall 2006, available from www.msmagazine.com/fall2006/abortionmag.asp, viewed online February 14, 2007.
- ⁷⁴ "Women's Petition for Safe, Legal, and Accessible Abortion and Birth Control," *Ms. Magazine*, available from msmagazine.com/donations/ms/womenspetition_c3_091906.asp, viewed online February 14, 2007.
- ⁷⁵ "Ms. Delivers 'We Had Abortions' Signatures to White House and Congress," press release January 22, 2007, contact: duVergne Gaines.
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.
- ⁷⁷ "Ms. Magazine Counters 'Silent No More' Campaign with List Praising Abortions," by Gudrun Schultz, LifeSite News, available from www.lifesite.net/ldn/2006/oct/06100406.html, viewed February 14, 2007.
- ⁷⁸ Diane Gianelli, "Abortion rights leader urges end to 'half truths,'" *American Medical News*, March 3, 1997.
- ⁷⁹ Scott Klusendorf, *Making Abortion Unthinkable: The Art of Pro-Life Persuasion* (California: Stand to Reason, 1997), 4.
- ⁸⁰ Mark 3:6.
- ⁸¹ Luke 5:21.
- ⁸² Matthew 26:65.
- ⁸³ John 15:18, 20.
- ⁸⁴ "Letter from Birmingham Jail," 365, 367-8.
- ⁸⁵ Ibid.
- ⁸⁶ John Howard Griffin, *Black Like Me* (Toronto: The New American Library of Canada Ltd., 1967), 5.
- ⁸⁷ Ibid.
- ⁸⁸ Inge Scholl, *The White Rose* (Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1983), 30.
- ⁸⁹ Ibid., 45-6.
- ⁹⁰ Ibid., 37.
- ⁹¹ Deuteronomy 30:19.
- ⁹² "Letter from Birmingham Jail," 365.
- ⁹³ Galatians 1:10.
- ⁹⁴ Psalm 32:3–5.
- ⁹⁵ Ephesians 5:11.
- ⁹⁶ 2 Corinthians 7:8–10.
- ⁹⁷ "The Murder of Emmett Till," PBS documentary, 2003.

-
- ⁹⁸ Dr. Alveda King, "Visual Learning and the Culture of Life," www.priestsforlife.org/articles/visuallearning.htm
- ⁹⁹ Gregg Cunningham, "Why Abortion is Genocide," p. 2 online, p. 8–9 in print (<http://www.abortionno.org/Resources/abortion.html>).
- ¹⁰⁰ Stephen Ertelt, "Pope Criticized by German Jews for Comparing Abortion to Holocaust," LifeSiteNews.com, available from <http://www.lifesite.net/ldn/2005/feb/05022306.html>, viewed February 19, 2005.
- ¹⁰¹ Prentice Hall General Reference, 1992.
- ¹⁰² In 2002, 105,154 abortions were performed (Statistics Canada, Pregnancy Outcomes by Age Group (Induced Abortions) <http://www40.statcan.ca/l01/cst01/hlth65c.htm>, viewed July 25, 2005). There were 443,355 pregnancies in 2002 with 328,802 Canadian women giving birth and a smaller number miscarrying (Statistics Canada, Pregnancy Outcomes by Age Group (Total Pregnancies), <http://www40.statcan.ca/l01/cst01/hlth65a.htm>, viewed July 25, 2005 and Statistics Canada, Pregnancy Outcomes by Age Group (Live Births), <http://www40.statcan.ca/l01/cst01/hlth65b.htm>, viewed July 25, 2005). According to Statistics Canada, 9399 pregnancies ended in fetal loss (miscarriage) (Statistics Canada, Pregnancy Outcomes by Age Group (Fetal Loss), <http://www40.statcan.ca/l01/cst01/hlth65d.htm>, viewed July 25, 2005).
- ¹⁰³ www.caral.ca. In 2005, CARAL closed its doors and as of March 9, 2006 their website is not functional.
- ¹⁰⁴ "The History Place: Child Labor in America 1908–1912: Photography of Lewis W. Hine," available from <http://www.historyplace.com/unitedstates/childlabor/about.htm>, viewed November 29, 2005.
- ¹⁰⁵ <http://www.spartacus.schoolnet.co.uk/IRhine.htm>, viewed November 29, 2005.
- ¹⁰⁶ Richard Lacayo, Book Review of *Inferno*, James Nachtwey, Time Online Edition, available from <http://www.time.com/time/daily/special/photo/inferno/book.html>, viewed November 29, 2005.
- ¹⁰⁷ "Facts in Brief: Induced Abortions in the United States," Alan Guttmacher Institute, May 18, 2005, available from http://www.agi-usa.org/pubs/fb_induced_abortion.html, viewed November 29, 2005.
- ¹⁰⁸ "Statement on Academic Freedom," December 14, 1994, McMaster University, available from <http://www.mcmaster.ca/senate/academic/acaafreed.htm>, viewed March 9, 2006. "Academic Freedom: Introduction," Calendar 2005/2006, The University of British Columbia, available from <http://students.ubc.ca/calendar/index.cfm?tree=3,33,86,0>, viewed March 9, 2006.
- ¹⁰⁹ Luke 10:31.
- ¹¹⁰ Proverbs 24:11.
- ¹¹¹ John 3:20.
- ¹¹² 1 Corinthians 12:14, 16–18, 21.
- ¹¹³ www.rachelsvineyard.org/aboutus/frfrank.htm
- ¹¹⁴ Fr. Frank Pavone, www.priestsforlife.org/articles/shouldweuse.htm
- ¹¹⁵ www.abortionno.org/AbortionNO/hurt.html
- ¹¹⁶ *Ibid.*
- ¹¹⁷ Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Letter from Birmingham Jail, www.stanford.edu/group/King/popular_requests/
- ¹¹⁸ John 15:18, 20
- ¹¹⁹ Hannah was also featured in March 2007 as "Global National's Everyday Hero," http://www.canada.com/globaltv/national/features/everyday_hero/story.html?id=40a2ce78-2f46-43bf-a05e-0e62e5f59380
- ¹²⁰ Gregg Cunningham, executive director, Center for Bio-Ethical Reform. Quote taken from Gregg's introduction to the film "Hard Truth."
- ¹²¹ Martin Luther King, "Letter from Birmingham Jail," in *Ideals and Ideologies: A Reader*, T. Ball and R. Dagger (US: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers Inc., 1999) 363.
- ¹²² Jerry Mander, *Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television* (New York: Morrow-Quill, 1977).
- ¹²³ Gregg Cunningham, "Why Abortion is Genocide," available from www.abortionNO.org.
- ¹²⁴ Neil Postman, *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business* (New York: Penguin Books, 1984).
- ¹²⁵ As early as 1974, for example, media critic Marshall McLuhan questioned whether rational discourse could reform culture because "abortion 'thinking' is taking place in an even deeper swamp of mass hysteria created by the inner trips of the TV image. All of our thinking about abortion is taking place in the smogged-over world of TV." His proposed solution was for networks to feature graphic abortion sequences on national television. When asked if footage would unfairly bias viewers, McLuhan replied, "These films don't have to have any pro or con slant, if they are permitted to show the actual process." (Matie Molinaro, *et al*, *Letters of Marshall McLuhan*, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987, pp. 441, 503.)
- ¹²⁶ This quote and the footnotes within it are from Scott Klusendorf's document, "Should Crisis Pregnancy Centers Use Graphic Visual Aids?" 2001.