

LIVE ACTION TALK, BERKELEY, CA, April 25, 2009

The pro-life movement began to lose the battle over abortion decades ago when its leaders allowed the abortion industry to frame the debate as a question of *choice*. Americans venerate personal “choice.” The *Tampa Tribune*, February 5, 1999 published a John Ellis column reporting that: "Richard Wirthlin, who did polling on this [abortion] issue for the Mormon Church, found that the word 'choice' (as in pro-choice) defeated the word 'life' (as in pro-life) in focus groups by a margin of 2-to-1."

Our only hope of turning things around is revise the terms of the discussion to focus public attention on *what's being chosen*. The gasps when we force them to see what that “choice” actually looks like.

Social reform is only possible when activists shift the debate way from euphemisms like “state’s rights” and compel society to consider exactly what certain states want the right to do – like the right to enslave black people. Deceptive terms like “separate but equal” must be pushed aside by pictures of black people being assaulted for trying to order a meal in a segregated restaurant. Even negative terms like “child labor” fail to express the full horror which is communicated by pictures of frail, little children being abused in mines and mills and factories.

No one wants to see these kinds of pictures because almost everyone is guilty of either committing or permitting injustice where injustice abounds. That means activists must be willing to invite terrible persecution in response to forcing society to face terrible truths. Activists must care what people think about the injustice and be largely indifferent toward what people think about them. Reformers don’t have to be liked to be effective. In fact, liked reformers are almost never effective and effective reformers are almost never liked.

One group of social reformers who paid a terrible price to achieve their ends was comprised of the journalists who opposed the Vietnam War. *Time*, November 23, 1998, describes their sacrifice:

By ... [1975], the public and most of the American press, including *Time*, had turned against the war. That was due in no small measure to the words and *pictures* from the correspondents sent to Vietnam to cover the conflict .... For their trouble, many were killed or wounded, and most were criticized as biased at best and unpatriotic at worst.

In 1906, photographer Lewis Hine was hired by the National Child Labor Committee, which sponsored a traveling photo exhibit to promote need for legislative reform. He fought back against the public anger he encountered when he publicly displayed the child labor abuses depicted in his photos:

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 abuses will be creatures of the past.

March 24, 2009, a sixteen-year-old girl from Jersey City, NJ who had seen our abortion pictures said, "Honestly, before I watched this video I was all for legal abortion .... You don't really think of these babies as human beings yet until you see their little bodies destroyed." On that same day, a twenty-nine-year-old woman from Knoxville, TN, who had just seen the same pictures said, "I know my life has been transformed ...." Still on the same day, a fifty-year-old email writer (no gender or hometown listed) who also saw the pictures said, "It is more barbaric than I ever imagined."

And perhaps abortion is more barbaric than could ever be imagined by Fr. John Jenkins, the president of the University of Notre Dame. Could his failure to fully appreciate the horror of abortion account for his misguided choice of Barack Obama to present this year's commencement address -- and receive an honorary doctorate? In announcing the invitation, Fr. Jenkins spoke of the historical significance of America's "first African-American president." In Fr. Jenkins' mind, the novelty of Mr. Obama's race apparently offsets the depravity of his support for killing human embryos, fetuses and newborns. Despite Mr. Obama's genocidal trifecta, Fr. Jenkins defended the decision to honor him by asserting that the president has "spoken eloquently and movingly" about race. Fr. Jenkins seems to believe that what Mr. Obama *says* about race is more important than what he *does* about stem cell harvesting, abortion and infanticide. Most strangely, he called Mr. Obama a "healer." Laying aside the fact that recent polling by the Pew Research Center shows Mr. Obama to have the most polarized job approval ratings of any modern president (PewResearch.org, April 2, 2009) how can any serial killer fairly be called a "healer?"

Fr. Jenkins, of course, says the invitation "should not be taken as condoning or endorsing ... [Mr. Obama's] positions on ... abortion and stem cell research." He is careful to not condemn Mr. Obama's barbarity. He will go no further than refusing to "condone" it. The Associated Press reported a story on the 9<sup>th</sup> of April ("Ten Holy Cross priests object to Obama invitation") which quotes Cecilia Prinster, president of the Alumni Association, speaking directly to that point: "Although we disagree with Mr. Obama on some core issues, we must not condemn ...." But if you can't condemn someone for killing full term, born babies, who might Ms. Prinster suggest could ever qualify for condemnation?

Another prominent Catholic who is nominally prolife, U.S. Senator (and rabid Obama fan) Robert P. Casey (D-PA) has confidently boasted that "I know Barack Obama." Then with a straight face, he assured us that Mr. Obama will "... pursue the common good by seeking common ground, rather than trying to divide us." (*The New York Times*, "Casey, an Abortion Opponent, Praises Obama," August 27, 2008). If Mr. Obama's abortion agenda represents the pursuit of "common ground," why did Michael Gerson title his April 2, 2009 *Washington Post* column "Obama's Abortion Extremism"? The National Right to Life Committee (NLRC) verifies the extremity of Mr. Obama's record (<http://www.nrlc.org/Election2008/Release101608.html>) and then lied about it, saying he would support any ban with a health exception. He well knows that the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled in *Doe v. Bolton* that the health exception must include mental health, which means emotional

wellbeing. In other words, the woman herself decides whether she qualifies for her abortion by telling us how she feels.

Even worse, Mr. Obama has, on multiple occasions, opposed legislation which would have protected full-term babies born alive after botched abortions failed to kill them. He also lied about that and said he would have supported this legislation had it contained clarifying language which had, in fact, been inserted into the bill. As a senator, Mr. Obama also sponsored The Freedom of Choice Act which would “nullify all state and federal laws which ‘interfere with’ access to abortion before ‘viability’ (as defined by the abortionist).” He told Planned Parenthood that the first thing he would do as president would be to sign the bill. NLRC quotes The National Organization for Women as exulting that the bill would “sweep away hundreds of anti-abortion laws [and] policies.” There is no serious disagreement that he intends to enact healthcare “reform” which would mandate universal abortion coverage for every American woman.

He is revoking the ability of doctors and nurses and pharmacists to opt out of morally objectionable professional conduct as a matter of conscience. He has appointed as his Health Secretary, Kathleen Sebelius, an aggressively pro-abortion Kansas governor whose political action committee not only accepted donations from George Tiller, notorious late-term abortionist but she took three times more money than she admitted during her Senate confirmation hearings [kansascity.com](http://kansascity.com), AP, “Sebelius left out ...” April 13, 2009). He wants to cut off all federal aid to crisis pregnancy centers. He refuses to support legislation requiring parental notice as a predicate to abortion for minors. He is funding the killing of human embryos for stem cell experimentation. He is sending tax money to foreign abortion providers. He has said he doesn’t want his daughters to be “punished with a baby” if they “make a mistake” (CNN, March 29, 2008, town hall forum in Johnstown, PA). Dawn Johnson, former lawyer for the National Abortion Rights Action League and Mr. Obama’s choice to become the Assistant Attorney General who heads the Justice Department’s Office of Legal Council, once filed a brief in which she incorporated footnote language which suggested that restricting abortion rights made pregnancy “disturbingly suggestive of involuntary servitude, prohibited by the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment, in that forced pregnancy requires a woman to provide continuous physical service to the fetus in order to further the state’s asserted interest.” (FoxNews.com, “Senate GOP Considers Filibuster ...” April 7, 2009). One is reminded of “Catholic” Gov. Mario Cuomo’s Notre Dame abortion speech. He argued that society’s refusal to pay the costs of killing the children of the poor would “burden the already disadvantaged.” So where is Mr. Obama’s “common ground?”

It is easy is to trivialize abortion, as Fr. Jenkins so consistently does, when you don’t have to look at it. Ironically, students and faculty members at Catholic universities, which are private schools, are far less likely to ever see the horror of abortion than students and faculties at public schools. Private universities can and do ban the display of our Genocide Awareness Project. Public schools are powerless to keep us off their campuses. Literally millions of public school students have seen our abortion photos over the last ten years; virtually no Catholic schools will permit huge, outdoor displays of abortion photos such as ours. Ignorance of the evil abortion represents may be at least part of the reason that Fr. Jenkins believes his decision to invite Barack Obama to graduation is fully compatible with the school’s theoretical opposition to abortion. If so, he would not be alone.

ChicagoTribune.com (March, 25, 2009, "Abortion debate dogs Obama's plan to deliver commencement address") quotes an all-too-typical clueless student: "I think it's really cool that he is coming here," said Megan Lyman .... "I don't think it is about pro-life or pro-choice. It will be a good experience for everyone to hear him." No one who has seen abortion and has a functioning conscience could make such a flippant statement. Then the Associated Press reported on March 28, 2009 ("Obama Notre Dame invite stirs Catholic debate") the remarks of a student who was even more confused: "Most students are excited Obama is coming, and some are embarrassed by 'the idea that Notre Dame is a radical place and that everyone is up in arms, when it's not,' said Gavin Payne, a senior from Seattle." This young man isn't embarrassed that the commencement speaker is the most radical pro-abort to ever inhabit the White House. Nor is he embarrassed that so few students are "up in arms about it." He is embarrassed that people might think "everyone" is up in arms about it. He doesn't see abortion as "radical." He sees opposition to abortion as "radical." He thinks opposition to abortion is radical because he has never seen what abortion is.

Next there is Greer Hannan, executive editor of the Irish Rover, the independent Catholic newspaper. She has her reservations about Mr. Obama's visit but her real concern seems to be that "... groups will use the controversy to promote partisan political agendas and do it in bad taste," using tactics like graphic posters of aborted fetuses." What this young woman fails to grasp (along with most of the rest of the prolife movement) is that the reason Fr. Jenkins can get away with putting his thumb in the eye of prolife bishops, students, faculty and alumni, is because abortion is a total abstraction at Notre Dame. Why? Because confused adults have taught confused kids that it is "bad taste" to publicly expose that portion of the truth about abortion which is so awful that it can't be communicated though the written or spoken word. Do they really believe that it is good taste to cover up that truth? These are fine, well-intentioned people but they really do seem to care more about etiquette than justice.

On March 24, 2009, Star-Telegram.com ran a *Chicago Tribune* story ("Some at Notre Dame object to Obama giving commencement speech") which quotes perhaps the most disoriented kid on campus:

The prospect of graphic abortion photos lining areas leading into the ceremony, meanwhile, has some students fearing that their day of accomplishment will be tarnished.

'Both my grandmothers are coming,' said Billy Lyman .... 'They don't want to see that on their way into the ceremony. Nobody should be subjected to that on such a happy day. I'm really concerned the day is going to be marred.'

"Marred?" If he thinks abortion pictures can mar a student's commencement, he should see how abortion procedures can mar a baby's life! These poor students are so out of it that they might not even object if Rev. Katherine Hancock Ragsdale were chosen to be their commencement speaker. Rev. Ragsdale is the new Dean of the Episcopal Divinity School in Cambridge, Massachusetts. She is a lesbian cleric who is also a past chairman of the Religious Coalition for Reproductive Choice. She has proclaimed abortion to be a "blessing." She adds that abortionists

“heroes” and “saints” who are “engaged in holy work” (Telegraph.co.uk, April 2, 2009, “Abortion is a blessing ...”).

This disastrous abortion cover-up has become so pervasive that even prolife activists are now censoring the truth as frenetically as does the abortion industry. We love the prolife students at Notre Dame but they are part of the reason Fr. Jenkins can honor this abortion extremist and do it with such impunity. It bears repeating that abortion is virtually a total abstraction at Notre Dame. It is easy to understand how the average student could be confused about the importance of ending the abortion cover-up but harder to understand the confusion of the prolife student organizations. They should be held to a higher standard but they have helped supporters of abortion rights preserve this informational vacuum by figuratively shouting down anyone who tries to hold up an abortion photo. Notre Dame isn't bothered by abortion because the prolife student groups are shielding the university from the truth.

Very recently, when we participated in a prolife planning conference call with Notre Dame students and other activists, the students reiterated their long-standing insistence that no abortion photos be displayed on their campus. In place of photos, they are handing out white carnations. What will anyone looking at a white carnation learn about the humanity of unborn children or the inhumanity of abortion? The same thing they will learn by looking at empty red envelopes. Not so much. In fact, it unwittingly trivializes abortion.

The problem with white carnations and red envelopes and red roses and countless other abstract expressions of opposition to abortion is that they merely express an opinion. And in so doing, they actually reinforce the idea that abortion not about facts, it is about feelings. Americans believe decisions regarding nominal evils are best left to personal discretion. They value individual liberty so highly that they will only restrict it to ban activity so evil that no one can reasonably insist on the right to do it. When we cover-up the magnitude of the evil abortion represents, the other side argues it's only a nominal evil, best left to personal choice.

Gallup reports that fully two-thirds of Americans believe abortion should be legal in the first trimester of pregnancy. These people don't look at a red envelope and see “one child who died in an abortion.” They look at that envelope and they see ... an envelope. Nothing more. They don't believe abortion kills a baby. They believe abortion prevents a baby from ever existing. This why they see abortion as the lesser of two evils, if they see it as any evil at all. But an abortion photo proves that there really was a baby there and that his abortion was an evil of sufficient magnitude to justify criminalizing the act.

The Red Envelope campaign estimates that 2.5 million pieces of its mail have now reached the White House. This correspondence came in while the president was in Europe, apologizing for America. Counting postage and paper, each envelope probably cost about one dollar to reach the White House mail room on its way to the landfill. It made the sender feel good but it was only seen by a handful of low-level civil service employees. The president will be much more impressed by the fact that 66% of Americans believe first trimester abortion should be legal than he will be by the 2.5 million empty envelopes which are now municipal garbage. \$2.5 million would have bought a lot of abortion photos with which to sharply reduce that 66% abortion approval ratio. In the process, a lot of babies could have been saved.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 wasn't passed because the American people were shown white carnations. It was passed because they were shown horrifying photos of African Americans being beaten nearly to death for trying to register to vote.

A few years ago some college students came up to our display at the March for Life in Washington, D.C. and blocked our abortion signs with a large sign of their own. They lectured us angrily about how awful we were for showing these horrible pictures. I assumed they were pro-abortion. It turned out they were pro-life. It turned out they were students from Notre Dame.

In a sense, it was these pro-life students who invited Mr. Obama to Notre Dame. They made abortion invisible, which allowed their adversaries to make it seem inconsequential. We want to show them how our pictures can change everything at Notre Dame if properly used. They won't let us onto their campus, but we can make everyone coming to graduation see the truth on the sides and backs of our billboard trucks as they drive onto the campus. We will also fly our huge aerial billboards around the golden dome of the Main Building and the steeple of Sacred Heart Basilica! They can keep us off their campus but they can't keep out of their airspace! We intend to make this event a teachable moment, beginning with the delivery of our own commencement address!

Many pro-lifers have heard about Emmett Till, the fourteen-year-old black boy from Chicago who, while visiting relatives in Mississippi, was tortured to death, allegedly for whistling at a white woman (or bidding her farewell with a flippant "bye baby" – accounts vary). But this tragic civil rights story offers more lessons for effective pro-life activism than is generally understood.

BlackPressUSA.com, August 27, 2001, reported in a story entitled "1955 – Emmett Till Killed in Mississippi" that Emmett's mother "had insisted that the casket be opened when it arrived in Chicago, although it had been sealed when it left Mississippi." There was a reason that authorities in Mississippi did not want the world to see the body of Emmett Till.

*The Washington Post*, August 28, 2005, published a story on the legacy of Emmett Till entitled "Dead End," with a subhead which read "On the Trail of a Civil Rights Icon, Starting Where He Did":

...Ahmed A. Rayner Sr., ... prepared Emmett's body for services after it was pulled from the Tallahatchie River – with a cotton-gin fan tied around his neck with barbed wire. Tortured and bruised, with most of his teeth missing, his remains were returned in a sealed box on a train to Chicago.

Ahmed Rayner is dead and the family-owned funeral home is run by his granddaughter [Pamela Rayner].

\* \* \*

‘I remember him saying that he had to do something because the way that he [Emmett] was brought up here, he looked so bad that it would probably scare most of the people,’ says Rayner. There was the eye that her grandfather had to put back into Till’s head and the fixing of his swollen tongue that hung out of his mouth – the stitching and patchwork to make the boy presentable in a glass-covered casket.

There was also a reason that Emmett’s mother demanded the unsealing of the crate in which the condition of her son’s body had been hidden:

‘After the body arrived I knew I had to look and see and make sure it was Emmett. That was when I decided that I wanted the whole world to see what I had seen. There was no way I could describe what was in that box. No way. And I just wanted the world to see.’ (BlackPressUSA.com, February 21, 2001, ‘A Disturbing Picture’)

Sounds a lot like abortion: no way it can be described; vital that we show the world how horrifying it looks.

Not only did Ms. Mobley (Emmett’s mother) want funeral-goers to see what had been done to her son, she urged that the entire black community be shown the hideous face of racism (BlackPressUSA.com, February 21, 2001, *supra.*):

John H. Johnson, publisher of *Ebony* and *Jet* magazines, recalls in his autobiography, ‘Succeeding Against The Odds,’ that Mobley had asked photographers to shoot pictures of Till’s body.’

‘There were people on the staff who were squeamish about the photographs,’ Johnson recalled. ‘I had reservations too but I decided finally that if it happened it was our responsibility to print it and let the world experience man’s inhumanity to man.’

Colbert I. King, today a columnist for *The Washington Post*, still remembers the photo he saw in *Jet* as a youngster. He wrote the following earlier this year:

‘We got the chance to see what he looked like with his skull crushed in, a bullet in his head, an eye gouged out and ... the barbed wire they had wrapped around his frame ....’

Mobley knew what she was doing. So did Johnson.

‘The issue [of *Jet*], which went on sale on September 15, 1955,’ recalled Johnson, ‘sold out immediately and did as much as any other event to traumatize Black America and prepare the way for the Freedom Movement of the sixties.’

Indeed it did. *The Washington Post*, August 9, 2005, in a story about Mr. Johnson called “The Publishing World’s Black Light,” agreed with this assessment of the influence of the shocking pictures:

When Johnson published the grisly photographs of Emmett Till ... people said later their lives were changed. They better understood all the stories passed down about lynchings and midnight murders and they were energized to fight a modern fight against hatred.

No one could have imagined at the time how these “energizing” photos would spark a literal revolution. Court TV’s Crime Library ([crimelibrary.com](http://crimelibrary.com)) describes the impact of the pictures in a story by Mark Gado entitled “Mississippi Madness: The Story of Emmett Till”:

The woman kept her seat. Despite the driver who, after several minutes, became noticeably irritated that a black person would have the audacity to do what this woman did. She refused to give up a seat to a white man. She sat in the middle of the bus, staring out of a grimy window, deaf to the shouting around her.

\* \* \*

‘Are you going to get up or do I have to call the police?’ the driver shouted.

The woman shifted her position slightly but did not get up. ‘Call them,’ she simply said.

\* \* \*

Glancing out the window, she saw a young boy ride by on his bike....

\* \* \*

She was thinking of another boy who was in the news recently, a teenager from Chicago, with the unlikely name of Emmett ‘Bobo’ Till.

\* \* \*

The woman saw a newspaper photo of the boy’s corpse. The image deeply disturbed her and because of it, she hadn’t been able to sleep lately. No, she wouldn’t give up her seat.

\* \* \*

Things are not right here, she said to herself. Maybe if people just didn’t go along with it anymore. Maybe if everyone just stuck together. Something had to happen. She saw a red-faced cop moving toward her but little did she care.

The only thing Rosa Parks thought about was the boy, Emmett Till.

And that's not all these sickening photos have accomplished. Outrage in the black community over Rosa Parks' arrest in Montgomery, AL, provoked the Montgomery bus boycott which gave Martin Luther King his first opportunity to test and refine theories of social change through non-violent resistance (Jessica McElrath, "Martin Luther King's Philosophy on Nonviolent Resistance," [afamhistory.about.com](http://afamhistory.about.com)). Keith Beauchamp, the film maker who directed the documentary "The Untold Story of Emmett Till," says that it was Emmett Till's murder which inspired Dr. King to assume the leadership of that boycott – the campaign which effectively launched the civil rights movement (*UC Santa Cruz Currents Online*, January 30, 2006, [currents.ucsc.edu](http://currents.ucsc.edu)).

Would Rosa Parks have been more willing or less willing to risk her life for a bus seat had she read of Emmett Till's murder without seeing photos? Wasn't it the photos which made her realize that this was no ordinary bus seat?

Would Martin Luther King have been more willing or less willing to risk his life for a boycott had he read of Emmett Till's murder without seeing photos? Was it not the photos which made him realize that this was no ordinary boycott?

The whole civil rights movement was about pictures. Social reform is always about pictures; and the racists knew it. The WGBH television documentary "The Murder of Emmett Till" (PBS Home Video, from the American Experience series) features an interview with a white racist who is angry, not that this boy had been murdered but that his mother had outmaneuvered the Klan by directing that lid be pried off the casket, insisting that the body be photographed and demanding that the pictures be published. Without those pictures, there would have been no political pressure with which to force even a bogus trial of two of his murderers (who after being predictably acquitted, confessed their guilt to a reporter in exchange for the \$4,000 they were paid for an interview). "I can't understand how a civilized woman can put the dead body of her child on public display," the racist indignantly lamented. Could there be a more perverse sense of civility? *Killing* him wasn't the outrage; *showing* him was!

We hear this all the time from critics of our public display of aborted baby photos: "It's not fair!" Implicit in this criticism is the depraved notion that killing these children *is* fair but showing them isn't.

And they have a point of sorts: showing victims of injustice isn't "fair" to a defender of an unjust status quo. Photos change everything. And one showing is seldom enough. That is why, even fifty years later, *The Chicago Defender* is still reminding black people with reprinted "funeral photos" of Emmett Till (*The Washington Post*, August 28, 2005, *supra*).

There aren't many news organizations which will publish or broadcast "Emmett Till-type" photos of aborted babies. That is why it is critical that we display them in the public square.

On May 10, 2004, The U.S. Department of Justice opened a federal investigation into the murder of Emmett Till. Mr. Beauchamp, the filmmaker, believes that at least fourteen men may have been complicit in the teenager's killing and that five are still alive. Emmett Till's body has now

been exhumed and an autopsy has been performed. Indictments capable of producing convictions may yet be handed up.

Would this new investigation have been more likely or less likely to have been undertaken without the publication of photos? In fact, without the photos, how many of us would have *ever* heard of Emmett Till?

On December 27, 2008, a woman from Millersburg, OH, who had just seen our abortion pictures, wrote to say “I knew it was horrible but never saw any photos of it ... it is a lot worse than I had thought it was.” These kinds of messages arrive virtually daily. When we drag concealed brutality out from under the rug beneath which so many are trying to conceal it, things change. You can’t alter public policy until you alter public opinion.

John 3:19-20 quotes our Savior teaching that “... men loved darkness instead of light because their deeds are evil. Everyone who does evil hates the light and will not come into the light for fear that his deeds will be exposed.” The great tragedy of abortion is that the evil men women who preside over the abortion industry “fear that their deeds will be exposed” so they base their litigation strategy on a demand for “rights of privacy.” “Privacy” in this sense is a legal term whose essence is secrecy. Abortion is an act so terrible that its horror must be concealed from aborting mothers or many will refuse to do it. It must also be concealed from the voting public or many will refuse to permit it.

Ephesians 5:11 commands Christians to “Have nothing to do with the fruitless deeds of darkness, but rather expose them.” Genesis 9:1 records God’s command to Noah and his sons that they be “Be fruitful and increase in numbers ....” “Fruitful” again and again in Scripture means pregnancy and abortion destroys this “fruit” of a mother’s womb. It is, in that sense, a “fruitless deed of darkness.” The church perversely facilitates the abortion industry’s desperate demand for secrecy when church leaders cover up the horror of abortion and even sabotage other’s efforts to expose it. This means much more baby killing and much less pro-life activism among Christians.

No one better understood the importance of the church “exposing the fruitless deeds of darkness” than Martin Luther King. He was not only a historically prominent civil rights activist but also an ordained minister and active church pastor. He saw the separation of social justice from the Gospel of Christ as a strange and artificial schism. In his “Letter From The Birmingham Jail,” written to Birmingham clergy men who had publicly condemned his lonely protests, he wrote:

In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churches stand on the sideline and merely mouth pious irrelevancies and sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard so many ministers say, ‘Those are social issues with which the gospel has no real concern.’ And I have watched so many churches commit themselves to a completely other-worldly religion which made a strange distinction between body and soul, the sacred and the secular.

Dr. King's heart was broken by the certain knowledge that God had given His church the power of life and death over the black community but even sympathetic white Christians largely refused to use that power in defense of their black brothers and sisters. Dr. King understood the importance of shock-photography as the only effective means through to expose dark deeds. But he also knew that he would get little help from churches which had the resources to change the law almost overnight had they been willing to take risks and make sacrifices. Like the priest and Levite in Christ's parable of the Good Samaritan, they might have felt pity for the victim but unlike the Samaritan, they were unwilling to show him that pity.

In *Why We Can't Wait*, Mass Market Paperback (2000), Dr. King wrote of the media coverage of the of the Birmingham movement he helped orchestrate in 1963:

The brutality ... became impotent when it could not be pursued with stealth and remain unobserved. It was caught ... [on film] revealing the naked truth to the whole world.

So Dr. King was on his own but he knew that as long as racists were allowed to abuse black people outside the view of the national news media, most Americans would remain ignorant of the frequency and severity of the mistreatment and the abuses would never end. He too struggled in vain to rally the church against the brutalization of helpless victims. In another section of his "Letter From The Birmingham Jail," he described racial violence that, as is true of the violence of abortion, few Americans had been forced to view:

I doubt that you would so quickly commend the policemen if you were to observe their ugly and inhumane treatment of Negroes here in the city jail; if you were to watch them push and curse old Negro women and young Negro girls; if you were to see them slap and kick old Negro men and young boys; if you were to observe them, as they did on two occasions, refuse to give us food because we wanted to sing our grace together. I cannot join you in your praise of the Birmingham police department.

It must have been maddening to feel powerless against attackers who had the initiative and could pick and choose the times and places of their assaults. Napoleon, when asked what kinds of generals he preferred, famously replied "Lucky ones!" No axiom of armed combat is more venerated than that "fortune favors the bold." Boldness is more often associated with dynamic offense than static defense. Yet to this point, civil rights activists had largely been hunkered down on defense. They were essentially reacting to what their tormentors chose to do. Coaches and generals live by the truth that you can't score on defense. But at some point Dr. King had an epiphany.

What might happen if, instead of waiting reactively for inconspicuous attacks against blacks who were perceived to have gotten out of line, civil rights leaders might organize protests specifically intended to provoke the racists into making their attacks at times and places chosen by their victims? And suppose those times and places were carefully coordinated with sympathetic

journalists who were eager to photograph and film the violence for publication and broadcast? Suddenly the public would be forced by the ugly pictures to confront the shame of racial violence. The civil rights movement realized it could use these shocking images to “shame America before the world.” Richard B. Speed’s review of Mark Kurlansky’s book *1968: The Year That Rocked The World*, describes this enormously successful strategy:

In discussing the impact of civil disobedience, Kurlansky relates a telling incident that took place during a 1965 march in Selma, Alabama. Martin Luther King apparently noticed that *Life Magazine* photographer, Flip Schulke had put down his camera in order to help a demonstrator injured by the police. Afterward, according to Kurlansky, King rebuked Schulke, telling him that ‘Your job is to photograph what is happening to us.’

And CBR’s job is to photograph what is happening to the babies. Social reform is always about the pictures. No one wants to see these sickening images but until the public is forced to look, the violence can’t be stopped. Dr. King and his associates had paid a terrible price for provoking these bloody attacks and without pictures to disturb the American people, their sacrifice would have been futile. Oppressors have always tried to suppress the evidence of their abuses. At [JessieDanielsPhD.com](http://JessieDanielsPhD.com) (Thinking At The Interface) we read a quote by Gary Olson, speaking of slavery:

In his recent book, [\*The Slave Ship\*](#), maritime historian Marcus Rediker documents the role played by emotional and especially visual appeals in ending the trans-Atlantic slave trade. The visuals were indispensable because, as the abolitionist James Field Stanfield argued, the terrible truths of the slave trade ‘had been withheld from the public eye by every effort that interest, ingenuity, and influence, could devise.’

The public dare not be allowed to see the abuses lest they rise up and change the law. Sadly, it is often deluded Christians who enable the oppressors to hide their terrible truth. The churches in the South in the 1960s were as complicit in facilitating civil rights abuses as today’s churches are derelict in their duty to demand an end to abortion. And like their slave-owning forbearers, 1960s racists quickly understood the dangers of news coverage and journalists, especially those with cameras, invariably became targets. Harry F. Rosenthal, an Associated Press reporter who covered the James Meredith march to Jackson, MS, is quoted in the book *Breaking News*, Associated Press (Princeton Architectural Press, 2007): “We never knew who to be afraid of” he said. ‘Nobody wanted us there.’ He recalled that about twenty of the twenty-five cars that had been rented by reporters were returned damaged, many with bullet holes.”

The *Washington Post*’s obituary of Mr. Schulke (May 17, 2008) quotes the photographer on the dangers of taking pictures of Klansmen attacking civil rights marchers:

Mr. Schulke was threatened by white mobs, tear-gassed by police and locked in squad cars so he couldn’t document demonstrations. He usually rented Cadillacs while on assignment in the South, he said, because they were heavy and could outrun the old pickup trucks favored by Ku Klux Klan members.

In the fall of 1962, he was in Oxford, Miss., where James Meredith was attempting to enroll as the first black student at the University of Mississippi. With federal marshals confronting an angry white mob, Mr. Schulke got onto campus hidden in the trunk of a professor's car. A fellow photographer was shot and killed by a sniper, shortly after Mr. Schulke urged him to take cover.

Mr. Schulke was hiding in the trunk of a car because Mississippi authorities had banned cameras from the streets of the campus (*Press-Telegram*, Long Beach, CA, October 1, 1962). They knew the world was watching and they didn't want pictures of literally thousands of Klansmen trying to kill one, brave, lone, black man.

The evidence that distressing pictures changed public opinion was undeniable. Associated Press photographer Jack Thornell was interviewed by *Smithsonian* magazine (*Smithsonian.com*, "Down in Mississippi," February 2005) about his photo of James Meredith, later writhing in the pain of multiple shotgun blasts on a march specifically intended to defy the Ku Klux Klan:

Of the many photographs that Thornell made of the incident, one shows the fallen man on dusty Highway 51 screaming in agony. It was published in newspapers and magazines nationwide and went on to win a Pulitzer Prize. The image suggests the very pain and frustration of being black in the Deep South of the 1960s. 'When people saw scenes like this in newspapers and on TV—when they saw what was actually happening down South—they couldn't believe it,' says Thornell, who is 65 and retired and lives in Metairie, Louisiana. He says his one lasting regret about that day four decades ago is that he didn't put his camera down to help the wounded Meredith.

Mr. Thornell says that when Americans saw his terrible pictures "... they couldn't believe it." They couldn't believe that such a thing could be happening in America. That is exactly the reaction our abortion photos constantly elicit from the public. In one recent twenty-four hour period we received seven e-mail messages from people who were shocked by what they saw on our website regarding abortion: The first said "I had no idea..." The next said "...changed my mind completely..." Another exclaimed "Oh my God!" From a woman who admitted to two abortions, we read "More information should be made available (like this site). I am convinced it would have changed my mind." The next said "I was amazed .... This is so horrific...." Another said "I never knew ...." The last explained that "I always thought abortion was okay until I saw videos and photos." How much evidence do national pro-life leaders need to convince them that we will continue to lose as long as we continue to cover up the awful truth of abortion?

Eisenhowermemorial.org says the following concerning awful Holocaust pictures:

General Eisenhower understood that many people would be unable to comprehend the full scope of this horror. He also understood that any human deeds that were so utterly evil might eventually be challenged or even denied as being literally unbelievable. For these reasons he ordered that all the civilian news media and military combat camera units be required to visit the camps and

record their observations in print, pictures and film. As he explained to General Marshall, 'I made the visit deliberately, in order to be in a position to give first-hand evidence of these things if ever, in the future, there develops a tendency to charge these allegations merely to "propaganda."'”

Most Americans, many of them who claim the name of Christ, mistakenly believe that it is “propaganda” to call abortion a “Holocaust.” Many of them, however, change their minds when we show them the same kinds of pictures General Eisenhower thought were so important. The only difference is that he could command the news media to record and report the truth. We are reduced to holding our low-tech signs in front of churches whose pastors ignore us.

History explains how the public display of abortion photos can create intolerable societal stress which can in turn produce social reform.

Consider the stress terrible visual images created among Holocaust executioners:

Viewing scenes of mass murder created unbearable stresses for both the executioners of the Holocaust and today’s practitioners of abortion medicine. The same kinds of tensions are created when aborted baby photos are forced upon societies which obtain and permit abortion.

In his book *The Architect of Genocide*, Richard Breitman, Knopf (1991), describes several implications of the emotional trauma experienced by Nazi SS leader Heinrich Himmler, as he witnessed mass executions carried out at his command in Minsk, in the Soviet Union, during World War II:

After each round of killing, the bodies were covered with earth, and the next group, which had been kept waiting at some distance, was brought to the killing and burial site. After one round, Himmler complained that a victim was still alive. The chief of Einsatzkommando 8, Dr. Otto Brandfisch, placed a gun in the hands of a reserve police officer, Paul Dinter, and told him to finish the man off, which he did.

As the executions proceeded, Himmler became more and more uncomfortable. [Heinz Hohne, in his *Order of the Death's Head*, Coward-McCann (1970) (translated by Richard Barry), reports that Wolff, the Head of his Personal Staff, barely managed to prevent Himmler from collapsing. 'Good for him to see what he expects people to do,' Wolff commented.] Bach-Zelewski took advantage of his momentary weakness to press Himmler to spare not the victims but the policemen. Pointing out how shaken the executioners were, he complained that these men were now finished for the rest of their lives: they would either be neurotics or savages. (In fact, one member of the police battalion soon had a breakdown in Mogilev.) Himmler gave a short speech in which he explained to the men that Nazi Germany would soon extend to the Ural Mountains, and that it had hard tasks to carry out. He said he was responsible – they were simply carrying out a repulsive but necessary duty. They were to obey their orders unconditionally; in any case, those orders were based on harsh

necessity. Combat was a law of nature, and human beings had to defend themselves against vermin, he concluded.

\* \* \*

Himmler then visited an insane asylum in Minsk, where he ordered Nebe to grant the inmates an end to their 'suffering' as soon as possible. Still shaken by what he had just witnessed, however, he said he was now convinced that shooting was not the most humane method. Nebe supposedly suggested the use of dynamite.... So Nebe received authorization to experiment with explosives.

\* \* \*

Hoss and Eichmann also discussed methods of killing. Because of the large numbers of Jews involved, shooting was out of the question: it would have placed too heavy a burden on the executioners, Hoss said.

\* \* \*

Himmler had wanted a neater, cleaner, less upsetting way of killing large numbers of people, and poison gas was the obvious solution.

\* \* \*

Poison-gas technology offered the prospect of a better and quieter way to exterminate additional millions.

Heinz Hohne, in his book *The Order of the Death's Head*, Coward-Mccann, (1970) (translated by Richard Barry) further examines the problem of preserving the sanity of executioners who perpetrate mass murder. There was simply no silver bullet:

Precise regulations were laid down to ensure that executions passed off rapidly and effectively before the executioners had time to realize what they were doing .... The individual man of the Einsatzgruppe should have no contact with his victim; he should feel himself part of a unit acting as such and acting only on the orders of his superiors, thus eliminating any individual sense of guilt. No individual was allowed to do the shooting; moreover Ohlendorf took care to ensure that the victims remained calm up to the last minute, for any uproar carried with it the danger that the liquidators might start firing wildly into the crowd and running amok – and that prospect Ohlendorf feared more than a mass escape of Jews. Anxiety on this score rather than any considerations of humanity caused Ohlendorf to recoil before the employment of gas vans. The gas vans, he thought, would produce 'an intolerable psychic burden' for his men, for after the execution they would have to unload the distorted bodies – frequently covered in excrement – and so the executioners would be brought face to face with what they had done – the moment of truth from which Ohlendorf wished to save them.

Dr. Otto Rasch, Head of Einsatzgruppe C, adopted other tactics. In his view every man of the Einsatzgruppe must partake of its collective guilt; scenes of horror witnessed in common were to form the bond of comradeship holding the unit together; collective blood guilt was to be its cement. Rasch insisted that every man of his Einsatzgruppe take part in executions; the individual had to 'overcome himself.' There was hardly a man in this Einsatzgruppe who did not

suffer from 'the most horrible dreams,' an eyewitness reported. Nevertheless, the aim was achieved – the camaraderie of guilt.

Every trick of psychology was employed to ease the work of the executioners.

\* \* \*

An unending stream of propaganda, even more intense in Russia than elsewhere, aimed to eradicate any feeling among the executioners that the Jew was a human being; he was presented as a pest or vermin.

In his book *Abortion Practice*, Lippencott (1990), (pp.9-10), abortionist Warren Hern describes pregnancy as "disease" and the unborn child as a "parasite," the same term Hitler uses to describe Jews in *Mein Kampf*, Houghton Mifflin, (1971), (translated by Ralph Manheim). But Hohne continues with his *Order of the Death's Head*:

In spite of these 'successes' the SS murderers were now showing clear signs of exhaustion. In September Schulz, a Commando leader, had requested a posting [transfer]. Rasch, commanding an Einsatzgruppe, had gone on leave, never to return; in November Nebe had told his deputy, Werner, that he was for home (Werner's comment was 'Arthur, if you can't go on, I'll release you'); Gisevius says that Nebe was, 'a mere shadow of his former self, nerves on edge and depressed'; Nebe's driver, Kohn from Kripo, had shot himself in horror at the anti-Jewish atrocities.

A few months later even Himmler's most aggressive Eastern minion became a victim of the nightmare – von dem Bach-Selewski was taken to the SS hospital in Hohenlychen, suffering from a nervous breakdown and congestion of the liver. Haunted by his guilt, he would pass his nights screaming, a prey to hallucinations: Dr. Grawitz, the Head SS doctor, reported to Himmler: 'He is suffering particularly from hallucinations connected with the shootings of Jews which he himself carried out and with grievous experiences in the East.'

\* \* \*

Even so fanatical a devotee of the Fuhrer's orders as Himmler must have known that, apart from a small minority of natural sadists and killers, the men of the Einsatzgruppen felt like Bach-Zelewski or Brigadefuhrer Eberhard Herf, Head of the SS Personnel Hauptamt, who wrote that he 'wished to get out of the East, since frankly I've had more than enough of it.'

Nevertheless in the Einsatzgruppen a determined army of death had arisen, unparalleled even in the SS. Wholly dedicated to achievement, 'hardness' and camaraderie, they reached a degree of insensibility surpassed only by those soulless automata, the concentration-camp guards. Here was to be found the elite of that barbaric type of mankind, intoxicated by its own achievements, which Himmler exalted as the SS ideal; it was indeed an Order of the Death's Head, divorced from the world of ordinary mortals and from their moral standards ....

\* \* \*

While mowing down their Jewish victims, the Einsatzgruppen believed that they were entitled to the sympathy of all good Aryans. 'The job is not a pretty one,' Gruppenfuhrer Turner lamented, while proceeding with his murders in Serbia. After the war Paul Blobel, leader of Einsatzkommando 4A, maintained that the real unfortunates were the liquidators themselves: 'The nervous strain was far heavier in the case of our men who carried out the executions than in that of their victims. From a psychological point of view, they had a terrible time.'

\* \* \*

Himmler was only too well aware of the sufferings of his little men. He seized every opportunity to encourage the men of his Einsatzgruppen – in sonorous pseudo-patriotic phraseology, calculated to make even the most cynical of his audience believe that he was participating in a mighty world plan, almost incomprehensible to human intelligence, designed to save the German people and the Nordic race.

\* \* \*

There was only one possible escape from this sense of isolation; he had to convince himself and his executioners in the East that they were the instruments of a great historical mission, the creators of a work surpassing all human comprehension.

In Heinz Hohne's *The Order of The Death's Head*, Coward-McCann (1969) (translated by Martin Secker & Warburg Limited), concern for the sanity of the executioners is further analyzed:

...[T]hose who had such a thing as a conscience could pretend, by a process of self-deception, that what occurred had never really taken place.

\* \* \*

Nevertheless his [Himmler's] speeches to the SS liquidators contained an element of self-exculpation and self-justification....

\* \* \*

In his heart of hearts he felt himself an outcast like his minions, saw himself an object of world detestation – the daily flood of requests for mercy for individual Jews was there to prove it.

\* \* \*

There was only one possible escape from this sense of isolation; he had to convince himself and his executioners in the East that they were the instruments of a great historical mission, the creators of a work surpassing all human comprehension. Himmler told Kersten: 'You oughtn't to look at things from such a limited and egotistical point of view; you have to consider the Germanic world as a whole ... a man has to sacrifice himself.'

\* \* \*

Much had been accomplished; of the 2.5 million Russian Jews unable to escape from the Germans, 900,000 had been liquidated. It remained to erase the evidence before the Soviet armies began to drive out the German invaders; this was the task of Standartenfuhrer Paul Blobel, commanding a special detachment known as 'Commando 1005.' He opened the mass graves and burnt the bodies on

oil-soaked grids; any remaining bones were ground up in special machines. The burning bodies illuminated an eerie scene, the final act of a perverted militarism unparalleled in the history of war.

\* \* \*

Eichmann arrived at Lange's mansion and saw the Jews being driven into the death vans and carted off to the mass grave. Later he told his story: 'I followed the van and then came the most horrifying sight I've ever seen in my life.'

\* \* \*

'I rushed to my car and departed and said no more. I was through. I had had it. A white-coated doctor said I ought to look through the peephole and see what went on inside the vans. I refused. I couldn't. I couldn't speak. I had to get away. Frightful, I tell you. An inferno. Can't do it. I can't do it. That's what I told him [Muller].'

\* \* \*

The commander of the Auschwitz protective custody camp put his Treblinka rival in the shade by discovering a new killing agent, entirely compatible with the theory that murdering Jews was equivalent to pest control; this was the prussic acid gas, Zyklon B, sold on the market as an anti-vermin substance by Degesch [Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Schadlingsbekampfung CmbH—German Pest Control Company Limited].

\* \* \*

The pest control method was eventually introduced into Auschwitz and no one was happier than Rudolf Hoss, the Commandant. In his autobiography he says: 'I must admit that the gassing process had a calming effect on me. I always had a horror of the shootings, thinking of the number of people, the women and children. I was relieved that we were all to be spared these blood-baths.'

\* \* \*

In autumn 1942 the Hauptamt SS-Gericht [SS Legal Department] posed the hypothetical question of how unauthorised [sic] shootings of Jews should be dealt with. Himmler's answer was: 'If the motive is purely political there should be no punishment unless such is necessary for the maintenance of discipline. If the motive is selfish, sadistic or sexual, judicial punishment should be imposed for murder or manslaughter as the case may be.'

\* \* \*

'Necessary though the annihilation of our people's worst enemy may be, it is not in the German manner to use Bolshevist methods to do so.'

\* \* \*

Himmler withdrew into his world of illusion. At a meeting of SS-Gruppenfuhrer as early as 1943 he had said: 'All in all we can say that we have completed this painful task (the annihilation of the Jews) out of love for our people.'

\* \* \*

They were sinister illustrations of the gulf which existed between public and private morality; refusal to admit any connection between their official duties and their private existence, together with an ineradicable self-righteousness, prevented them regarding themselves as murderers.

On the contrary – from their grotesquely exaggerated sense of righteousness in the fulfilment [sic] of their civic duty sprang the notion that basically in the midst of all this murder they were men of compassion who had every sympathy with those who must die, with the ‘existing and the perishing’ – Hoss's hypocritical description of mass murder. ‘Nothing is more difficult,’ Hoss said, ‘than to have to make one's way through this business cold, unsympathetic and without pity.’

Like the men of the Einsatzgruppen, the death-camp technicians entrenched themselves behind a spurious self-pity which enabled them seriously to believe that in fact they were tragic figures.

*The Orange County Register*, March 1, 2000, reported a story headlined “Eichmann on Holocaust: details and denial”:

In describing the killing at the Auschwitz death camp, for example, Eichmann wrote of watching as a commander ‘burned the corpses on an iron grill, in the open air. He led me to a shallow ditch where a large number of corpses had just been burned.’

In the same section, he described how he drank alcohol to numb himself after witnessing scenes like this one:

‘As I arrived I saw a Jewish woman with a small child in her arms in the ditch. I wanted to snatch out the child, but a bullet smashed into the child's skull. My driver wiped small pieces of brain from my leather coat.’

The *Los Angeles Times* reports that Eichmann then wrote: "I got into the car. Berlin, I told the driver. I drank schnapps like it was water. I had to numb myself. I thought about my own children."

Willi Frischauer wrote *Himmler, The Evil Genius Of The Third Reich*, Beacon Press (1953) and discussed the importance of secrecy in genocide:

To kill thirty million people is no easy job. Already there had been small actions of the sort Himmler had in mind, but there was a regrettable lack of preparation and the accompanying factors of the operations threatened to endanger the whole programme. There had been shootings in Poland, but German Army doctors had protested that ‘since these shootings were done publicly, enemy propaganda may derive much material...’

Henry V. Dicks, in his *Licensed Mass Murder, A Socio-psychological Study of Some SS Killers*, Chatto-Heinemann (1972) discusses the issue of self-pity among practitioners of genocide:

‘The people really worthy of pity were we, the liquidators, because our men were in worse nervous condition than those who had to be shot’ (Commander, EG 4A.)

\* \* \*

It is regrettable that over and above this unsavoury work (uble Arbiet) we also have mud slung at us when we are merely doing our duty.' (Gestapo/SD commander in Minsk area, referring to criticism by his Gauleiter.)

\* \* \*

Even Heydrich, not usually credited with Nazi fervour [sic], is recorded as claiming that 'posterity would one day be grateful for what the SS had shouldered as a sacrifice for the German people.'

Here then was the grandiose delusional basis of the SS's mission as the chosen instrument of the saviours [sic] and cleansers of the world.

In *Himmler*, Manvell and Fraenkel, G.P. Putnam (1965) the issue of self-pity is further explored:

It would be wrong to think that Himmler had no conscience and no pity; but his real pity was given to the men and women of his Death's Head units who had to have this fearful burden placed upon them.

\* \* \*

In January 1943 Himmler issued personally very detailed instructions for executions in the concentration camps. These included the following clauses:

'The execution is not to be photographed or filmed.'

\* \* \*

Then he [Himmler] referred to the task of extermination which, he said, 'is exactly the same as de-lousing; getting rid of lice is not a question of ideology. It is a matter of cleanliness.'

## STRESS AMONG ABORTIONISTS AND ABORTING MOTHERS

Abortionist Warren Hern, MD, in his book *Abortion Practice*, Lippincott (1990), expresses the widely-held clinical preference for shielding "patients" from the reality of their abortion experience. "... [I]t is not advisable for patients to view the products of conception, to be told the sex of the fetus, or to be informed of a multiple pregnancy." He also urges the use of fetal heart monitors with "outputs inaudible to the patient." It complicates the denial process for aborting mothers to hear their baby's heartbeat accelerate, stumble and stop.

The February 15-28, 1986 issue of *Ob. Gyn. News* reported that:

Sonography can make induced abortion safer, but care must be taken so that its psychological impact is not negative, Dr. Sally Faith Dorfman said at the annual meeting of the American Public Health Association.

\* \* \*

Seeing a blown-up, moving image of the embryo she is carrying can be distressing to a woman who is about to undergo an abortion, Dr. Dorfman noted.

She stressed that the screen should be turned away from the patient.

Staff members also may be affected by sonographic images and may need opportunities for venting their feelings and reconfirming their priorities, Dr. Dorfman said.

The September 15, 1979 issue of *The American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* published an article by Drs. Nancy Kaltreider, Sadjia Goldsmith and Alan Margolis entitled "The impact of midtrimester abortion techniques on patients and staff." It compared abortion techniques which require the mother, by herself, to deliver (and see) her dead baby, often after lengthy, painful labor (amnio methods) with techniques which involve an abortionist rapidly killing the baby by dismembering and removing fetal body parts, out of the mother's line of sight (dilatation and extraction or D&E):

The two procedures have markedly different effects on patients and medical personnel; change from amnio to D&E methods shifts some of the emotional problems of the abortion away from the woman and onto the physician.

\* \* \*

... [T]he amnio patients noted more depression .... A lingering sense of guilt was reported by none of the D&E patients and 24% of the amnio patients ....

... [T]he D&E was seen as helpful in getting through an ambivalent situation and tended to reinforce pre-existing denial .... The D&E patient was consciously aware of avoiding the implications of the procedure and rarely asked for any details.

The women who went through a prostaglandin amnio abortion had a long and painful experience which made it generally impossible for her to turn away from the reality of her choice. Most of the amnio subjects described the product of labor as a baby ....

\* \* \*

The house staff, although technically available [to assist in amnio abortions] made clear their preference to be in the delivery room where 'live births' occur. The nurses found the physical contact with the [aborted] fetus particularly difficult; it reminded them of the 'premies' just down the hall ....

Physicians tend to ... welcome relative noninvolvement that the amnio procedure offers them. 'A physician who did amnios but not D&Es said, 'Killing a baby is not a way I want to think about myself.'

\* \* \*

Stubblefield and colleagues recently reported that pregnancies up to 16 weeks from LMP [last menstrual period] can be effectively aspirated with a [suction] cannula .... They suggested that such a procedure might be more acceptable to gynecologists than fetal dismemberment by forceps.

\* \* \*

The D&E procedure allows the patient to continue her characteristic pattern of denial and have a smooth psychological course.

\* \* \*

[In the case of amnio abortions] The floor nurse must deal with the expelled fetus; even nurses in favor of abortion find this a lonely and difficult task.

Warren Hern, MD and Billie Corrigan, RN presented a paper at the October 26, 1978 meeting of the Association of Planned Parenthood Physicians. The paper was entitled "What about us? Staff reactions to D&E." (*Advances in Planned Parenthood, Vol. XV, No.1, Excerpta Media, 1980*).

National statistics are beginning to suggest that dilatation and evacuation (D&E) may have important advantages for the patient experiencing a second-trimester abortion. However, significant emotional reactions of medical and counseling staff tend to accompany this procedure.

\* \* \*

Reactions to the fetus ranged from purposely not looking at it to shock, dismay, amazement, disgust, fear, and sadness.... Two respondents felt that performing D&E must eventually damage the physician psychologically.

The respondents noted several differences between first-trimester abortions and second-trimester abortions done by D&E. For second-trimester abortions, there was an increased fear of complications, the visual impact of the fetus, and the violence of D&E. About one third [sic] of the respondents felt that D&E was longer and harder on the patients, and several thought it was more difficult to rationalize or intellectualize D&E.

\* \* \*

About half of the respondents ... felt less positive toward it [D&E] or 'burnt out.' One respondent increasingly resented the casual attitudes of some of the patients who have D&E abortions when she considered the emotional cost to those providing the service.

Two respondents described dreams they had had that related to D&E. Both described dreams of vomiting fetuses along with a sense of horror. Other dreams were about a need to protect others from viewing fetal parts.

\* \* \*

Several others felt that the emotional strain affected their relationships significantly or resulted in other behavior, such as an obsessive need to talk about the experience.

\* \* \*

After a time, the laboratory assistant asked to be relieved from examining the tissue obtained from urea D&E abortions because of the size and intactness of the fetuses. She found herself becoming nauseated during the tissue examination and having disturbing dreams at night.

\* \* \*

In general, it appears that the more direct the physical and visual involvement with D&E, such as that experienced by nurses and physicians, the more stress is experienced.

\* \* \*

The physician has found that the relationships established with patients through repeated contacts during the ultrasound examination, the laminaria changed, and the D&E itself permitted him to develop a sense of the person whom he was helping and her special needs. This contact has proved to be important in maintaining the physician's commitment to performing D&E.

\* \* \*

We discerned that the following psychological defenses were used by staff members at various times to handle the traumatic impact of the destructive part of the operation: denial, sometimes shown by the distance a person keeps from viewing D&E; projection, as evidenced by excessive concern or anguish for other staff members assisting with or performing D&E; and rationalization.

\* \* \*

For the senior author [Hern], rationalization has been shown by his intensive involvement in professional meetings, where this matter is discussed, and by his seeking peer support from colleagues who have similar experiences.

\* \* \*

In order to help staff members cope with the stresses of participating in D&E, we have adopted certain strategies.

\* \* \*

...[W]e have consciously promoted the idea of team effort and the need for mutual support.

\* \* \*

Some part of our cultural and perhaps even biological heritage recoils at a destructive operation on a form that is similar to our own, even though we know that the act has a positive effect for a living person.

Abortionist Warren Hern rationalized baby-killing in near-poetic terms in his essay "Life On The Front-Lines" in *WHI* Vol. 3, Fall 1993:

I had helped her change her life. I was relieved that this young woman was safe to go on with her life and realize her dreams. I felt I had found a new definition of the idea of medicine as an act of compassion and love for one's fellow human beings, an idea that I gained from learning about Albert Schweitzer.

\* \* \*

The freedom to choose a safe and legal abortion meant nothing without someone willing to do it. I thought it would be a valuable thing to do.... It allowed me to put my beliefs about the need for this service into action.

\* \* \*

I felt by this time that providing abortion services was the most important thing I could do in medicine.

\* \* \*

I found that getting to know the patients and their families was the most rewarding part of the experience, and it was gratifying to see what a positive event this was for them in their lives. Each day, each patient, some more than others, convinced me of the absolute need for the service we're providing and the need for it to be as high a quality as we could make it.

We did not just provide a medical service. We had to solve important problems for individuals and families that frequently had nowhere else to turn. We dealt with problems of acute emotional need and suffering, acute family and social disorganization, frequently under circumstances of severe economic deprivation and social injustice, individual grief and loss, occasional psychiatric disorder, and wrenching religious and philosophical issues, all in a context of public controversy.

\* \* \*

Our only option for taking the high moral ground was to place our own lives and bodies on the line. We must risk our lives for our cause by continuing to provide safe abortion services in the face of these threats and attempts to intimidate. Only our own moral courage in doing what we see as right and ethical could be an effective counterpoise to the antiabortion movement.

Hern also expressed pathetic self-pity:

I knew hardly anyone in Boulder and had no friends in town except for a couple of classmates from medical school, and our lives were very different. They had normal medical practices, and they were already leaders in the community.

In a March 13, 1993 op-ed piece in the *New York Times*, entitled “Hunted by the Right, Forgotten by the Left,” he whined on:

Feminist abortion clinics treat doctors like technicians and are especially contemptuous of male physicians. Entrepreneurs who treat abortion strictly as a retail business also tend to treat doctors as technicians. Doctors who perform abortions have usually acquiesced in these roles, and their status has plummeted lower than that of physicians who do insurance company examinations.

\* \* \*

Abortion has become a commodity, like soap, and its social value has dropped. Competition has become intense and fees have been cut, resulting in reduced income for doctors and others who provide the services as well as poorer treatment.

Insurance costs, particularly for coverage from property destruction by anti-abortion vigilantes, have gone up.

On August 12, Hern was back with a whimpering letter to the editor of this same pro-abortion paper:

I saw on the news that the former home of a colleague in Denver was again the site of an anti-abortion demonstration. He no longer lives there because he is being divorced. Were the demonstrations and threats as tough on his marriage as they were on mine, which also ended in divorce?

THESE SAME KINDS OF STRESSFUL IMAGES CAN BE APPROPRIATED AND IMPOSED ON THE PUBLIC, CREATING MUCH THE SAME TENSION THEY CREATED AMONG HOLOCAUST EXECUTIONERS AND ABORTION DOCTORS

The later term procedures are the most stressful for the abortionist when they involve the most violence. Earlier suction procedures, which are essentially blind, exact a lower emotional toll (except for the non-physician personnel who must reassemble tiny body parts to ensure the removal of all tissue). The growth in medical abortions, such as RU-46, and the increase in the numbers of private physicians willing to prescribe these chemical agents is due in part to the fact that these procedures are less visual for the doctor himself. He writes a prescription and or hands over the pills/suppositories and mother administers them, aborting her baby into the toilet in her home. The remoteness of this process makes it easier for the physician to distance himself from what is happening physically, emotionally and morally.

Human beings who are complicit in mass murder feel guilt which they attempt to “manage” (a euphemism for “suppress”) through denial. In the case of abortion, they deny that the baby is a baby and that abortion is an indefensible act of violence. Aborted baby photos make that denial impossible for the public. Society is filled with enormous numbers of post-abortive women and men and even larger numbers of people who have made abortion possible through indifference. If we don't make abortion intolerably distressing, people will continue to have abortions, minimize their culpability for the abortions they have already had and remain apathetic about atrocities which take place out of sight, behind closed doors.

It is what abortionists see which causes the most stress. We take the images which most stress the abortionists and use them to stress the public.

Pastor Rick Warren of Saddleback Church credits his wife with pushing him into the global fight against AIDS. ABCnews.go.com, Dec. 10, 2007, carried a feature titled “Kay Warren Finds Her ‘Purpose Driven Life.’”

‘I picked up a news magazine on my dining room table,’ Kay said on ‘Good Morning America’ today. ‘It had an article on AIDS in Africa ,and I didn’t care. I thought it was a gay man’s disease; therefore, I didn’t have to care. I was ignorant and hardhearted.’

But Warren said the sight of helpless children captured in the magazine’s heart-wrenching pictures left her in tears and ignited a passion in her that made her want to help.

‘The pictures were so horrible. I tried to reduce the horror by looking in the smallest way, but I couldn’t escape it,’ Kay said. ‘Once I couldn’t escape it, I was toast.’

Ugly pictures. If news magazines published disturbing photos of aborted babies, I believe that many women like Kay Warren would respond as she responded to horrible but widely circulated photos of AIDS children. Photos of brutalized black children changed America in the 1960s and photos of neglected black children changed Mrs. Warren today. I believe that photos of aborted children have the same impact but again, since the press won't show Mrs. Warren those photos, we must. If the church fought abortion the way Saddleback fights AIDS, the world really would quickly become a different place. That is why we are about to do everything in our power (by God's grace) to show Christians like Mrs. Warren another set of terrible pictures. Our goal is to persuade pastors to show their congregations these pictures from the pulpit but we will show them from the sidewalk if we must.

The focus of our activism must become the church because we can't win this fight without the church. The money and manpower required to fund and staff the projects which must be part of any strategy with any reasonable hope of outlawing abortion, must come from Christians. That fact doesn't change with any of the competing alternative strategies. The church is the most practical place to access Christians. Most pastors also have pro-life convictions but they won't mobilize their churches against abortion and they actively resist our efforts to mobilize their churches.

But our largest churches are attended by significant numbers of people who every year are killing their children. Our experience teaches us that if they were shown the horror of abortion, many would spare their children.

Our largest churches are attended by significant numbers of people who are complicit in the commission of abortions (including women who abort and boyfriends who pressure their girlfriends to abort, husbands who pressure their wives to abort and fathers who pressure their daughters to abort). Many have never recovered from the injury abortion inflicts spiritually because they can't be healed without being forgiven; and they can't be forgiven without repentance; and they haven't repented of abortions which, in the secrecy of their hearts, they are still attempting to justify instead of fully confessing. They feel just enough guilt to make them want to ignore this issue but not enough to force them to deal with it at any constructive level. Our experience teaches that if they were shown the horror of abortion, many would confess, repent, seek forgiveness and be healed.

Our largest churches are attended by significant numbers of people who will tell you that they oppose abortion but almost none are involved in serious prolife activism. God has given His people the resources required to stop abortion so in a sense, abortion is happening with the permission of the church. That is why abortion is totally out of control. Our experience teaches that if they were shown the horror of abortion, many would be motivated to support pro-life activism with their time and money.

We know how to win the abortion wars. Outlawing abortion requires a shift in public opinion at the huge levels required to change public policy. The public doesn't believe the first trimester baby is developmentally entitled to rights of personhood. Nor does it believe that abortion is an evil of sufficient magnitude to justify criminalizing the act. Until they see who the baby is and see what abortion does to him, they will remain convinced that abortion is a nominal. Americans believe that nominal evils are best left to individual discretion. They will only accept

government intrusion into people's private lives to stop unconscionable evils, such as civil rights violations.

That is why civil rights activists used horrifying imagery to emphasize the humanity of the victim and the inhumanity of the injustice by which the victim was being victimized. Asserting that voting rights violations are intolerable produces weaker feelings of outrage than does showing video of black people being beaten to their knees for trying to register to vote. Those kinds of violent images were shown to the public by the press, the schools, and the entertainment industry. Today those same institutions have done all in their power to convince the public that the victim of abortion is a blob of tissue and that abortion is the lesser of two evils if it is any evil at all. While this cover-up was going on, the church remained meekly uninvolved. Throughout the history of social reform it is always disturbing pictures which make injustice intolerable. If the church doesn't show those kinds of pictures in the fight to end abortion, who is going to do it. If Saddleback won't be the church which leads that campaign, which church will?

What good are those convictions if you and they have agreed to not act on them at more than a token level? James 2:16 says, "If one of you says to him, 'Go, I wish you well; keep warm and well fed,' but does nothing about his physical needs, what good is it?"

But because churches have covered-up the horror of abortion, between 1980 and 1998, public support for first-trimester abortion (the period during which 90% of abortions are performed) rose from 50% to 61% (Wirthlin poll). By 2003 it had climbed to 66% (Gallup poll).

We will start with Pastor Rick Warren of Saddleback Community Church but his church is only the first of many we will be contacting in an effort to mobilize Christendom in defense of life. When a pastor refuses to meet with us or work with us, should we just do what the pro-life movement has been doing for thirty-six years and walk away? Or should we show from the sidewalk, the pictures the pastor refuses to show from the pulpit? We understand that our presence on that sidewalk will make that church angry toward us but how is their anger at us any more injurious than their indifference to us and this issue has already been? We don't care what people think about us. We care what they think about abortion.

In Jeremiah 7:1-7, God commanded his prophet to "Stand in the gate of the Lord's house..." (verse 2) for the purpose of confronting worshippers over the sin of "oppressing the fatherless" and "shedding innocent blood" (verse 6). No child is more "fatherless" than most aborted babies. Their blood is innocent and it is being shed in every church.

We are asking Pastor Warren the following questions:

Would you agree that if our presence with aborted baby photos on the public sidewalk outside that church convinces even one pregnant woman to not kill her child, the project will be a success and worth any persecution or division which might result?

Would you agree that if our presence on the sidewalk with an aborted baby photo convinces one post-abortive woman (or one post-abortive man) to stop rationalizing this sin and confess and

repent so they can be forgiven and healed, the project will be a success and worth any persecution or division which might result?

Would you agree that if our presence on the sidewalk with an aborted baby photo convinces one apathetic, pro-life Christian to become seriously involved in the defense of life, the project will be a success and worth any persecution or division which might result?

If you don't agree, then what would you advise us to do that we haven't already tried in vain for the last thirty-six years? Nothing is going to change until "business as usual" stops. If the church won't stop "business as usual," why shouldn't we stop it for them? Is it a sin to stand prayerfully, respectfully, on public property on a university campus with large photos of aborted babies? If not, how does that same display become a sin on public property at a church campus? Babies are being killed in both places, in some measure, because the horror of abortion is being covered-up in both places, whether by professors or pastors or the abortion industry.

How is it a sin for us to keep coming back to that resistant church Sunday after Sunday, pursuant to the example our Lord taught in Luke 11:8, where He says, "I tell you, even though he will not get up and give him anything because he is his friend, yet because of his persistence he will get up and give him as much as he needs." Luke 18:5 adds, "... [Y]et because this widow bothers me, I will give her legal protection, otherwise by continually coming she will wear me out." We believe most pastors are good-hearted men who want to do God's will. They just aren't certain where God's will lies in the abortion struggle. We think they are entreatable. Are we wrong to entreat them interminably, considering what is at stake?

And even if they aren't entreatable at first, we know that many refuse to address this issue because they don't want to become known as the "abortion church" and start to lose people. How is it wrong for us to create a disincentive to this sort of avoidance by effectively telling them that our pictures on their sidewalk will even more decisively define them in the public mind as the abortion church and they will lose even more people if we show the pictures endlessly than they would lose if they showed them occasionally?

What would you have us do?